



Please ask for: Mark O'Callaghan
Direct Dial: (01892) 554219
E-mail: mark.ocallaghan@tunbridgewells.gov.uk
Reference:
Date: Friday 18 January 2019

Dear All

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - MONDAY 21 JANUARY 2019

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board on Monday 21 January 2019, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No Item

- 4 **Minutes of the meeting dated 15 October 2018** (Pages 3 - 10)

To approve the minutes of a previous meeting as a correct record. The only issue relating to the minutes that can be discussed is their accuracy.

- 7 **Proposed Amendments to Parking and Traffic Restrictions - Mount Pleasant Road and adjoining roads for the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme** (Pages 11 - 26)

Appendix C to the report

Kind regards,

Mark O'Callaghan
Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

TUNBRIDGE WELLS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Monday, 15 October 2018

PRESENT: Borough Councillors Stanyer (Chairman), Backhouse, Dr Hall, Lidstone, Simmons and Woodward
County Councillors Barrington-King (Vice-Chairman), Hamilton, Holden, McInroy and Rankin
Parish Councillor Mackonochie

Officers in Attendance: Lisa Gillham (Tunbridge Wells District Manager), Vicki Hubert (Principal Transport Planner), Carol Valentine (West Kent Highway Manager), Hilary Smith (Economic Development Manager), Nick Baldwin (Senior Engineer, Parking), Jane Fineman (Head of Finance and Procurement) and Mark O'Callaghan (Democratic Services Officer)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors Dr Basu, McDermott, Moore and Podbury

APOLOGIES

TB10/18 Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor Oakford.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

TB11/18 There were no disclosable pecuniary or other significant interests declared at the meeting.

NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK

TB12/18 Councillor Moore had registered to speak at minute TB15/18.

The Chairman noted that three members of the public had registered to speak at minute TB14/18 and two members of the public on minute TB16/18.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 16 JULY 2018

TB13/18 Members reviewed the minutes. No amendments were proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 16 July 2018 be approved as a correct record.

UPDATE REPORT

TB14/18 John Barber, for the Friends of Tunbridge Wells and Rusthall Commons, had registered to speak and welcomed the completion of the Major York's Road crossing and progress on the Langton Road crossing. At a site visit on 31 January 2018 it had agreed that a traffic survey would be undertaken to inform the next steps and the cost of approximately £750 would be met jointly by County Councillor Rankin and Rusthall Parish Council. This was subsequently confirmed in updates at the April and July meetings of the Joint Transportation Board. He was concerned by an apparent lack of progress and confusion between officers and Rusthall Parish Council who appeared not to have received any quotes for the survey.

Adrian Berendt, for the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum, had registered to speak and commented that there was a lack of progress and, in some cases, counteractive actions on many significant issues including congestion, safety

and pollution. Cars were being prioritised at the expense of people. Kent topped the list of road casualties with 811 in 2017. There had been very little progress on safety schemes and no progress on increasing the number of journeys taken by active travel. £20m was being spent on town centre parking which would not help with congestion or pollution but a small fraction of that amount would have a transformational effect on active travel. The Council's consultation on air quality clearly identified road traffic as the main component of poor air quality yet noting was being done to tackle it. 2019 should be the year to make radical changes, to protect vulnerable road users, to make reductions in pollution and to reverse decisions making things worse.

Lachlan Burn, resident of Pembury, had registered to speak and commented that traffic used the country lanes such as Kings Toll Road to access or bypass the A21. Several stables along the road catered for school children and disabled people who, along with the stable staff, were at risk from increasingly heavy traffic. The road also formed part of a designated route popular with walkers and cyclists. The narrowness of the road and the acute angle of the junction with the A21 was a hazard to all road users, some drivers were ignoring the no right-turn causing significant danger to oncoming vehicles. Action should be taken to dissuade drivers from leaving the A21.

Comments were made in respect of the following items (other items were taken as read):

Pedestrian Crossing on Langton Road

- County Councillor Rankin had not received confirmation from Rusthall Parish Council that it would share the cost of the surveys but on receipt of such she would complete the necessary paperwork to facilitate the use of her Combined Member Grant.
- The surveys only informed the next stages and did not guarantee that a crossing would be forthcoming.
- The Chairman of Rusthall Parish Council had confirmed to Councillor Stanyer in a recent telephone call that they were willing to share the cost.
- Lisa Gillham, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, KCC, agreed to liaise between Rusthall Parish Council and County Councillor Rankin to progress the matter.

St Johns 20mph zone (including Currie Road)

- 'Zone alterations' mentioned in the report referred to additional roundels and signage.

