A G E N D A

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Monday 18 July 2016 at 6.00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS

Borough Members: Councillors Bulman (Chairman), Backhouse, Lidstone, Simmons, Stanyer and Woodward
County Members: Councillors King (Vice-Chairman), Davies, Hoare, Holden, Oakford and Scholes
Parish Member Councillor Mackonochie
Quorum: 4 Members (2 KCC members and 2 TWBC members)

1 Apologies
Apologies for absence as reported at the meeting.

2 Declarations of Interest
To receive any declarations of interest by Members in items on the agenda. For any advice on declarations of interest, please contact the Monitoring Officer before the meeting.

3 Notification of Visiting Members wishing to speak
Members should indicate which item(s) they wish to speak on and the nature of their comments no later than 4pm on the working day before the meeting. (Pursuant to Cabinet Procedure Rule 27.4)

4 Minutes of the meeting dated 15 February 2016
The Chairman will move that the minutes be signed as a correct record. The only issue relating to the minutes that can be discussed is their accuracy. (Pages 1 - 16)

5 Minutes of the meeting dated 18 April 2016
The Chairman will move that the minutes be signed as a correct record. The only issue relating to the minutes that can be discussed is their accuracy. (Pages 17 - 28)
6 Tunbridge Wells Tracker for July 2016 (Pages 29 - 30)

Reports of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

7 Traffic Regulation Orders - Objections Received (Pages 31 - 38)

8 Waiting Restrictions Review - Cranbrook and Hawkhurst (Pages 39 - 40)

9 A26 Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells - Proposed Cycle Route Design
   Large printed copies of the plans included in the agenda pack will be available for inspection from 5pm immediately prior to the meeting.

Reports of Kent County Council

10 Highway Works Programme (Pages 59 - 82)

11 Topics for Future Meetings
   There can not be any substantial debate/discussion or any decision on any reports raised, but the agreement of the Board that the topic may come forward to the Board as a report to the next or future meeting would be required. Prior notice of the topic should be sent to the Chairman and Democratic Services Officer.

12 Date of Next Meeting
   The date of the next scheduled meeting is Monday 17 October 2016 at 6.00pm.

Mark O'Callaghan
Democratic Services Officer
Town Hall
ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS
Tel: (01892) 554219
Kent TN1 1RS
Email: mark.o'callaghan@tunbridgewells.gov.uk

mod.gov app – go paperless
Easily download, annotate and keep all committee paperwork on your mobile device using the mod.gov app – all for free!
Visit www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/modgovapp for details.
All visitors wishing to attend a public meeting at the Town Hall between the hours of 9.00am and 5.00pm should report to reception via the side entrance in Monson Way. After 5pm, access will be via the front door on the corner of Crescent Road and Mount Pleasant Road, except for disabled access which will continue by use of an ‘out of hours’ button at the entrance in Monson Way.

Notes on Procedure

(1) A list of background papers appears at the end of each report, where appropriate, pursuant to the Local Government Act 1972, section 100D(i).

(2) Items marked * will be the subject of recommendations by Cabinet to full Council; in the case of other items, Cabinet may make the decision, subject to call-in (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 12).

(3) Members seeking factual information about agenda items are requested to contact the appropriate Service Manager prior to the meeting.

(4) Members of the public and other stakeholders are required to register with the Democratic Services Officer if they wish to speak on an agenda item at a meeting. Places are limited to a maximum of four speakers per item. The deadline for registering to speak is 4.00 pm the last working day before the meeting. Each speaker will be given a maximum of 3 minutes to address the Committee.

(5) Please note that this meeting may be recorded or filmed by the Council for administrative purposes. Any other third party may also record or film meetings, unless exempt or confidential information is being considered, but are requested as a courtesy to others to give notice of this to the Democratic Services Officer before the meeting. The Council is not liable for any third party recordings.

Further details are available on the website (www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk) or from Democratic Services.

◊ If you require this information in another format, please contact us on 01892 526121

◊ Accessibility into and within the Town Hall - In response to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, the Council has provided the following features to overcome physical barriers to access. There is a wheelchair accessible lift by the main staircase, giving access to the first floor where the committee rooms are situated. There are a few steps leading to the Council Chamber itself but there is a platform chairlift in the foyer.

◊ Hearing Loop System - The Council Chamber and all the Committee Rooms have been equipped with hearing induction loop systems. The Council Chamber also has a fully equipped audio-visual system.
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JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD
MONDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2016

MINUTES of the Joint Transportation Board held at the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS on Monday, 15 February 2016

PRESENT: Borough Councillors Bulman (Vice-Chairman), Backhouse, Scott, Stanyer and Woodward
County Councillors King (Chairman), Hoare, Holden and Scholes
Parish Councillor Mackonochie

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors Mrs Cobbold, Hamilton, Lewis-Grey, McDermott, Moore and Munn

OFFICERS: Nick Baldwin (Senior Traffic Engineer), Rosemarie Bennett (Parking Manager), Earl Bourner (District Manager for Tunbridge Wells), Chris Hatcher (Senior Project Engineer), Vicki Hubert (Strategic Transport and Development Planner), Sue Kinsella (Street Lighting Manager), Hilary Smith (Economic Development Manager), Bartholomew Wren (Economic Development Officer) and Mark O’Callaghan (Democratic Services Officer)

APOLOGIES
TB29/15 Apologies for absence were received from Borough Councillor Neve and County Councillors Davies and Oakford.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
TB30/15 There were no disclosable pecuniary or other significant interests declared at the meeting.

NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK
TB31/15 Councillor Moore had registered to speak on minute item TB33/15 (Tracker Item 10), TB38/15 and TB42/15. Councillor Lewis-Grey had registered to speak on minute item TB37/15.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 19 OCTOBER 2015
TB32/15 Members reviewed the minutes. There were no amendments proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 19 October 2015 be approved as a correct record.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TRACKER AS AT 05 FEBRUARY 2016
TB33/15 The Board considered the Tunbridge Wells Tracker as at 5 February 2016. Comments were made in respect of the Tracker Items as follows:

Tracker Item 1 – Crescent Road central crossing refuge:
Councillor Backhouse asked when the works were going to start. Earl Bourner, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, Kent County Council, agreed to take back the question for the relevant officer. Councillor Bulman added that he had received a large number of enquiries regarding this item so some
urgency was required. County Councillor King requested that Members be written to with details of timescales.

**Tracker Item 2 – St. John’s Road:**
Vicki Hubert, Strategic Transport and Development Planner, Kent County Council, advised Members that Section106 money originally secured for this project would be put towards the A26 design work being undertaken by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.

**Tracker Item 3 – Longfield Road and North Farm:**
Mr Bourner updated Members noting that all structural works were complete and the final task of seeding was due to take place in February 2016.

**Tracker Item 4 – Borough Transportation Strategy:**
Mr Peter Perry had registered to speak on behalf of the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum.

Mr Perry welcomed the A26/A264 Route study but noted that it did not refer to the Pembury Road/Calverley Park Gardens/Kingswood Road junction which was a major contributor to congestion on Pembury Road. It was suggested that both ends of Calverley Park Gardens should be included in the study. The Town Forum would like the study to be the basis of a debate at the next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board prior to the Borough Transportation Strategy being considered by the Cabinet Committee of Kent County Council. The route study had shown that traffic into town, rather than through the town, was the chief concern so whilst a bypass was unnecessary; relief was needed at Pembury Road, A26 and at Carrs Corner, particularly from HGVs. The latest figures showed that a further 13,000 homes would be needed, such a large increase would require significant infrastructure investment. A radical rethink was required to include all forms of sustainable transport modes. The Town Forum’s Transport Working Group included enthusiastic and informed members who would welcome the opportunity to be involved in developing plans.

Ms Hubert advised Members that the need for further study had been identified particularly around Carrs Corner and Calverley Park Gardens. Initial work would be undertaken this financial year with further studies as funding became available in the next financial year. The results of the three studies would hopefully form the basis of a Strategy that could deal with the issues highlighted by the speaker. County Councillor King asked that an update be given at the meeting of the Joint Transportation Board following the consideration of the Strategy by the Cabinet Committee of Kent County Council.

Councillor Scott supported the comments of the Town Forum and added that it was important that future planning include all forms of transport and not just cars, particularly the new technology that was likely over the next 10–20 years.

County Councillor Holden advised members that through his Members’ Grant he was funding a traffic survey at Hawkhurst traffic lights which were a major source of congestion and asked that progress be recorded in the Tracker. Members agreed.

**Tracker Item 5 – Grass verges on King George V Hill:**
County Councillor Hoare commented that the work had been completed.
unsatisfactorily, a view which was supported by Councillor Backhouse who added that the standard of the asphalt was poor and some of the paving was loose or standing proud. County Councillor King asked that officers undertake an appraisal to be reported at the next meeting.

**Tracker Item 6 – Street Lighting Review and Tracker Item 7 – Street Lighting LED:**
Mr Bourner advised members that the relevant officers were due to attend and asked that the item be deferred until later in the meeting.

**Tracker Item 8 – Grosvenor Bridge Repairs:**
Mr Bourner advised that the start of works was delayed until April or May. County Councillor King asked that if works had not commenced by the time of the next meeting then an explanation should be given.

**Tracker Item 9 – Pedestrian crossing in Major York’s Road and Langton Road:**
Mr Bourner had nothing to add to the written update but advised Members that he would take back a request for timescales.

**Tracker Item 10 – Carrs Corner:**
Mr Peter Perry had registered to speak on behalf of the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum.

Mr Perry welcomed the new tree on the roundabout but noted that weeds were already growing around it and called for details of a maintenance plan. He highlighted that at a previous meeting of the Joint Transportation Board it had been agreed to update the signage and road lining around the junction but implementation was still outstanding and works should be expedited. The Town Forum strongly advocated the need for significant improvements to access and safety on all arms of the junction including the introduction of 20mph speed limits. Furthermore, the Town Forum asked to be involved in the planning and design of any works.

Councillor Tracy Moore, Borough Councillor for Park Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Moore distributed photographs to members which highlighted damaged road infrastructure around the Calverley Park Gardens junction with Carrs Corner. In addition to the focus on pedestrianisation of the town centre there also needed to be attention on the pedestrian routes into town. The speeds and oversized HGVs using Calverley Park Gardens and Carrs Corner created a significant hazard. Reducing speed and a fundamental redesign of Carrs Corner was essential. Some mapping programmes incorrectly identified Calverley Park Gardens as the A264 so some sat-navs were directing inappropriate traffic along the road and it was the responsibility of Kent County Council to correct this error.

County Councillor Holden commented on damage caused by HGVs in rural areas and would like to see a strategic review of HGVs which appeared to have outgrown the existing infrastructure, measures could include weight and size restrictions. The balance between economies of scale and quality of life was askew and needed to be redressed. Some European countries protect their standard of living by imposing restrictions on when and where large lorries can go and a similar attitude should be adopted in the UK. County Councillor King asked that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Joint
Transportation Board, no later than the October meeting, considering the proposals outlined by County Councillor Holden. Members agreed.

Councillor Bulman commented that the issues at Carrs Corner had been discussed for a long time, a final resolution with timescales was needed and quickly.

**Tracker Item 11 – A26 London Road junction Yew Tree Road, Southborough:**

Mr Bourner advised members that the project had been split into two with upgrades to the traffic signals and footways at the Yew Tree Road junction ongoing overnight and nearing completion. Phase two would look at the junction of Pembury Road and Halls Hole Road and was covered in detail later in the agenda. County Councillor King asked that once works at Yew Tree Road were complete officers undertake an analysis and report to the next Joint Transportation Board meeting on the effectiveness of the improvements. Councillor Scott added that an analysis of vehicles using the access road alongside the traffic lights to jump the queue should be included.

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

**LOCAL GROWTH FUND FUNDING ALLOCATION**

**TB34/15** Vicki Hubert, Strategic Transport and Development Planner, Kent County Council, introduced the report and advised that funding was left over from the A26/Yew Tree Road scheme. It was important to retain this funding in Tunbridge Wells so the A26/A264 route study recently completed had been used to identify suitable improvement sites, the forerunner being the Pembury Road/Halls Hole Road junction. Kent County Council would be presenting proposals to the South East Local Enterprise Partnership for a decision and would keep the Joint Transportation Board informed.

In response to a question from County Councillor Hoare, Ms Hubert clarified that the proposal was for a roundabout to replace the traffic lights at the junction. The results of the route studies had facilitated a small scale transport model which suggested that the proposed scheme would be effective. The cost of the studies had been met from the scheme funding, the exact amount was not known.

