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

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 it's 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 weary 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 became 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.