Congestion on Kings Toll Road, Pembury

- The problems had arisen as a result of the duelling of the A21, previously congestion started further along the route and there was no benefit to using Kings Toll Road to avoid traffic.
- Signs were being installed to dissuade drivers from leaving the A21 but the key would be to reduce congestion on the A21.
- Work was ongoing with Highways England and the Board's support would be welcomed.
- No significant disruption had been experienced during the particular day when officers inspected the area. However, quantitative data had been supplied by local residents.
- It was worth considering whether access to the road should be restricted.

Strategic Planning

- Consultants were being appointed to provide evidence in the development of the Local Plan, following which a meeting of the Local Plan Working Group would be convened.

Brick Paving

- The County Council's response had been disappointing.
- Advance notice of any future removals of brick paving had been requested.
- Previously removed bricks from Royal Chase had not been located.
- It was a condition of granting permission that any removed bricks were returned to the Highway Authority, unfortunately enforcement of said condition was difficult.
- Granting of permission should be subject to the posting of a bond secured against the return of any removed bricks, thus avoiding the need of pursuing enforcement through the Courts.

RESOLVED – That, subject to the comments made in the discussion, the report be noted.

RESIDENT PARKING RESTRICTIONS - GROVE HILL ROAD AREA, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

TB15/18 Nick Baldwin, Engineer, TWBC, introduced the report and noted that having considered the wider implications of the proposals the Council was proposing alternative restrictions to those which had initially been discussed. Details were set out in the report.

Councillor Moore, member for Park Ward, had registered to speak and commented that elected members needed to demonstrate leadership and responsiveness. Through the Board's support, the revised restrictions set out in the report provided an appropriate response to reasonable concerns and she supported the recommendations.

The discussion included consideration of the following matters:

- Current parking on roads adjacent to Grove Hill Road was tight but provided sufficient space to allow vehicles to turn, thus avoiding the need for vehicles to reverse out on to Grove Hill Road.
- The support for the proposals expressed by local residents and the local member was satisfactory justification for approving the recommendations.

RESOLVED – That the Board endorses the proposed minor amendment to parking restrictions in the Grove Hill Road area to extend restrictions for one hour parking between 8am and 8pm Monday to Saturday with no return for four hours, to between 8am and 10pm Monday to Saturday still with no return within four hours.

HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME

TB16/18 Lisa Gillham, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, KCC, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- Resurfacing of the A26 through St. John's Road was completed in August 2018.

- All sites listed for micro-surfacing and surface dressing as set out in the report had been completed on schedule.
- Resurfacing of Langton Road was due to commence this evening.
- Six surface drains in the Nevill Street area had been disconnected from the Southern Water sewer and connected to the River Grom to help reduce the risk of flooding in the area.
- A drain cleansing 'blitz' had recently been completed.
- A full drainage report would come to the next meeting. In the meantime, it was confirmed that drains on minor roads were cleansed in response to reports whilst drains on major roads were routinely cleansed on an annual basis or biannual basis in high risk areas.
- Gully cleansing had commenced in October and was due to complete in November 2018.

John Coupe, for Tunbridge Wells Bicycle User Group, had registered to speak and questioned how the reduced provision for the A26 cycle route achieved the objectives of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, as set out at Appendix D4 to the report. Previous proposals enjoyed support from 70 per cent of respondents to the public consultation which, whilst not perfect, were a significant improvement. The designs to be implemented were much poorer by comparison. Retention of six on-street parking spaces would reduce the benefits of the scheme and there were more examples where the scheme was being undermined. Actions were failing to live up to promises.

Paul Mason, for Tunbridge Wells Bicycle User Group, had registered to speak and noted that the purpose of TWBUG was to get more people to cycle. Appendix E to the report contained 15 examples where a bell-mouth junction was to be installed, some of which had already been completed. Tight-curve junctions were considerably safer and should be preferable. Bell-mouth junctions were no-longer best practice and in many instances were being replaced by tighter curves, doing so now would reduce future costs and demonstrate the Council's commitment to making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

Comments were made in respect of the following matters:

A26 Cycle Route (page 32):

- A26 cycle route was a priority route for TWBC and efforts were ongoing to improve it further.
- The diminishing of the cycle route and the lost opportunity of completing the raised tables at the same time as the resurfacing was disappointing.

Bell-mouth Junctions (pages 33-36):

- The design of junctions was inline with established standards and dependent on local conditions, turning curves needed to accommodate larger vehicles as well as cars.
- Bell-mouth junctions had lower long-term maintenance costs.
- Design standards had been slow to take account of increasing trends towards more walking and cycling.
- Clarification was sought as to whether there was agreement with the principal of tight-curve junctions being safer.
- Officers were increasingly mindful of local conditions in determining the most appropriate junction for the location.