County Councillor Hoare asked what was involved with the land surveying as the cost seems high compared to the construction costs. Ms Hubert advised that there were significant land level differences and stats through the site which would require diverting.

Councillor Bulman commented that this was an urgent issue and that the implications for Cornford Lane should be taken into account so that a complete solution could be achieved at this junction.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.
Bartholomew Wren, Economic Development Officer, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The Strategy had been prepared following a six-week period of public consultation which concluded in November 2015.
- Feedback received indicated a strong level of support with a lack of infrastructure and road safety concerns identified as the main barriers to cycling.
- Significant support was received for 20mph speed limits in appropriate areas to support safer cycling.
- A full consultation feedback report was included at appendix M to the report.
- Whilst there had been no feedback which would require a fundamental change to the Strategy, several routes had been amended in response to specific comments.
- Alongside the Strategy several infrastructure projects were being progressed, including: design work for infrastructure improvements to the A26 and 21st Century Way; A21 non-motorised users route and connections to Tunbridge Wells Hospital; and increased cycle parking at Tunbridge Wells and High Brooms Stations.
- The Strategy should be considered as a starting point for promoting cycling in the borough and having a strategy put partners in a stronger position when seeking funding.

Mr Paul Mason had registered to speak on behalf of the Tunbridge Wells Bicycle Users Group.

Mr Mason highlighted that there had been a continual degradation of public spaces and a reduction to the quality of life by ever increasing traffic. The Cycling Strategy was a solution. The issues at hand were not the details of particular routes but broader issues of vision, choice and finances. The vision was simple and that was to bequeath a borough that was free of congestion and pollution and that was safe and vibrant. The current Transport Strategy was primarily concerned with motor vehicles or walking, cycling provided additional choice. Numerous polls had delivered overwhelming support for a huge increase in cycling infrastructure and evidence showed that where safe cycling was available it was used. 60 per cent of all journeys in Britain were less than five miles and 90 per cent of traffic in Tunbridge Wells was internal. The choice of cycling was currently being denied. Without such a Strategy it would be impossible to tap into sources of funding. The duelling of the A21 was costing £70million, for the same amount 150 miles of safe, segregated, high quality cycling infrastructure could be made.

Councillor Backhouse commented that the 21st Century Way had been made possible through Section 106 contributions and so having a Strategy would make it much easier to obtain further such money in future. Through the Planning process it should become expected that people wishing to develop in the town should contribute to cycling schemes.

Councillor Scott added his support for the Strategy and warned of the scale of the task. A big swing towards cycling would be needed to have an impact and so some measure of success should be part of the outcomes from the Strategy.
County Councillor Holden welcomed the report and added that routes between rural areas should also be included.

County Councillor Hoare also supported the Strategy but felt that it should go further. He highlighted comments made by Skinners School whereby they support cycling but felt it was impractical given the safety concerns on St. John’s Road. This was a widely held view and overcoming it would require more radical proposals.

Parish Councillor Mackonochie echoed the comments of County Councillor Holden and added that cycling infrastructure should be referenced in the proposed report on HGV access as rural cycle-ways should be away from the main lorry routes.

Hilary Smith, Economic Development Manager, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, commented that the A26 route was a top priority and initial design work was underway facilitated by the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. The safety concerns were acknowledge and the best possible solution would be sought.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

RESOLVED – That the Board supports the Final Draft Cycling Strategy for adoption by the Cabinet of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.

UPDATE ON 20MPH WORKING GROUP

TB36/15 Hilary Smith, Economic Development Manager, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- Since the request at the October meeting of the Joint Transportation Board work had progressed on introducing 20mph speed limits in the borough.
- Other authorities who had introduced such zones had been contacted, including Lancashire County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council.
- Key local stakeholders had been identified.
- A working group had been established and the first meeting was held in January 2016 to further explore the issues with a second meeting due in March. It was agreed that a detailed business case would be prepared for the April meeting of the Joint Transportation Board.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

PARKING STRATEGY 2016-2026

TB37/15 Rosemarie Bennett, Parking Manager, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- A draft Strategy was consulted on in 2015 and was based on the knowledge that many parking related issued required a more holistic, long term approach.
Four key objectives had been identified which were explained in section 4 of the Strategy. Most of the consultation feedback came from resident permit holders whose main complaint was summarised as having to pay for a permit to allow everyone else to park for free while they have the search of space. While some were calling for resident only parking at all times, a majority would be satisfied with resident only parking at key times of the day so spaces were free for residents when needed and provided short stay parking during the day. The Strategy also sought to align restrictions within zones to eliminate confusion and reduce unnecessary traffic circulation. Other concerns raised were footway parking and general congestions. The Strategy proposed a number of measures, some of which would need to be delivered in partnership with Kent County Council. All the actions proposed by the Strategy were summarised and cross-references against the objectives in the Implementation Programme at the end of the Strategy. Most actions would need separate consultation with any objections being reviewed by the Joint Transportation Board. Any recommendations from the Joint Transportation Board to be made at this meeting would be included in the report for adoption by the Cabinet of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council at its meeting in April 2016.

Councillor Scott noted that the Strategy sought to ‘meet’ the current and future parking needs, however, there should be an attempt to influence future parking requirements by including Parking into the wider Transport Strategy. The increasing rate of vehicle ownership was unsustainable and there needed to be a greater increase in the number of people using alternative modes of transport.

Councillor Alex Lewis-Grey, Borough Councillor for Culverden Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Lewis-Grey warmly welcomed the Strategy and supported Councillor Scott’s comments. He was pleased that the anecdotal evidence received by councillors on a regular basis was backed up by the data in the report. In reference to the map of parking zones in the town centre, attention was drawn to the gap between zones B and C which generated a significant number of complaints, particularly from Park Road, and it was asked that this be considered when the zones were expanded. Expediency in making changes was called for as the long timescales for approving traffic regulation orders was often not understood by residents. Councillor Lewis-Grey called for the Strategy to include an analysis of enforcement of both parking and speed, perhaps as part of the congestion and traffic flow section, and a greater utilisation of residents permits in multi-story car parks rather than residents having to buy the more expensive season tickets. The creative use of parking restrictions and other traffic calming measures was suggested as a means of reducing speeds.

Mrs Bennett agreed to consider the proposal to allow residents’ permits in car parks and to relook at a parking consultation in Park Road. In terms of influencing parking needs it had been suggested that the number of permits available per household could be restricted to suggest to those who do not
need more than one car to consider reducing the number of vehicles. Other measures would need to be considered in partnership with other strategies.

Hilary Smith, Economic Development Manager, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, commented that the Transport Strategy and Cycling Strategy sought to promote various alternatives to car travel which should reduce the need for parking. The development of the new Local Plan would also consider the needs of a growing population.

County Councillor Scholes welcomed the report noting its comprehensiveness and commented that it took a long time when implementing parking measures. Each change required a separate traffic regulation order which involved consultation and a lengthy process.

Councillor Backhouse agreed with the need to influence parking needs and commented that in Planning terms any new development had to provide suitable parking. However, much of the housing in Tunbridge Wells was Victorian and Edwardian terrace which were designed without consideration for vehicles. People moving into the area must have reasonable expectations when purchasing such a house.

County Councillor Holden commented that he hoped there would not be an attempt to control the number of vehicles a household may have.

Councillor Bulman was disappointed to note that a more user friendly form of parking charging was not being considered for the Royal Victoria Place and that take-up of Pay-by-Phone was not proving popular. He asked why Pay-on-Exit was not being considered. Furthermore, charging for on-street parking was not supported as it only served to raise revenue and not control parking.

Mrs Bennett advised that the Cabinet had approved a barrier-less Pay-on-Exit system for the Royal Victoria Place Car Park which was the same system in use at Great Hall Car Park. Barriers were not suitable for Royal Victoria Place as queuing already occurred and barriers would exacerbate the problem further. Councillor Bulman commented that the proportion of people using Pay-on-Exit at Great Hall Car Park was quite low and asked how that system was expected to cope with the greater number of people wanting Pay-on-Exit at Royal Victoria Place Car Park. He also did not accept that the use of barriers would cause the problems suggested. Mrs Bennett advised that the Car Park had been independently surveyed and did not meet the requirements for a barrier system. The Pay-on-Exit system at Great Hall Car Park accounted for 30 per cent of transactions and was increasing. A further 30 per cent of transactions were using Pay-by-Phone. People using Pay-on-Exit tend to park for longer meaning that the car park was usually at full capacity so there was not much scope to increase Pay-on-Exit further. Royal Victoria Place Car Park had a far greater capacity to cope with higher volumes and it was expected therefore that the proportion of people using Pay-on-Exit there would be higher. Councillor Bulman was dissatisfied with the dismissal of a barrier system which had been supported by a number of retailers.

County Councillor Scholes suggested that the Board could endorse the Strategy but with the caveat that the Cabinet review the use of barriers. County Councillor Holden agreed and strongly supported the use of Pay-on-Exit.
County Councillor King, brought the discussion to a conclusion and summarised the options. There being a consensus, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the Board endorse the Parking Strategy 2016-2026 subject to the reservations expressed by Councillor Bulman and supported by the Board being taken into consideration by the Cabinet.

**PARKING CONSULTATION IN HAWKENBURY**

TB38/15 Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The report followed an informal consultation undertaken in the Hawkenbury area related to parking issues since the occupation of the old Land Registry building by AXA PPP.
- The intention was to take on comments received and consider potential changes to alleviate some of the worst problems.
- The report summarised the feedback received by the survey and recommended that it form the basis of more specific proposals for a further informal consultation ahead of a statutory consultation.
- The Board were asked to endorse this course of action.

Councillor Tracy Moore, Borough Councillor for Park Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Moore noted that the results of the survey was consistent with her own findings from when she had conducted a residents’ survey shortly before being elected. The number of responses clearly demonstrated the level of concern, particularly with the prospect of an enlarged AXA PPP. The view expressed in paragraph 15 of the report which explained that residents had no more legal right than any other road users to park on a public highway was not a view held by residents nor elected representatives and the staff of one employer should not be allowed to affect residents ability to park near their homes. Although the results of the consultation were inconclusive, members were urged to support the recommendation to progress this matter.

Councillor Bulman agreed that this was a key matter for the residents of Hawkenbury, it had recently been reported that parking was often not only inconsiderate but sometimes dangerous. This issue had been a problem for a long time and it was expected to be exacerbated by the forthcoming enlargement of AXA PPP. Urgency was called for.

County Councillor Scholes supported the comments of the previous speakers and added that parking had been a constant problem even with the Land Registry before AXA PPP. It was a regular source of complaints and urgent action was needed.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed course of action as set out in the report be endorsed.
Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The report had been prepared with the intention of clarifying the various roles within the Traffic Regulation Order approval process.
- The potential for confusion existed where there was a difference of opinion and a matter was referred to Kent County Council as highways authority for final decision. Members of the public may incorrectly believe that a decision had been made by the Joint Transportation Board. Therefore, it was proposed to make a slight change so that objectors were advised of the full process prior to the matter being reviewed by the Board.

County Councillor Scholes commented that elected members should not be excluded from the process. Mr Baldwin confirmed that it was not the intention to remove members from the process. Currently if objections were made to a Traffic Regulation Order the matter would come before the Joint Transportation Board and the objectors would be advised of the outcome. There was often the perception that the matter was final. The proposed change meant that officers would take a view and feedback to objectors who would be advised that the Joint Transportation Board would be consulted. If there was a difference of opinion between the Board and officers then the matter would be referred to Kent County Council for a final decision. County Councillor Scholes commented that this meant officers of Kent Highways would make a decision and reiterated that this prevented members from being involved in the final decision. Members often had relevant experience or local knowledge and there was no opportunity for Members to express those views should they feel strongly on the matter.

County Councillor King proposed that in the event of a difference of opinion the matter should be referred to the Kent County Council Cabinet Committee. County Council Scholes added that it was important for members of the Joint Transportation Board to be aware if a differing course of action was being proposed by the officers.

Councillor Stanyer supported the position outlined by County Councillor Scholes and noted his dissatisfaction that the view of the Joint Transportation Board had been overruled by officers. He had referred to the Council’s Constitution and in all cases there was a strong principle of Member’s making decisions. County Councillor Scholes noted that the Joint Transportation Board only had an advisory capacity. County Councillor King acknowledged the fact but commented that the matter should be referred to either the Cabinet of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council or the Kent County Council Cabinet Committee. County Councillor Scholes advised that as the highways authority the matter should reside with Kent County Council.

County Councillor Holden supported the principle that the final decision should involve Members. County Councillor Scholes added that there needed to be some mechanism whereby Members could appeal if it was still felt strongly after further professional advice. County Councillor Holden noted that the Kent County Council Cabinet Committee was itself not a decision making body therefore any recommendations would ultimately pass to the Cabinet Member, a process that was already in use on other matters.
The Chairman, County Councillor King, brought the discussion to a conclusion and summarised the debate. There being a consensus, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the Board requests in the event of the Joint Transportation Board taking a different view to the officer’s recommendation in the matter of a Traffic Regulation Order, it be referred to the Kent County Council Cabinet Committee for recommendation to the Cabinet Member.

**WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON NORFOLK ROAD**

TB40/15 Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, explained that this item had been the impetus for the previous item and that it had been expected that the Kent County Council Parking Manager would be present to explain the process. He introduced the report which included the following comments:

- At the site visit to Norfolk Road it had been explained to all present that where the officer’s decision was disputed the matter would be referred to the Cabinet Member at Kent County Council.
- The Parking Manager had found that the restrictions as marked were appropriate for highway safety purposes.
- Should Members strongly be opposed to the outcome then the matter would be referred to the Cabinet Member who would also be made aware of the resolution of the previous item.

County Council Scholes commented that the owner of the property in question had since sold the house advertising an additional parking space. County Councillor King noted the debate on the previous item and sought Members’ agreement that the matter be referred. County Councillor Scholes added that if the Kent Parking Manager had been in attendance and could explain the reasons for the decision it would allow Members to make a judgement. Councillor Scott commented that there had been no explanation as to why this scheme was now considered to be safe when previously it had not been.

County Councillor King advised that the Kent Parking Manager would be invited to attend a future meeting and asked Members whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted subject to further discussion.

**SAFE AND SENSIBLE STREET LIGHTING UPDATE**

TB41/15 Sue Kinsella, Street Lighting Manager, Kent County Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The report provided an update on phase one of the safe and sensible street lighting project which was primarily concerned with the trial switch-off sights.
- Of the original nine trial sites, seven had progressed with one site being excluded from the trial and one site being converted to part-night switch-off.
- The trial sites were switched-off in June 2014 and the number of incidents and enquiries monitored.
• There had been a number of enquiries in respect of London Road, Southborough and subsequently these lights were switched back on.

Each of the trial sites as detailed in the report were then reviewed. No comments from Members contrary to the Officer’s recommendations where received.

County Councillor Scholes noted that Langton Road, Speldhurst had been identified as suitable for part-night operation and asked whether this included a stretch of road where there had been a particularly bad accident and a number of smaller incidents. Chris Hatcher, Senior Project Engineer, Kent County Council, confirmed that it did not. County Councillor Scholes added that there were regular problems with badgers and deer in that area so he was concerned about a reduction in lighting. Mr Hatcher advised that an update on the LED Project deferred from earlier in the meeting would address some concerns as it was expected that part-night operation would end.

Mr Hatcher provided an update on the LED Street Lighting project deferred from Tracker Item 7 which included the following comments:

- In 2014/15 Kent County Council obtained funding to convert all street lights to LED which would be connected to a central management system so that they can be controlled remotely.
- A contract was awarded in December 2015 for the installation and maintenance of all 120,000 street lights owned by Kent County Council.
- Works were due to commence in March 2016 with residential roads, minor roads and those with part-night lighting being converted first, due to complete May 2017. Main traffic routes and town centres would follow.
- The use of part-night lighting was subject to a consultation which had completed and a report presented to the Cabinet Committee for consideration. That meeting, held on 12 March 2016, resolved that once a road had been converted to LED it would be set to ‘optimal lighting’ and part-night operation would end.
- Optimal lighting would be determined on a case-by-case basis with low traffic roads likely to be dimmed whereas high traffic roads could be run on full power.
- Tunbridge Wells would be in the third tranche of works, expected to start in the Autumn of 2016.

Councillor Backhouse commented that eight roads in Sherwood were subject to part-night lighting and there had been a spate of crime. He asked whether he could now advise residents that full-time lighting would be returned. Mr Hatcher confirmed that it would.

County Councillor Holden asked what consideration had been given to the colour of the light. Ms Kinsella advised that advice had been sought and various impact assessments conducted after which a neutral white had been selected. There would be a marked difference between the old sodium yellow lights which dispersed the light more widely. The new lights would direct the light to the ground, there would be less light intrusion and would aid colour recognition. A warm-white light had been chosen rather than the harsher blue-white lights. County Councillor Holden asked whether this would result in less light pollution. Ms Kinsella confirmed that it would.
Councillor Backhouse advised Members that an LED light was in operation and could be viewed on Thornfield Gardens in Tunbridge Wells. It appeared to be welcomed by the residents.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – That the comments in respect of each trial switch-off site be noted.

### HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME

**TB42/15** Councillor Tracy Moore, Borough Councillor for Park Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Moore was disappointed to note that the construction of a build-out on Bayhall Road at the entrance to Dunorlan Park had been completed as she had intended to propose an alternative. A build-out at the current location was poorly sited, would not help safety and would do little to reduce speed on the road. A zebra crossing at the main entrance to the park closest to St. Peter’s Church would be more suitable to provide better access to the park, increase safety and reduce speed on Bayhall Road.

Earl Bourner, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, Kent County Council, agreed to take the matter to other officers for full comment. County Councillor Scholes commented that funds may be available through his member’s grant. County Councillor King asked that he, County Councillor Scholes and Councillor Moore receive a full response by email.

Councillor Bulman commented that there were several items he would have liked to have seen in the Highway Works Programme for 2015/16 but accepted their omission on the understanding that they would form part of the programme for 2016/17. He sought reassurance that west Kent received its fair share of resources. There were a number of roads which were in urgent need of repair.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the resolution was agreed.

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

### SELF-DRIVING VEHICLES FOR TUNBRIDGE WELLS

**TB43/15** Councillor David Scott introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The objective of the report was to include the concept of driverless vehicles in all of the transportation planning of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Kent County Council.
- It had been reported in the LA Times that driverless vehicles were expected to enter the mainstream within four to five years. Similarly, The Economist had reported that driverless vehicles were expected to be as transformative to modern life as the mobile phone.
There were many examples whereby driverless vehicles were already on the streets and several trials were underway in the United Kingdom.

There was a good example in use in the Netherlands where there was a driverless vehicle route between Wageningen and Ede, two towns not dissimilar to Royal Tunbridge Wells and Pembury.

The detailed report demonstrated the amount of work that had been done and it was hoped that it would raise awareness of the type of technology that was available.

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council was already leading the way in thinking about driverless vehicles when considering plans for the central spine of the town, initially to run alongside other forms of public transport.

Members were asked to endorse the principles outlined in the recommendations of the report.

County Councillor Holden identified a recent press report which stated that driverless vehicles were in use in Bristol, Greenwich, South East London, Coventry and Milton Keynes. He asked what the experience had been. Councillor Scott noted that these were a variety of trials underway to test different uses of the vehicles. The report which had been prepared for Tunbridge Wells identified three potential uses where they could be on pedestrianised areas, on roads or on designated pathways. The trial in Milton Keynes was looking at use of driverless vehicles on a pedestrian route from the station to main shopping area, approximately the distance from Royal Victoria Place to the Pantiles in Tunbridge Wells. In Greenwich the trial was as an alternative mass-transit system in the New Town but they were looking to expand it. Oxford trials were at a very early stage. Each trial was at a different stage of development. Councillor Scott added that the Borough Council was in discussion with Catapult to get their advice on potential uses on the system in Tunbridge Wells.

Councillor Woodward supported the recommendation and noted that to not consider such technology would be blinkered. This provided a good opportunity to make effective use of resources, improve the environment and be a draw for visitors.

County Councillor King commented that people would be remiss to not take heed of increasing congestion and potential solutions and noted that recommendations three and four called upon the relevant authorities to consider these proposals. County Councillor Scholes warned against not setting specific actions to ensure progress. There needed to be a follow-up report outlining what had happened to progress this matter.

The Chairman, County Councillor King, summarised the options. There being a consensus, Members were asked whether the resolutions were agreed.

RESOLVED –

1. That the Board endorse the following recommendations to decision makers:

   A. To note and include the possibility of self-driving technology within the planning of all changes to roads, pedestrian ways and transportation infrastructure - as a key requirement for the future;
B. To include the assessment of the need for improvements to all forms of movement of people, goods and vehicles as part of the fundamental infrastructure of the town. This should also be included in Planning Strategy documents currently being considered and/or developed;

C. To recommend to Kent County Council that full consideration of new technology be given to help solve transportation problems, particularly in relation to dealing with the severe congestion issues of Tunbridge Wells;

D. To recommend to Tunbridge Wells Borough Council that it leads a project, in the first instance, to fully consider a transportation strategy for the central spine of Tunbridge Wells. This study to include the use of self-driving technology. Thereafter TWBC should consider the possible use of new technology elsewhere in the town and surrounding areas;

2. That the Board requests the respective officers apprise their authorities and provide a progress report for the October meeting of the Joint Transportation Board outlining progress made and actions taken; and

3. That the Board requests the Kent County Council Cabinet Member be briefed on the above recommendations and a meeting arranged between him, the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and Councillor Scott to be held prior to the October meeting of the Joint Transportation Board.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

TB44/15 The Board considered items for future meetings and comments were made in respect of the proposals as follows:

Devolution of Highway Responsibilities to Parishes:
County Councillor Holden advised Members of a recent discussion with highways officers during which it was noted that some aspects of local highways responsibility, such as salt bins and informal passing places on country lanes, could be devolved to Parishes who had the required local knowledge. There should be consideration of what aspects could be devolved and the implications of doing so.

Parish Councillor Mackonochie agreed and noted that cooperation had worked well in the past particularly in the case of salt and sand which had been supplied to Parish Councils for use as necessary. It had been suggested that a fund could be put aside for Parishes as they would know local priorities.

Councillor Backhouse supported the suggestion and commented that devolution was much discussed currently and there could be some movement of highway responsibilities down the chain in future.
Transportation Implications of Changes to the Town Centre:
Councillor Scott noted that Tunbridge Wells Borough Council was proposing changes to the central spine of the Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre and there should be consideration of the transportation implications.

Use of Traffic Lights:
Councillor Bulman reminded members that a previously agreed report into the perceived over-use of traffic lights was still outstanding.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TB45/15 The next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board would be held on Monday 18 April 2016 commencing at 6pm.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 8.00 pm.
PRESENT: Borough Councillors Bulman (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Backhouse, Neve, Scott, Stanyer and Woodward
County Councillors Hoare, Oakford and Scholes
Parish Councillor Mackonochie

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors McDermott, Podbury, Rankin and Williams

OFFICERS: Nick Baldwin (Senior Traffic Engineer), Vicki Hubert (Strategic Transport Planner), Hilary Smith (Economic Development Manager), Carol Valentine (West Kent Highway Manager) and Mark O’Callaghan (Democratic Services Officer)

APOLOGIES

TB46/15 Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Davies, Holden and King.

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Bulman, was in the Chair.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

TB47/15 There were no disclosable pecuniary or other significant interests declared at the meeting.

NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK

TB48/15 Councillor Rankin had registered to speak on minute item TB50/15 (Tracker Item 7).
Councillor Williams had registered to speak on minute item TB51/15.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 15 FEBRUARY 2016

TB49/15 The Chairman advised that the minutes were not available therefore this item would be carried over to the subsequent meeting. The minutes would be circulated to Members and published as draft at the earliest opportunity.

In response to a request for clarification from Councillor Neve, Mark O’Callaghan, Democratic Services Officer, apologised and added that recent staffing changes and a particularly heavy workload within the department had contributed to the delay.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TRACKER FOR APRIL 2016

TB50/15 The Board considered the Tunbridge Wells Tracker for April 2016. The Chairman confirmed that items where there were registered speakers would be taken first. Comments were made in respect of the Tracker Items in the order as follows:
Tracker Item 1 – Crescent Road crossing refuge:
Jane Fenwick had registered to speak on behalf of the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum.

Mrs Fenwick was disappointed by the apparent cancellation of the planned works and noted that it had been reported to a previous meeting that funding was in place and design works were underway. She noted that the reason given was that the project had failed to be delivered within the financial year and funding had been reallocated following an unsuccessful bid this year. Mrs Fenwick questioned why it had taken so long despite remaining on the Tracker for a year and there only being minor obstacles reported during that time. She also sought clarification as to the scoring system in use to determine such schemes. There was a distinct lack of safe crossing points on the A264 and such a high traffic area was in urgent need of a crossing, she considered that this was one of the highest priority sites. The requested works were relatively minor and consisted of a simple pedestrian refuge within the existing hatched area which would not interrupt the flow of traffic but would allow a two-stage crossing of a very busy road. The Town Forum requested that the A264, Calverley Park Gardens, Carrs Corner and Crescent Road be considered as one project in terms of pedestrian safety and that urgent action be taken as the needs of residents and other pedestrians had been neglected for too long.

Councillor Bulman was very unhappy that the works had been cancelled and reiterated that the Board had expected that these works would be completed.

Carol Valentine, West Kent Highway Manager, Kent County Council, advised that the relevant officers were not present and as such a detailed response could not be given. However, she agreed that a report would come to the next meeting which would include details as to why the works had not been completed within the agreed timeframe, an explanation of the scoring system used to prioritise works, explanation of the grounds by which the scheme did not score as highly this year and details of how much the scheme would have cost. Ms Valentine added that the failure of the scheme was disappointing which she believed was due to a lack of available officers to ensure all schemes were delivered in time. To combine the various schemes into a single project delivered within the current financial year would be impractical due to a lack of funding. The breakdown of this scheme was regrettable and processes would be reviewed to ensure it didn’t happen again.

County Councillor Scholes expressed his dissatisfaction with what had happened. He confirmed that he had made it known that if it was a case of a lack of money he had been prepared to consider the use of his Members’ Grant, however, the first time he had heard of the cancellation of these works was when it appeared in the agenda papers. He suggested that the cause of the cancellation was systemic and noted that he had been allowed to carry over amounts of his Members’ Grant specifically because schemes were consistently being delayed. Getting information was a constant battle.

County Councillor Hoare strongly supported the comments of the previous speakers.

Councillor Scott concurred and suggested that a temporary measure consisting of two blocks of concrete could be put in place and sited an example of where this had been done before. Urgent action was needed.
Councillor Neve added his frustration at the cancellation and added that officers should be in attendance when matters they have responsibility for are due for consideration, otherwise the matter should be deferred until they can attend. Councillor Bulman agreed in principle but gave caution as to the practicality. In this case the responsible officer’s manager was in attendance.

County Councillor Oakford shared the disappointment expressed by previous speakers and asked when it was first recognised that there wasn’t enough members in the team to deliver this scheme last year and why it wasn’t flagged at previous meetings that there were concerns and that the scheme was at risk of losing its funding. If it was the case that there were insufficient resources available then alternative arrangements could have been made.

Ms Valentine agreed with the comments that had been made but did not know when the lack of resources was first recognised. She advised that there had been a number of changes within the department that had lead to many staff changes and it was known that this had contributed to the problems described by County Councillor Scholes. Responsibility for schemes funded through the Members’ Grant could be changing to address the issues. Other processes would be reviewed to ensure the right information is brought to the Board’s attention in a timely fashion.

Councillor Bulman welcomed the acknowledgement of the issues but was not satisfied with the responses. He proposed that he write on behalf of the Joint Transportation Board to the Kent County Council Cabinet Member expressing the Board’s concerns. Members agreed.

At the Chairman’s discretion Mrs Fenwick addressed the Board and implored Members to ensure this matter remained a priority. Councillor Bulman confirmed that this matter would be a personal priority for him and his fellow Ward Members.

**Tracker Item 7 – Carrs Corner:**
Jennifer Hemming, resident of Calverley Park Gardens, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Mrs Hemming highlighted that despite being a minor residential road, Calverley Park Gardens was being used as a main road by heavy goods vehicles and an inappropriate number of other vehicles. The problem had been aggravated by the incorrect designation of Calverley Park Gardens as the A264. Whilst the error had been corrected the damage had been done and many Sat-Nav devices were still directing traffic along the road. Mrs Hemming welcomed the focus on pedestrian and cyclist safety and called for some specific measure to be taken urgently:
1. Implementation of a 20mph speed limit along Calverley Park Gardens;
2. Make the junction of Calverley Park Garden with Carrs Corner a no right turn, this would prevent vehicles from using the road as a cut-through and simplify the junction at Carrs Corner;
3. Erect signs at either end of Calverley Park Gardens to direct traffic to use the correct route of the A264; and
4. Create pedestrian crossing refuges on Calverley Park Gardens and the junction with Pembury Road. The existing refuge at the junction with Carrs Corner was constantly being demolished by heavy goods vehicles turning.
Mrs Hemming asked that Calverley Park Gardens be considered as an integral part of the Carrs Corner area and to be included in any solution.

Vicki Hubert, Strategic Transport Planner, Kent County Council, advised that as part of the A26 / A264 Route Studies it had been recognised that any action at key junctions would have a wider impact and it was hoped that funding would be available this financial year to progress plans for Carrs Corner and adjoining roads. A report would be brought to a future meeting outlining whether funding was available and what can be achieved for the area. The problems were recognised and plans for Carrs Corner would also address the issues in Calverley Park Gardens.

Councillor Catherine Rankin, Borough Councillor for Park Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Ranking commented that she strongly supported the views of the Members in respect of the previous item regarding Crescent Road. Regarding Carrs Corner, Councillor Rankin supported the comments of Mrs Hemming and added that making the junction of Calverley Park Gardens and Carrs Corner no right turn would be a simple and effective solution. It would reduce traffic using the road as a cut-through and would also have a significant impact on the congestion caused by vehicles pulling out of the junction and trying to join the main flow of traffic. Stopping the heavy goods vehicles cutting-through would improve safety for cyclists using the narrow lanes and improve traffic flows on the main route of the A264.

Councillor Scott concurred but warned that a no right turn sign was not a guarantee that it would be observed and gave the example of the junction of Mount Ephraim and London Road where the no right turn was frequently disobeyed. Ideally there should be either a physical barrier or other enforcement to change ingrained behaviours.

County Councillor Scholes advised Members that he had had a meeting with Michael Hardy, Schemes Project Engineer, Kent County Council, who, given the aforementioned problems with completing projects, had advised him to prioritise Major York’s Road and Calverley Park Gardens. Therefore, he was prepared to assist with the use of his Members’ Grant.

**Tracker Item 2 – St. John’s Road Improvements:**
Ms Hubert advised that the study was ongoing and it was expected that a report would be brought to the next meeting by which time firmer plans would be available. Councillor Scott asked that the Board see the plans before they were finalised.

**Tracker Item 3 – Borough Transportation Strategy:**
There was no further update.

**Tracker Item 5 – Grosvenor Bridge Repairs:**
County Councillor Hoare asked what was being done to reduce the impact of the works. Ms Valentine advised that works were scheduled to be undertaken between June and October 2016 and noted that Katie Moreton, Structures Manager, Kent County Council, was available to attend the next meeting where a full update could be given.

Councillor Scott asked for the works to be widely publicised as there would be considerable disruption.
Tracker Item 4 – King George V Hill:
Councillor Neve welcomed the improvements but highlighted that a lack of parking restrictions had resulted in parking on both sides of the road, often by commercial vehicles, effectively creating a single lane with poor visibility. He advocated restricting parking on one side of the road limited to two hours with no return and suggested this enjoyed support from residents. Councillor Backhouse concurred. Councillor Bulman noted that any proposed restrictions would be subject to public consultation. Ms Valentine confirmed that such restrictions would be worth considering as a separate matter but that the works as completed were constrained by the available budget. Any parking matters would be lead by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council as the parking authority.

Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, advised that following the adoption of the Parking Strategy, the expansion of residents parking zones was one area that would be looked at. Parking restrictions on King George V Hill could be considered as part of a wider zone or in isolation and the Parking Department would look to Members for guidance on the preferred options. Councillor Neve suggested that residents would support restrictions on King George V Hill as mentioned but not a wider residents’ zone.

Tracker Item 6 – Pedestrian crossings in Major York’s Road and Langton Road:
County Councillor Scholes sought clarification on comments he had received from Mr Hardy who had advised him that funding had been found for the Langton Road crossing but had been unable to elaborate at the time. Ms Valentine confirmed that funding had been allocated for the crossing in 2016/17. The scheme was about to start the design stage but an exact timescale for delivery had not been determined. County Councillor Scholes was pleased and commented that he would be putting some of his Members’ Grant towards the corresponding crossing on Major York’s Road.

Tracker Item 8 – Hawkhurst Traffic Lights:
There was no further update.

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

HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME (APPENDIX D)

TB51/15

At the Chairman’s discretion part of item Highway Works Programme (agenda item 7) was brought forward to allow an early discussion of the A26 Southborough congestion reduction scheme and the funding of other related schemes contained within appendix D to the report.

Councillor Frank Williams, Borough Councillor for Sherwood Ward, had registered to speak.

Councillor Williams reminded Members that £0.4 million had been spent on the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Halls Hole Road, Blackhurst Lane and Pembury Road which the proposed roundabout sought to replace. Residents had expressed surprise that so much could be written off after only three years. If there was a surplus from the Southborough scheme it was not understood why the more dangerous junction of Pembury Road and
Sandhurst Road was not being tackled first. It gave the impression that safety was being sacrificed for speed which was not in the public interest. Councillor Williams expressed particular concern for drivers and pedestrians from Sherwood and the Blackhurst Lane side of the junction who presently could traverse the main flow of traffic in relative safety. It was not clear that a roundabout would permit safe vehicular exit onto the busier main road as Kent County Council officers had specifically stated three years ago that the only way to achieve safe egress from a minor to major road was by traffic lights that halted the flow on the main road. Similarly, pedestrians who needed to cross Pembury Road or children who cross Blackhurst Lane in hundreds at peak times could presently do so safely but its not clear whether they could do so without the traffic lights.

Councillor Williams continued by explaining that a scheme to increase traffic flow in the middle of a road where there was known congestion at either end was flawed and in previous reports there had been other schemes which were viewed as preferable to this one. The most worrying aspect was the apparently lack of consultation which gave the impression of a Council that was unresponsive to the views of residents. Members were therefore asked to defer the matter until a proper consultation exercise could be undertaken. It was felt that an extension to the available funding could be granted by the Secretary of State who was expected to be keen to ensure a considered solution was achieved.

Councillor Backhouse commented that a roundabout had previously been considered at this junction but had not been progressed at that time as the implications for people crossing Pembury Road, including the more than one thousand people accessing Skinners’ Kent Academy, were that a roundabout would not allow for safe pedestrian crossing. Many of the residents who had expressed an opinion were surprised that there had not been any consultation and that the current plan was a reflex rather than considered proposal. There was also concern that the budgeted £1.2million would be insufficient given that compulsory land purchases would be needed and therefore other budgets would suffer in order to make up the shortfall. He felt that alternative minor improvements at the junctions with Sandhurst Road and Calverley Road would be preferable.

County Councillor Scholes advised members that the matter had recently been discussed at the Local Area Board where it had been made clear that these proposals were only at a very early stage and it was intended that there would be public consultation.

County Councillor Hoare thanked Councillor Williams for his carefully thought out words and noted that at a recent meeting of Pembury Parish Council the two options of traffic lights or a roundabout had been presented. They had preferred the traffic lights. He acknowledged that the proposal were at an early stage but added that they still appeared rushed.

Councillor Bulman commented that these proposals were less about increasing speed and more about allowing any movement, particularly at peak times. There was clearly a problem with congestion on Pembury Road. Questions on whether the proposed scheme as the right one were perhaps premature until there had been a detailed analysis which would be forthcoming.
At the request of the Chairman, Councillor McDermott, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, who was in attendance, confirmed the comments made by County Councillor Scholes.

Vicky Hubert, Strategic Transport Planner, Kent County Council, acknowledged that the decision to target the junction of Pembury Road, Halls Hole Road and Blackhurst Lane may appear hasty as officers were keen for the surplus funds from the Yew Tree Road scheme to be retained in Tunbridge Wells but the choice had been reached following due process. The Council leadership had been made aware a year ago that a surplus was likely. Since then officers had conducted the A26/A264 Route Study to inform potential other schemes. Considering that Highways England had prevented any works on the junction of Pembury Road and Tonbridge Road, the proposed works were seen as the next priority. The purpose of the proposals was not to increase the speed on Pembury Road but to relieve the congestion caused by the bottleneck at Halls Hole Road. Initial modelling suggested that a roundabout would be most effective at improving the flow of traffic.

Ms Hubert advised that pedestrian traffic was high priority and would be addressed in the detailed plans. Officers were working with South Eastern Water on the land needed for the corner of the junction and it was expected that there would be no need for compulsory land purchase. Work was ongoing with the Council Conservation Officers to try and preserve as many trees as possible. Plans were progressing quickly but in the knowledge that funding was not secure, there would be public consultation once funding was more secure.

Councillor Bulman was pleased that a proper consultation would be part of the proposals.

Councillor Backhouse noted that it was unfortunate that it had been reported in the local press that these proposals were going ahead and local people were under the impression that the matter had been decided without consultation. He also questioned whether the scheme would be possible without compulsory land purchase, whilst the land from South Eastern Water may be sufficient to allow the road surface there was still an issue with sight lines on the approach to the junction. Councillor Bulman noted that there was little the Board could do to regarding what the press reported but wondered whether a press release would help to reassure residents. County Councillor Scholes welcomed the idea of communicating with residents to give assurance that there would be a consultation.

Councillor Neve was concerned that if this funding was not spent it would be lost as had happened with other schemes. He was frustrated that the discussion around what to do with the junction with Halls Hole Road had been going on for many years with various schemes being consulted on. The example of Longfield Road was given where there had been a long debate whether traffic lights or roundabouts were best, it had been proven that the roundabouts had relieved the congestion without making the area more dangerous. Councillor Neve commented that there was an underpass under Pembury Road which could be improved to provide a safe pedestrian crossing. He felt that doing nothing and losing the funding would be viewed unfavourably by residents.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, brought the discussion to a conclusion. He noted that officers would be well aware of the points raised in the debate.
when considering detailed plans and reminded members that a paper would be brought to a future meeting considering the efficacy of traffic lights in general.

PROPOSED APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTING 20MPH RESTRICTIONS IN TUNBRIDGE WELLS

TB52/15 Hilary Smith, Economic Development Manager, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- Following on from previous updates; a working group had been set up to explore 20mph restrictions across the Borough.
- The working group consisted of Members and Officers of both Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Kent County Council along with representatives of Kent Police, the Community Safety Unit, the local Twenty’s Plenty campaign group and the Cycling Forum.
- The working group had prepared a paper outlining the experience of a number of other locations across the country including Maidstone Borough Council who were also looking into 20mph limits.
- The conclusion of the research was that 20mph restriction could deliver benefits where they were implemented appropriately.
- Wider areas were preferred over small pockets.
- Focus should be maintained to learn lessons as the scheme progressed.
- Full consultation and engagement with local people was essential.
- Before and after monitoring should be carried out to ensure schemes were effective.
- The proposal was that officers should seek funding for design and costing of two 20mph pilot areas, one urban and one rural.
- The suggested urban area would comprise a large part of St. John’s Ward.
- The rural area would be a village centre, possibly Sissinghurst, Frittenden or Goudhurst, dependant on the appetite of the relevant Parish Councils.
- The key barrier was the lack of available funding with approximately £10,000 - £15,000 needed for the design work. Officer’s first task was to identify possible sources of funding.

Councillor Neve sought clarification as to what would be included in the St. John’s pilot area and suggested that restrictions on St. John’s Road itself would be ineffective. Mrs Smith advised that the area would not include the main road and added that the area in question had been suggested as some preparatory work had already been undertaken by Councillors Scott and Oakford. Councillor Scott advised that the area covered parts of three Wards bounded by St. John’s Road, Yew Tree Road and Upper Grosvenor Road. County Councillor Oakford confirmed that he had already funded, through his Members’ Grant, traffic surveys which were now complete and allocated a further £10,000 for future work on this project. He sought clarification on the anticipated costs which seemed high for just design work and warned that more money would be needed for implementation of any scheme.

County Councillor Oakford commented that he was supportive of 20 mph limits in certain areas where it could improve the flow of traffic on main roads but not on main roads themselves where slowing traffic would only serve to increase pollution. He warned that Members’ Grants had been cut further this year and so he was wary of putting money into design work where there was
no funding to implement the works. There were examples of schemes where significant sums had been wasted on design work only for the project to be cancelled due to lack of funds for implementation. County Councillor Scholes further warned that it was often the case that budgeted costs soon escalated when the works actually commenced.

Mrs Smith acknowledged that the £10,000 - £15,000 estimate was only a best guess at that stage and consultants would be required for a more accurate quote. It was unfortunate that in order to seek funding for a scheme there needed to be a fully designed and costed plan which itself cost to produce. Councillor Bulman commented that any preparatory work could remain on file if funding was not available for immediate implementation.

Councillor Stanyer broadly welcomed the approach and remarked on the apparent speed of progress made by colleagues at Maidstone Borough Council. He commented that when investigating 20mph schemes in the past there had seemed to be an inordinate number of barriers to what was a simple solution. Vicky Hubert, Strategic Transport Planner, Kent County Council, advised that the guidelines from the Department for Transport required that where average speeds were above the threshold for a particular speed limit there had to be other physical traffic calming measures and it was insufficient to only rely on revised signage. Therefore, the necessary works and costs would vary depending on the specific circumstances.

Councillor Scott thanked the working group for the report. He commented on the use of average reductions in speed in the report and noted caution that an average seven per cent reduction could also mean that half the drivers made no change to their behaviour whilst the other half reduced their speed by fourteen per cent. It was the fastest drivers that needed to be targeted. Councillor Scott added that there needed to be a change in attitude which would be brought about by a wider implementation of 20mph throughout the Borough. Behaviours in respect of seat belts and drink driving had changed largely due to a general change in attitude. In the survey carried out as part of the report, he would have liked additional questions on how safe the respondent would feel if they were to cycle. In concluding, Councillor Scott highlighted the case of Upper Grosvenor Road where there had been yet another accident. One resident had had three cars written off in the last eighteen months after being hit whilst parked on the road. There needed to be action taken throughout the Borough and deaths on the road should not be accepted as an inherent risk of driving.

County Councillor Oakford commented that the various speed surveys that had been carried out showed that the majority of drivers abided the speed limits and it was a small minority who drove dangerously fast. There needed to be coordinated action with other organisations to enforce the limit. Drivers keeping to the current 30mph were not causing the problems and dropping the limit to 20mph was unlikely to affect the number of accidents caused by those people. The problem was primarily with those who pay little regard to limits and who would be unlikely to reduce their speed without enforcement of the restrictions, even if the limit was lower. Councillor Bulman concurred with the need for enforcement for the small minority of people who drive significantly over the limit. The Police were affected by a lack of resources and could only act to target a specific problem. Ms Hubert commented that a report by the Department for Transport was expected which would be reviewing existing 20mph limits to see whether they were effective.
Councillor Scott acknowledged the view expressed by the previous speakers but commented that the change in attitude was a much longer term objective. He noted that the view taken by people of his generation in their youth towards drink driving was completely different to the view now. The possibility of people breaking the limit should not obviate the need to take action and may have related benefits. Councillor Scott believed that even drivers who were prepared to exceed the speed limit would observe a relative reduction in speed and may be forced to drive slower by other drivers keeping to the limit. Councillor Bulman commented that in matters such as the wearing of seat belts, drink driving and smoking in public places there was a very high level of compliance with the law despite very little enforcement.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, drew the debate to a conclusion and asked Members if the recommendation was agreed.

RESOLVED – That the Board supports the proposed approach as set out in the report.

HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME

TB53/15 The Chairman returned to the remainder of the item Highway Works Programme (agenda item 7) for any further issues.

County Councillor Scholes asked when the surface treatment of Calverley Road, as set out at appendix A to the report, was likely to be programmed. Carol Valentine, West Kent Highways Manager, Kent County Council, confirmed that all works in the schedule were due to be programmed for delivery this financial year. The exact date was to be confirmed but likely in the summer.

Councillor Bulman noted a recent statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that a sum of money was being allocated to highways authorities for the repair of pot holes and asked how this was to be received. Ms Valentine confirmed that the revenue budget had been significantly reduced but that an additional sum had been received and had been ring fenced for pot holes, exactly how that money would be spent was currently under discussion by the Head of Service and Leader of the Council. County Councillor Scholes commented that he believed the total amount available for the UK was £50million but that the Local Government Association had stated that at least £1billion would be needed. In response to a request for further clarification from Councillor Bulman, Ms Valentine advised that the sum available was approximately £1million for the whole county of Kent.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked whether the recommendation was agreed.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

TB54/15 The Board considered items for future meetings and comments were made in respect of the proposals as follows:
Driverless Vehicles:
Councillor Scott advised Members that he had received an offer from the
organisers of the driverless vehicle trial scheme in Canterbury that would
mean Tunbridge Wells becoming a second trial. There were considerable
advantages in pursuing this at this time including reduced capital costs as the
vehicles were already in production and utilising the experience of the
Canterbury trial. He added that driverless vehicles were coming and it was
essential to ensure they were implemented in a planned way so that they
came part of the solution rather than an additional problem. An item was
requested for a future meeting to discuss and agree an endorsement of
progressing with the trial.

St. John’s Road, Southborough:
Councillor Bulman raised a request for an item for a future meeting from
Councillor Simmons that a reduction in the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph
be considered on St. John’s Road in Southborough.

Upper Grosvenor Road:
Councillor Scott referred to a recent incident on Upper Grosvenor Road
whereby a speeding vehicle had lost control travelling downhill and jumped a
property boundary. Had it not been for a tree the vehicle could have landed in
a second floor apartment. He had had discussions with Earl Bourner, District
Manager for Tunbridge Wells, Kent County Council who had agreed to look
into options. An item on the tracker was requested to monitor progress. In
response to a request for clarification, County Councillor Oakford confirmed
that in a conversation Mr Bourner had stated that an engineer would attend
the scene with a view to recommending improvements.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TB55/15 The next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board would be held on Monday
18 July 2016 commencing at 6pm.

NOTES:
- The meeting concluded at 7.27 pm.
- Councillor Backhouse left the meeting at the conclusion of Highway
  Works Programme (Appendix D)
- Councillor Neve left the meeting at the conclusion of Highway Works
  Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Subject</th>
<th>Issues/Proposals</th>
<th>Latest position</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 St. John's Road: Cycle Route Improvements</td>
<td>Design work progressed, supporting developer S106 funding</td>
<td>Covered by report at agenda item 9</td>
<td>Vicki Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grosvenor Bridge Repairs</td>
<td>Schedule of repairs for Grosvenor Bridge, Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Works were supposed to commence in June 16, but due to an overhead power cable which requires relocating the works are on hold. UK Power Networks have failed to supply KCC with a start date for the works. This issue has been taken up at the highest level between KCC and UK Power Networks. Network Rail has given us a timescale of between July and the end of October for the cable diversion. If it turns out to be nearer the latter we will probably be forced to delay the works until after Christmas to minimise the disruption. As soon as we have a more accurate idea of date we will advise the local community and businesses.</td>
<td>Katie Moreton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Crescent Road crossing refuge</td>
<td>Feasibility of refuge provision investigation</td>
<td>Funding has been secured. Scheme will be commissioned to consultant for delivery this financial year. Further updates to be monitored through the Highway Works Programme (Appendix D Transportation and Safety Schemes)</td>
<td>Michael Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Carrs Corner / Calverley Park Gardens</td>
<td>Reducing HGV and other vehicles using the road as an extension of the A264</td>
<td>There is now a small amount of funding available to investigate this area of the town at a strategic level, encompassing CPG, Carrs Corner, Royal Oak junction etc, to assess what the problems are and how they may be addressed. This work (via Amey) will be commencing in the next few months and an update will be made at a future JTB meeting.</td>
<td>Vicki Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Subject</td>
<td>Issues/Proposals</td>
<td>Latest position</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hawkhurst Traffic Lights</td>
<td>Progress to be reported on Tracker</td>
<td>Following the resurfacing works on the A229 the yellow box at this location will not be replaced, but an alternative “KEEP CLEAR” marking is to be added in its place. The reason for the decision is to improve traffic flow on this often congested approach to the traffic lights, which are affected due to the lengthy yellow box marking. Driver compliance with the restriction is very high but this creates an artificial gap in the queue which causes the traffic signals to revert to a red light. It is expected that by changing the marking to a shorter “KEEP CLEAR” option there will be a reduced gap in the queue and a smoother flow of vehicles through the traffic lights.</td>
<td>Earl Bourner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Upper Grosvenor Road</td>
<td>Potential improvements following incident whereby a speeding vehicle crashed into a tree narrowly avoiding buildings.</td>
<td>Investigations underway to identify possible amendments.</td>
<td>Michael Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pedestrian crossings in Major York’s Road and Langton Road</td>
<td>Petition requesting the crossings</td>
<td>Langton Road – Funding has been secured from the Local Transport Plan. Discussions underway with Commons to identify land negotiation with the aim of delivery January 2017. Major York’s Road – Scheme funding has not been agreed for progression to the outline design stage in the 2016/17. Will be put forward in bid for funding for 2017/18. Further updates to be monitored through the Highway Works Programme (Appendix D Transportation and Safety Schemes)</td>
<td>Michael Hardy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Regulation Orders – Objections Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Author / Lead Officer</th>
<th>Nick Baldwin – Senior Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Service</td>
<td>Kevin Hetherington – Head of Customers &amp; Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originating Authority</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision Taker</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption</td>
<td>Non-exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>For Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**
That the Board endorses the proposed course of action for each site, namely:

I. **Camden Park** – drop the current proposal pending consultation on a permit parking scheme.

II. **Byng Road** – Implement the proposal as advertised.

III. **Culverden Down** – amend the proposals advertised to allow on-street parking to continue to take place on the southern side of the road

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Following complaints and requests from a number of sources, a draft traffic regulation order was advertised in April. The proposals covered 17 locations within Tunbridge Wells, Southborough and Langton Green. 56 objections were made to proposals contained within the draft order, with 3 locations having more than 5 adverse comments. The Board is requested to endorse a course of action for each of those 3 sites.

**THE PROPOSALS**

2. The draft traffic regulation order covered 17 distinct locations, these being:-

- Barnetts Close, High Brooms
- Camden Park/The Meads/The Shaw
- Crendon Park/Yew Tree Road, Southborough
- Culverden Down/Culverden Avenue/Reynolds Lane
- Culverden Park/Culverden Park Road
- Denbigh Road/Silverdale Road
THE OBJECTIONS

3. As per agreed practice, locations receiving up to 5 objections are referred direct to KCC Highways for a decision, whereas those with more than 5 adverse comments first need referring to this Board for a recommendation.

4. Because some comments were quite wide ranging, covering more than one location, only those where specific points were raised in respect of a particular proposal have been brought before members for consideration.

5. The three sites where more than 5 objections were submitted are as follows, including details of the comments made:-

- **Camden Park/The Meads/The Shaw** – Double yellow lines had been proposed to ease movement along the spine road (Camden Park) and at junctions, but objectors – 6 in total plus 4 who expressed qualified support – stated that what was proposed was insufficient and would simply concentrate any problems on the unrestricted sections. 3 respondents indicated support although two of these were received after the consultation closed.

- **Byng Road** – Here the proposal was for a single yellow line along one side of the road with a restriction in force between 10am and 11am during the week to prevent long stay parking on both sides of the road which currently creates a narrow central running lane. 30 objections to this were raised during the consultation plus one just after the deadline. 4 declarations of support were submitted together with one qualified response. It should, however, be noted that this proposal was instigated by a petition with 58 signatures from 36 addresses in Byng Road. The objections, whilst acknowledging the issue in Byng Road all considered that the issues in the wider residential area should be addressed holistically and not in a piecemeal way which, it was felt, would simply transfer long-stay parking by non-residents into other roads – i.e. the problem would simply migrate elsewhere..

- **Culverden Down/Culverden Avenue/Reynolds Lane** – Double yellow lines were proposed on both sides of Culverden Down across the two side turnings together with the same restriction for the first few metres of each side road. This followed concerns about highway safety through obstructed visibility at
the junctions. Objectors said this was too much and would lose parking space on street and cause traffic speeds to increase. 9 objections were made with one letter of qualified support.

RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDED COURSES OF ACTION

6. In the cases of Camden Park and Byng Road there are similar underlying issues with commuters and/or local workers parking in residential streets and creating problems for those who live in the area. In both cases more work and wider ranging proposals are under consideration but it was felt that the restrictions as advertised could be implemented in the shorter term without significant detriment elsewhere. Objectors clearly felt otherwise in both cases.

7. It should be noted that in neither of these cases did objectors feel that the restrictions being proposed were fundamentally wrong, simply that they were either premature or did not go far enough in dealing with perceived problems.

8. The choice therefore rests between implementing the restrictions as advertised and accept the fact that there may be some negative impact until more wide ranging proposals come to fruition or, delay their implementation and include them in a larger overall scheme.

9. Camden Park - problems only began to appear when AXA PPP occupied the old Land registry building. If that parking could be prevented, it is reasonable to assume that the situation would revert to its previous state. An option is, therefore, to restrict the three roads (Camden Park, The Meads and The Shaw) to permit holder parking during specified hours, either for the whole estate or selected areas.

10. Since that was one option being considered for these roads, it is recommended that the current proposal be dropped in favour of promoting a permit parking scheme subject to the results of further consultation.

11. Byng Road - problems being experienced have been steadily increasing over a long period of time and, whilst a permit parking scheme is likely to be considered for the area as a whole, the outcome of that process is far less certain than for Camden Park. In view of the nature of issues being raised in respect of Byng Road, it is recommended that the proposal be implemented as advertised.

12. Any consequential effects could be considered as part of the wider review of parking in the area.

13. Culverden Down - objections covered two principle issues, one being the loss of on-street parking space and the other questioned whether there was any need for restrictions at all and that introducing them may lead to an increase in traffic speeds.

14. On the loss of parking, it needs to be understood that there is no right to park on a highway and that a highway authority is under no obligation to provide parking facilities. Notwithstanding that point, parking is normally only restricted where there is demonstrable harm either to safety or the local environment.
15. In respect of this particular proposal it is accepted that the proposal as advertised may be more than the minimum necessary to preserve safety – which was the basis of the original request. To address both the initial concern and the concerns about parking it is recommended that the proposal be adjusted to only provide the restriction on the northern side of Culverden Down across and to each side of the affected junctions – Culverden Avenue and Reynolds Lane.

16. Details of these three proposals and suggested amendments are shown on drawings included at Appendix A

Appendices to the Report
- Appendix A – Traffic Regulation Order Proposals
Culverden Down, Culverden Avenue and Reynolds Lane, Tunbridge Wells

As originally proposed with restrictions on both sides of Culverden Down. Revised proposal omits the new restriction on the south side of Culverden Down.
Waiting Restriction Review – Cranbrook and Hawkhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Author / Lead Officer</th>
<th>Nick Baldwin – Senior Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Service</td>
<td>Kevin Hetherington – Head of Customers &amp; Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originating Authority</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Decision Taker</td>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption</td>
<td>Non-exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>For Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
- That the report be noted.

INTRODUCTION

1. Following a review of waiting restrictions in Cranbrook and Hawkhurst, it is proposed that a new traffic regulation order be made.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The vast majority of waiting restrictions in the Borough are within the urban nucleus of Tunbridge Wells, Southborough and Langton Green. Outside this area, restrictions have been introduced sparingly with the town centre of Cranbrook having some of the more extensive ones.

3. Hawkhurst, although having a relatively small amount of restricted waiting, does have a significant volume of through traffic which relies in part on restrictions to minimise congestion.

4. Current restrictions are, however, covered by a variety of traffic regulation orders some of which have their origins in ones made in the 1960’s. As a consequence there are several orders in existence and a number of anomalies have arisen between what is contained in those orders and what is marked on the ground.

PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION

5. Surveys have been undertaken to confirm the status of existing waiting restriction signs and lines in both Cranbrook and Hawkhurst. A number of anomalies have arisen which, in the normal course of events would necessitate either alterations to the markings and/or making of an updated traffic regulation order.
6. Before taking either course of action, however, the respective parish councils have been contacted for their views on what restrictions should be retained, whether any should be removed and whether any new ones should be implemented.

7. The views expressed are being taken into account in drafting a new traffic regulation order and, whilst there are no significant changes likely, the intention is to remove any restrictions which KCC Highways agree are not necessary for highway safety reasons and implement new ones where there is a demonstrable need for them. This work is still in progress but it is hoped that an order will be advertised later this year.

Appendices to the Report

- None
SUMMARY

The Borough Cycling Strategy, adopted in March 2016, identifies the A26 between Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells town centres as a priority utility cycling route. The route benefits from some segregated infrastructure for cyclists at present; this is not however, consistent or continuous and requires further improvement to provide a higher quality route.

The Borough Council secured funding from the West Kent Local Sustainable Transport Fund during 2015/16, to prepare detailed plans to improve the route. Feedback and support is sought from JTB regarding the scope and detail of the plans, so that these can be finalised. Once complete, the plans will be used to support funding bids and development-related funding negotiations.

LINK TO

The Cycling Strategy and proposed A26 route improvements link to the Five Year Plan including:

Objectives - ‘A Prosperous Borough’ and ‘A Green Borough’

2.4 Challenges - “Addressing transport congestion: improvements to our local network and alleviating traffic congestion are crucial in order to encourage growth and improve ease of accessibility to Tunbridge Wells”.

6.3.3 A26 (Southborough & London Road) - Next Steps: “Work with Kent Highways Services to implement proposals put forward in the draft Transport Strategy to further ease traffic congestion in the centre of Royal Tunbridge Wells and secure funding from the South East Local Enterprise Partnership”.

In addition the proposed A26 route links to Kent County Council’s recently prepared Draft Active Travel Strategy which has the following aim:

‘to make active travel an attractive and realistic choice for short journeys in Kent. By developing and promoting accessible, safer and well-planned active travel opportunities, this Strategy will help to establish Kent as a pioneering county for active travel.’

A26 Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells - Proposed Cycle Route Design

To: Joint Transportation Board

Date: 18 July 2016

Main Portfolio Area: Planning & Transportation

Author of Report: Bartholomew Wren/Hilary Smith

Classification: Non-exempt

Ward: Culverden, St John’s, Southborough & High Brooms and Southborough North
BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION

1. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council adopted its new Cycling Strategy in March 2016. The Strategy encourages active travel and identifies the shared commitment of TWBC and KCC to provide an enhanced cycle route network. It acknowledges that levels of cycling in Tunbridge Wells are relatively low at present, and that whilst the Borough has some cycle routes that link Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre to suburban areas, these are either incomplete or require further enhancement.

2. The Cycling Strategy is an implementation tool to assist partners in achieving the higher level objectives that are set out in the Borough Transport Strategy. Objective 6 in the Transport Strategy aims to increase the use of sustainable transport modes which include cycling and walking.

3. It is considered that every resident, worker and visitor should have the opportunity to cycle for everyday purposes (utility cycling). In order to achieve this, it is recognised that a range of measures and interventions are required to make cycling a more attractive proposition, especially for shorter local journeys. The lack of dedicated infrastructure is a significant barrier for many people in using a bicycle as part of their normal day to day life.

4. The Cycling Strategy identifies a network of routes within the urban areas of Royal Tunbridge Wells, Southborough, Paddock Wood and Cranbrook which require implementation and/or improvement. These are set out in priority order. Route 1 - Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells town centres via the A26 is the highest priority as it is an inter-urban corridor that connects Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre with Southborough, other prominent residential communities and secondary schools. Once complete it is hoped that the route will link with Route 8 - A26 London Road to Dowding Way via Barnetts Wood as well as Route 5 - 21st Century Way.
5. The A26 is a key arterial road that is subject to heavy traffic flows, especially at peak times. Department for Transport annual average daily flow data for 2014 confirms that 85.7% of daily traffic is derived from cars and taxis in comparison to 0.5% of journeys by pedal cycle. It is also a designated Air Quality Management Area. A solution is required to increase the level of cycle use along the route which would contribute to congestion relief and improvements in air quality, as well as encouraging active travel.

6. Consultants have been appointed to prepare plans for the improvement of the cycle route. These are included separately at Appendix A, and are a further development of the route assessment that was undertaken to accompany the Borough Cycling Strategy. The plans include detailed annotations of the proposed alterations. The design approach is based upon the following criteria:

- Seek to provide a safe, coherent, comfortable and attractive route that conforms to established cycle route design principles, providing segregated space where this is achievable. Where this can’t be achieved consider reducing traffic speed as a means of improving perceived safety.
- Application of London Red Route principles which seek through design and enforcement to minimise stopping to maintain traffic flow and provide enhanced priority for cyclists.
- Take account of up-to-date guidance and legislation, including The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.
- Use land that is within the ownership of Kent Highways, with the exception of revisions at Southborough Common (subject to agreement).

7. The proposals include the following key features:

- Where width is available existing advisory cycle lanes are widened to provide mandatory lanes (minimum 1.5m wide).
- Revised geometry at some side junctions, most of which include raised tables that provide an enhanced flush crossing arrangement for pedestrians. Raised tables also help to reduce the speed of vehicular turning movements.
- Inclusion of two bus stop bypass features north of the junctions with Culverden Park and Pennington Road (Southborough).
- Provision of continuous red surfacing throughout the scheme on all cycle lanes with priority for cyclists 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 20mph limit on the A26 between the junctions of Pennington Road and Holden Park Road (opportunities for introducing pilot 20mph areas within the Borough are being explored separately).
- Removal of southbound bus lane between the Hand and Sceptre and junction at Yew Tree Road to allow for cycle lanes to be introduced in both directions.
- Improvement of segregated provision at Mabledon to include the extension of shared use pedestrian and cycle paths both north and southbound.
- Provision of new shared use link on Quarry Hill (within Tonbridge & Malling Borough).

8. Options to provide some physical segregation between the mandatory cycle lanes and vehicular running lanes, continue to be discussed with KCC officers. The route could include the trial use of rumble strips within the separating solid white lines marking the cycle lane. This is subject to agreement and feedback from the appointed highway safety auditor in due course. It is recognised that the physical segregation of cycle
lanes can increase perceived safety and therefore, encourage less confident cyclists to use on carriageway routes.

9. It should be noted that the proposals do not include any segregated cycling infrastructure between the junction of Church Road (Southborough) and Mabledon. This is due to constraints of available highway land and topography, meaning that any solution would require costly land purchase and civil engineering which is considered to be unachievable. Reducing the 40mph speed limit along this stretch of road has been considered but is not supported by the consultants. In reaching this decision they have been guided by the DfT guidance on Setting Local Speed Limits (Circular 01/2013); the guiding principle of which is that speed limits should be evidence-led and encourage self-compliance. The key factors that should be taken into account in making decisions on speed limits include:

- Accident history;
- Highway geometry and engineering;
- Road function;
- Composition of road users (including levels of vulnerable road users);
- Existing traffic speeds; and
- Highway environment.

10. Due to the existing traffic speeds, the absence of residential or commercial frontages and minimal pedestrian movements on the A26 north of Southborough, the consultants do not consider that the justification exists to reduce the speed limit to 30mph. Even if this was pursued, it is not considered that it would result in a significant uptake in cycling amongst those groups that do not currently travel along this stretch of road.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE THAT REQUIRES A DECISION AND WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE PEOPLE OF TUNBRIDGE WELLS?

11. Feedback and support is required to progress the delivery of the A26 cycle route. Once implemented the project will provide a higher standard of cycle route for the benefit of local residents and those who work in the Borough.

WHO HAVE WE CONSULTED AND HOW?

12. To date members of the Tunbridge Wells Cycling Forum have been consulted informally on the detail of the design proposals at a meeting held on 25 April. Discussions have also been undertaken with KCC Highways and a separate meeting held with The Tunbridge Wells Bicycle Users Group.

13. Going forwards further consultation is required with stakeholders including, the Cycling Forum, KCC Highways, Southborough Town Council, owners/occupiers of premises fronting the route, bus operators plus other consultees as necessary.

WHAT FEEDBACK HAS BEEN RECEIVED?

14. Following the meeting of the Cycling Forum, The Tunbridge Wells Bicycle Users Group (TWBUG) has expressed overall support for the scheme but raised some concerns regarding the design of parts of the scheme, particularly the lack of infrastructure to the north of Southborough Common. The following specific points have been made:

- focus on those parts of the route which could be built to the highest standard.
• prioritise the stretch from the centre of town to Yew Tree Road, with Southborough High Street considered as a second priority, when funds allow.
• concern expressed about the recently implemented scheme at the Yew Tree Road and Speldhurst Road junctions, which has included no cycling provision southbound and limited provision northbound, contrary to the wishes of the JTB in [October] 2015.
• ensure that the design takes into account the possibility of a 20mph zone being implemented to the east of St John's Road, allowing for the cycle route to be raised to pavement level and given priority over side junctions.
• consider reducing access to some of the road along the eastern side of St John's Road, to reduce rat-running and improving safety for cyclists.

These points will be considered further as the design is finalised.

HOW WILL THE DECISION BE COMMUNICATED?

15. The outcome of ongoing stakeholder consultation and the more formal consultation relating to the Traffic Regulation Orders that are necessary to implement the proposals; will be reported to the Joint Transportation Board prior to the delivery of the cycle route improvements.

CONCLUSIONS

16. The A26 is a priority cycle route as it is an inter-urban corridor that connects Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre with Southborough, other residential communities and secondary schools. It is a heavily congested route that suffers from poor air quality. The cycle route proposal will create a significantly improved route that will become integrated with the wider cycle route network in due course.

17. It is perceived that there is a high level of unmet demand for cycling especially within the wider urban area of Tunbridge Wells. It is hoped that the route will appeal to those that have yet to consider cycling for local journeys as well as existing cyclists.

RECOMMENDATION:

18. That the Joint Transportation Board supports the principle of the A26 cycle route proposals and the approach to implementation which will include:

• A programme of stakeholder consultation (as set out above);
• The finalisation of route design proposals;
• Applications for funding and negotiations with developers; and
• The agreement of a phased delivery timetable with KCC.

19. Once consultations have been undertaken the final route proposals will be brought back to JTB.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

20. To progress towards the implementation of proposals that will provide significant improvements to the existing A26 cycle route. The route will form a central part of the Borough’s urban cycle route network and will encourage more people to cycle in the future.
**Contact Officers**: Bartholomew Wren, Economic Development Officer, x2128 and Hilary Smith, Economic Development Manager x3295

**Name of Director/Head of Service** – Jonathan MacDonald/David Candlin

**Director’s / Head of Service’s Job Title** – Director of Planning & Development/Head of Economic Development

**APPENDICES TO REPORT**

APPENDIX A-F – A26 Proposed Cycle Route Design – Drawing Numbers 11011-T-07 to 11011-T-12
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Appendix B

Extent of KCC LGF junction improvement scheme to north (Completed)

- Advisory cycle lane across junction
- Road and the Tunbridge Wells TA Centre all on-road lanes

Mandatory cycle lanes shall be 1.5m minimum width with red surfacing and bounded by a continuous 100mm wide white line.

- With the exception of the foot/cycle lanes between Speldhurst Road and the Tunbridge Wells TA Centre all on-road lanes are designed to be 2.5m wide.
- Cycle lanes shall be 1.2m minimum width with red surfacing and bounded by a 100mm wide white line.

Bus and cycle lanes to have signing in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual for advisory warning of lanes, indication of lanes afterécole due to side roads and at regular locations along the route as necessary.

- Taper of advisory cycle lane to continue
- Bus and cycle lanes to have signing in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual for advisory warning of lanes, indication of lanes afterécole due to side roads and at regular locations along the route as necessary.
- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.

Modeling of revised lane layout at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
- Possible delay in implementing improvements at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

Road model is used to review the capacity of the road will be required to ensure sufficient capacity remains.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
- Possible delay in implementing improvements at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
- Possible delay in implementing improvements at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

The height of the parapet on the eastern side of the A21 overbridge is 1.1m, below the minimum 1.4m required for use by cyclists (BD 2049/14 Para 1.2) and the width of the path at the northern end of the structure reduces to 2m. Cyclists will need to be signed to dismount to cross the overbridge using the eastern route.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
- Possible delay in implementing improvements at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
- Possible delay in implementing improvements at Speldhurst Road/Yew Tree Road due to Section 58 notice in place after the signal upgrade works.

- Raised tables to be constructed of bituminous material. For construction details refer to drawing 11/11-17-07 Datum A.
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Highway Works Programme 2016/17

Report Author / Lead Officer  Carol Valentine – West Kent Highway Manager
Originating Authority  Kent County Council
Final Decision Taker  Kent County Council
Exemption  Non-exempt
Classification  For Information

Recommendation:

- That the report be noted.

Introduction

This report provides an update and summarises schemes that have been programmed for delivery in 2016/17.

Footway and Carriageway Improvement Schemes – see Appendix A

Drainage Repairs & Improvements – see Appendix B

Street Lighting – see Appendix C

Transportation and Safety Schemes – see Appendix D

- Casualty Reduction Measures – see Appendix D1
- Local Transportation Plan – see Appendix D2
- Local Growth Fund – see Appendix D3

Developer Funded Works – see Appendix E

Bridge Works – see Appendix F

Traffic Systems – see Appendix G

Combined Member Fund – see Appendix H

Contact Officers:

The following contact officers can be contacted on 03000 418181

Carol Valentine  West Kent Highway Manager
Earl Bourner  District Manager
1.1 Legal Implications

1.1.1 Not applicable.

1.2 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.2.1 Not applicable.

1.3 Risk Assessment

1.3.1 Not applicable.
Appendix A – Footway and Carriageway Improvement Schemes

The delivery of these schemes is weather dependent; should it prove not possible to carry out these works on the planned dates, new dates will be arranged and the residents will be informed by a letter drop to their homes.

### Machine Resurfacing – Contact Officer Byron Lovell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Extent of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A264 Church Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Between A264 Mount Ephraim and A26 London Road</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2162 The Broadway</td>
<td>Lamberhurst</td>
<td>Moreland Drive to outside The Chequers</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2086 Benenden Road</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Junction Tilsden Lane</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A229 Cranbrook Road</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Ockley Road to junction Ry Road</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26 Woodgate Way</td>
<td>Capel</td>
<td>Roundabout at junction with Woodgate Way</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footway Improvement - Contact Officer Neil Tree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Extent and Description of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayhall Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Rookley Close to property named Beech Manor.</td>
<td>To be Designed (subject to consultation with TWBC conservation officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandown Park</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Entire length (Footway protection treatment).</td>
<td>To be programmed (Works subject to specialist contractor assessment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surface Treatments - Contact Officer Clive Lambourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Extent and Description of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calverley Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Calverley Park Gardens to Pembury Road</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramble Reed Lane</td>
<td>Matfield</td>
<td>Maidstone Road to Romford Road</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yew Tree Green Road</td>
<td>Horsmonden</td>
<td>Maidstone Road to Little Crosslets</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayham Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Frant Road to Forest Road</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pond Road</td>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>Benenden Crossroads to Hemstead Golf Club</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddards Green Road</td>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>At junction with New Pond Road</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballards Hill/Goudhurst Road</td>
<td>Horsmonden</td>
<td>Gateway to North Road</td>
<td>To Be Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsmonden Road</td>
<td>Lamberhurst</td>
<td>Forstal roundabout to Church Road</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilsden Lane</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Bakers Cross to Swattenden Lane</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowding Way</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Lamberts Road to Longfield Road</td>
<td>Programmed to start 4th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Down</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Spa Hotel to Bishops Down Road</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Road</td>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>Binan Cottage bends to The Moat</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crockhurst Street</td>
<td>Capel</td>
<td>Alders Road to George and Dragon bends</td>
<td>To Be Programmed Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Oak Green Road</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
<td>Whetsted Road to Junior School</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxbridge</td>
<td>Frittenden</td>
<td>Grandshore Lane to District boundary bridge</td>
<td>Programmed to start 4th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penshurst Road</td>
<td>Bidborough</td>
<td>Barden Road to Hayesden Lane</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Lane</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>A229 to Potters Lane</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Drainage Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Drainage works planned over £5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C – Street Lighting

Structural testing of KCC owned street lights has identified the following as requiring replacement this financial year. A status of complete identifies that the column replacement has been carried out. Programme dates are identified for those still requiring replacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashcroft Road</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 9 columns</td>
<td>Works completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner Farm Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 concrete column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Down</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works delayed due to UKPN cable fault in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel columns</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunston Grove</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 3 steel columns</td>
<td>Works completed with temporary lanterns - to be replaced when correct available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eridge Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 19 steel columns</td>
<td>17 completed, 2 to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frant Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 6 steel columns</td>
<td>3 completed, 3 programmed for July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuggles Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 4 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldings</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 concrete columns</td>
<td>Completed, remedial works to one street light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Station Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Old street light disconnected, new to be installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Hill Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>1 completed, 1 to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works completed minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Court</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Close</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Works completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larch Grove</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 3 concrete columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Temple Road</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 8 concrete columns</td>
<td>7 completed, 1 remaining for completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liptraps Lane</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 4 steel columns</td>
<td>Works completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone Road</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 3 steel columns</td>
<td>2 completed, 1 one to be replaced by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascalls Park</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 11 concrete columns</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercers Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 4 concrete columns</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ephraim</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Work Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 9 concrete columns</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 concrete column</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Street</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklea Road</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 6 concrete columns</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembury Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder Mill Lane</td>
<td>Southborough</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusthall Road</td>
<td>Rusthall</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Road</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Works Programmed for Completion by end July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glebe</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Columns erected, temp lanterns fitted, awaiting arrival of correct lanterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Avenue</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 steel column</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Close</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Replacement of 1 concrete column</td>
<td>Completed, minor remedial work outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Park</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Replacement of 2 steel columns</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D – Transportation and Safety Schemes

Appendix D1 – Casualty Reduction Measures

Casualty Reduction Schemes programme update for the Tunbridge Wells Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casualty Reduction Schemes – Contact Officer Michael Hardy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A267 Town Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D2 – Local Transportation Plan

Local Transport Plan programme update for the Tunbridge Wells Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Transportation Plan – Contact Officer Michael Hardy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A264 Langton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major York’s Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D3 – Local Growth Fund

Local Growth Fund programme update for the Tunbridge Wells Borough.

The Department for Transport (DfT) added £100m to the Local Growth Fund (LGF) pot in order to fund Local Sustainable Transport Fund Style schemes. KCC subsequently submitted four Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) capital bids 1) East Kent – A network for Growth, 2) Kent Thameside – Integrated door-to-door journeys and 3) West Kent – Tackling Congestion. The fourth was for Tonbridge Town Centre Regeneration, which included a highway improvements scheme in the Lower High Street as well as additional LSTF style measures. The objective of all of the capital bids is to boost economic growth by decreasing carbon emissions and reducing congestion.

The Kent Thameside, West Kent and Tonbridge Town Centre Regeneration bids were all successful. The schemes aim to:

- improve access to employment and services
- reduce the need to travel by the private car
- enhance pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities
- improve sustainable transport connections

The following schemes have been submitted as part of the successful West Kent LSTF this financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells A26 cycle route design - To design improved infrastructure for cyclists on the A26 Quarry Hill Road/ London Road/St John’s Road between its junctions with Brook Street and Grosvenor Road.</td>
<td>Have met with cycle groups to discuss designs and now progressed to Detail Design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells way finding signs - Installation of way finding monoliths to assist pedestrians and tourists in Tunbridge Wells.</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge wells – A26 Southborough Congestion reduction scheme – Replacement of existing traffic signal control junctions of Yew Tree Road and Speldhurst Road with the A26 with an intelligent traffic control system that models traffic flows in real time and adjusts signal timings to improve capacity. Removal of standalone pedestrian “Pelican type” crossing on London Road near the junction of Holden Park Road. Pedestrian crossing facilities to be incorporated into Yew Tree Road junction signals.</td>
<td>Construction is complete. Phase 2 of the scheme involved analysis and modelling of the existing traffic signal controlled junction of Halls Hole Road with Pembury Road Investigation is ongoing. Phase 3 of this scheme is currently being carried out to model and analyse possible improvements to the junction of Calverley Road with Crescent Road in Tunbridge Wells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E – Developer Funded Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Name</th>
<th>Mastergov File Ref No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Description Of Works</th>
<th>Brief Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alders Road - Capel Court, Capel</td>
<td>TW003103</td>
<td>Capel</td>
<td>Removal of an existing entrance and construction of a new one.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asda - Dowding Way Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>TW003066</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Widened access into Asda store off Dowding Way and central island to stop right turning out of Asda.</td>
<td>Waiting for design submission from Designer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayham Road</td>
<td>TW003043</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into development and new footway in Bayham Road + new ped crossing islands in Forest Road</td>
<td>Works 90% complete. Waiting for street lighting, block paving and road markings to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benenden Hospital</td>
<td>TW003051</td>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenchley Road (phase 1)</td>
<td>TW003046</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into development site</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be carried out before issuing the final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenchley Road (phase 2)</td>
<td>TW003047</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>New footway from new development mentioned above to bus stop to the west and to recreation ground car park to the east.</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be carried out before issuing the final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burslam Road car park</td>
<td>TW003061</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Removal of carriageway narrowing in Greggs Wood Road and construction of new crossovers, also new crossovers in Burslam Road</td>
<td>Works 95% complete. Waiting for minor defect works to be completed and AS BUILT drawings and Health &amp; Safety File before issuing 1st Certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Rd - Calverley Rd Junction - Outside Royal Victoria Place</td>
<td>TW003099</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Phase 2 of town centre Public Realm Scheme - Full details not yet known.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>TW Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Road - Church Farm Paddock Wood</td>
<td>TW003064</td>
<td>Paddock</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into new development + traffic islands</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colts Hill - Spring Farm</td>
<td>TW003058</td>
<td>Capel</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into Colts Hill Farm and closure of old access</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be completed and a AS BUILT DWGS to be amended before issuing final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Road Sissinghurst (east side).</td>
<td>TW003092</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>New bellmouth and crossovers into new development</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Road Sissinghurst (west side).</td>
<td>TW003030</td>
<td>Sissinght</td>
<td>New bellmouth and crossovers into new development</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be carried out before issuing final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Road - Hawkhurst Castle, Cranbrook - S278</td>
<td>TW003049</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Closure and re-routing of north end of Heartenoak Road to come out onto Cranbrook Road slightly south than existing junction</td>
<td>Stage 2 technical audit in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Road - Gills Green Cranbrook</td>
<td>TW003071</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Road - Brook House</td>
<td>TW003097</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into new housing development.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranwell Road Rushhall</td>
<td>TW003036</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>New bellmouth and crossovers into new development</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be carried out before issuing final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eridge Road - Union House</td>
<td>TW003091</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>New access into development</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eridge Road</td>
<td>TW003013</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>New access into development</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbet Lane</td>
<td>TW2038</td>
<td>Horsmonde</td>
<td>New footway and raised table into new S38 development.</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be carried out before issuing final certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Station Road (107 to 109 former Wheelers Motors garage site)</td>
<td>TW003038</td>
<td>Tunbridge</td>
<td>Removal of buildout and new crossovers into new development</td>
<td>Adopted 11 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>TW003082</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst Road Horsmonden - Bassetts Farm</td>
<td>Horsmonden</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003012</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greggs Wood Road (phase 1)</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth accesses into phase 1 housing development</td>
<td>Works completed 12 months maintenance started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003031</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greggs Wood Road (phase 2/3)</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth into phase 2/3 of housing development</td>
<td>Works 80% completed - waiting for footway repairs to be completed and AS BUILT DWGS and Health and Safety File before issuing 1st Certificate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003056</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greggs Wood Road phase 4</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into phase 4 housing development</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003042</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartley Road - Cranbrook - Brick Kiln Farm</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003083</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Road Hawkhurst - Lillesden House</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003095</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highgate Hill Hawkhurst - S278</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003045</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent and east Sussex Hospital (new access off north side of Mount Ephraim)</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth accesses into housing development</td>
<td>On site now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003022</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent and East Sussex Hospital (Culverden Park &amp; Culverden Park Road)</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth accesses of north and south sides of Culverden Park. New crossovers off south side of Culverden Park Road</td>
<td>Works completed - waiting for defect works to be completed and AS BUILT DWGS and health and safety file to be provided before issuing 1st Certificate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TW003072</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kippings Cross</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>Details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix E**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knights Wood phase 1A - S278 connection to Knights Way</td>
<td>TW003054</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New access into Knights Wood housing development, new bus stop locations at west end of Knights Way and construction of new surface water sewer in Knights Way.</td>
<td>On site now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Wood Phase 1A - S278 Phase 2 - Bus Stops</td>
<td>TW003101</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Phase 2 of S278 works to install two new bus stops at the east end of Knights Way.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle Road Brenchley (Latters Toll)</td>
<td>TW003087</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>Details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road Southborough</td>
<td>TW003033</td>
<td>Southborough</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into Bupa care home</td>
<td>Waiting for defect works to be completed before issuing 2nd Certificate and adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road Tunbridge Wells (No11)</td>
<td>TW003096</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield Road - Travis Perkins - New Travis Perkins Store</td>
<td>TW003098</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into new Travis Perkins store.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield Road - Travis Perkins - New Wicks Store</td>
<td>TW003080</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into Wicks store, new ped crossing island in Longfield Road, move bus stop</td>
<td>On site now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascalls Court Farm</td>
<td>TW003069</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into development off green lane</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Kent Road Paddock Wood</td>
<td>TW003073</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearsons Green Road Solar Farm, Paddock Wood</td>
<td>TW003063</td>
<td>Paddock Wood</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into solar farm</td>
<td>Works completed 12 months maintenance started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penns Yard Pembury</td>
<td>TW003015</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>New parking bays off each side of Penns Yard, open end of Penns Yard to give access to new housing development, move existing column in Pembury Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Road Pembury (No’s 36 to 38)</td>
<td>TW003088</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>Waiting for design submission from Designer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Road Pembury - The Priory</td>
<td>TW003075</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropers Gate</td>
<td>TW003028</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into development, new parking bays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail Dowding Way</td>
<td>TW003074</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Road Hawkhurst - The Priory</td>
<td>TW003081</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Road Hawkhurst - Woodham Hall</td>
<td>TW003100</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into housing development off Rye Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Road Hawkhurst - Old Bus Station - Tesco Store</td>
<td>TW2036</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>New bellmouth access into Tesco Store off Rye Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Road Hawkhurst - Birchfield</td>
<td>TW003065</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Works completed - Establishing amount KCC have spent on traffic signal alterations at junction of A229 and A268 before returning remainder to the Developer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissinghurst Primary School</td>
<td>TW2044</td>
<td>Sissinghurst</td>
<td>New access into new development at Sissinghurst School to improve visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smugglers Hawkhurst - Bowles Lodge</td>
<td>TW003057</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>New access into development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>TW Code</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelmonden Rd (A262) - Spelmonden Farm</td>
<td>TW003086</td>
<td>Horsmonden</td>
<td>Details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standen Street Iden Green</td>
<td>TW003079</td>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>New access into development off Standen Street + layby at junction with Woodcock Lane</td>
<td>Stage 2 technical audit in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Approach Paddock Wood - Nat West Bank</td>
<td>TW003094</td>
<td>Paddock wood</td>
<td>DDA access into Bank off Station Road / Station Approach.</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge Road Pembury - Owls Nest</td>
<td>TW003090</td>
<td>Pembury</td>
<td>New access into development</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Ways - Tunbridge Wells public realm scheme</td>
<td>TW003059</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Paving improvements to Tunbridge Wells town centre in Grosvenor Road</td>
<td>Final remedial works have been agreed, just awaiting a start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites Lane Hawkhurst</td>
<td>TW003078</td>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>Full details not yet known</td>
<td>At planning stage with Development Control Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix F – Bridge Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Bridge</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>Repair works to Grosvenor bridge No.1995 – reconstruction of concrete piers for safety critical work.</td>
<td>Construction Phase due to start 12 June 2016 but postponed because outside party work to divert HV cable not completed as scheduled. Construction and road closure to commence when diversion completed. Awaiting notification of revised schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G – Traffic Systems

There is a programme of scheduled maintenance to refurbish life expired traffic signal equipment across the county based upon age and fault history. The delivery of these schemes is dependent upon school terms and holiday periods; local residents, businesses and schools will be informed verbally and by a letter drop of the exact dates when known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2015 Lower Green Road / High Street</td>
<td>Refurbishment of traffic signal controlled junction</td>
<td>Being designed and programmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H – Combined Member Fund

Combined Member Grant programme update for the Tunbridge Wells District

The following schemes are those which have been approved for funding by both the relevant Member and by the Director of Highways and are up to date as of 18th February.

The details below are for Highway Schemes only and do not detail contributions Members have made to other groups such as Parish or District Councils.

More detail on their schemes can be accessed by each Member via the online database or by contacting their Highway Project Engineer.

2015/16 Combined Member Grant Highway Schemes

John Davies – Tunbridge Wells West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ephraim zebra crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design complete, work to be programmed with contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London Road, investigation and design of making service road one-way to prevent southbound entry from York Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design with Member for consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sean Holden - Cranbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of speed limit on A229 between Wilsley Pound and Knoxbridge</td>
<td>£930</td>
<td>Joint scheme in conjunction with similar scheme in Mr Hotson’s division. Design with consultant, consultation now complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realignment of southbound approach to junction of Angley Road with Waterloo Road to make the Angley Road a side junction rather than a ‘straight-through’ from the A229.</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Detailed design complete. Programmed construction beginning summer 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christopher Hoare – Tunbridge Wells East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Alex King – Tunbridge Wells Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate in speed limit change in Bedgebury Road</td>
<td>£1,860</td>
<td>Programmed construction beginning summer 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Oak Green Road, replacement vehicle activated sign</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter Oakford – Tunbridge Wells North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Johns – 20mph zone investigation between St Johns Road and Upper Grosvenor Road</td>
<td>£2,268</td>
<td>Speed data surveys carried out in January Assessment and design being progressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

James Scholes – Tunbridge Wells South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>