- Given that there was general agreement for a review of the policy of the use of bell-mouth junctions, the current proposed works should be halted.
- KCC Officers undertook to provide greater explanation on the particular factors that impacted on the decision for the proposed junctions. However, review of the wider policy and Kent Design Guide may have a number of implications and would need to be subject to the usual County Council decision making process.

Footway and Carriageway Improvements (page 25-26):

- The schemes set out in the report were only those recently completed or due to be completed. Previously completed schemes had been removed from the list so there had been substantially more throughout the year.
- Approximately £2m had been spent on remedial works in Tunbridge Wells.
- Works were generally scheduled to take advantage of summer weather and most had been completed before the winter.

Street Lighting (page 29-30):

- The columns of recently replaced lights would be removed.
- All columns were subject to a routine scheme of structural testing and replacement columns were ordered for all lights which failed tests.
- KCC had agreed to maintain district-owned assets in Tunbridge Wells.
- Private street assets were the responsibility of the owner.
- Permission was required to attach flower baskets, Christmas lights or other items to light columns. Such permission would only be granted if appropriate.

RESOLVED – That, subject to the comments made in the discussion, the report be noted.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

TB17/18 Comments were made in respect of the following items:

Reporting of Performance Indicators

- Following a request from the Chief Executive, the reporting of some key performance indicators may be possible, however, consideration was ongoing and would be reported to a future meeting.
- Thousands of fault reports were received and acted upon in Tunbridge Wells each year, any such reporting must be effective and appropriate.
- Numbers of people killed or seriously injured on Kent roads was the worst in the UK and there should be a regular item to monitor both numbers and actions taken to mitigate incidents.
- If statistics were to be provided, a standard method of comparison would need to be established.
- The number of people killed or seriously injured was a national data point required by the government.

- A limited number of key points would be helpful to determine the actual state of affairs rather than having to rely on anecdotal evidence.
- Any statistics would need to be considered in context.
- Crash statistics were key in determining the necessity of crash remedial works which reduced the amount of money for other improvement works. Any such spend needed to demonstrate a reduction in crashes.

Members agreed that the item come forward to a future meeting.

Criteria for 20 mph Zones

- A recent response from KCC for a 20mph zone in the Banner Farm area had set out the criteria for future consideration of such schemes and were noted here for members information.
- Community led schemes which were not safety schemes required external funding.
- The Schemes Planning and Delivery Team are only able to initiate 20mph schemes if either a crash remedial scheme or if led by a public health agenda with evidence to suggest that the local area is highly ranked in terms of priority based on public health indicators.

Members noted.

On-Street Parking Enforcement Reserve

- The JTB had no budget.
- The reserve consisted of the surplus from penalty charge notices after costs had been deducted. TWBC held the money on KCC's behalf.
- The Borough Council could put a business case to KCC to access the reserve. Applications would be made through officers.
- Only small surpluses were made so the reserve needed to accumulate funds over long periods. The reserve was currently £317k.
- The Council could not 'profit' from penalty charge notices therefore any surplus must be spent on road transport projects.
- JTB could recommend priority projects, within the criteria, for consideration of an application for funding from the reserve.
- There had not been any recent applications to the reserve but a number of projects were expected from the forthcoming review of the Parking Strategy.
- Use of the reserve should be positively publicised to avoid accusations of profiteering from penalty charge notices.

Members agreed that the item come forward to a future meeting.

High Brooms Rail Bridge

- A heavy goods vehicle had again become stuck under the High Brooms Rail Bridge leading to considerable disruption.
- Given the unlikelihood of physical alterations to the bridge, creative solutions would be needed.
- This was a key consideration in the development of the new Local Plan.

Members noted.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TB18/18 The date of the next scheduled meeting was Monday 21 January 2019 at 6pm.

NOTES:

The meeting concluded at 7.40 pm.

An audio recording of this meeting is available on the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council website.

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed Amendments to Parking and Traffic Restrictions – Mount Pleasant Road and adjoining roads for the Public Realm Enhancement Scheme

Response to proposed TROs

Response 1

I have no objections, at this time, but I would like to request that a small residents motorcycle bay is put on each end of Dudley Road. My motorcycle has been knocked over by parking and passing cars on several occasions and I have in the past had to call the police to have a car removed that was blocking access to my bike. Having spoken to other motorcyclists on Dudley Road, we have all experienced similar issues. We pay the same fee as cars, but our vehicles are more at risk without a dedicated bay.

Response 2

I would like to query the proposed changes to York Road. As far as I can gather, other than the change to 20mph (which I am very much in support of) it appears that all the current single yellow lines will be replaced with double yellow lines. Is this correct? My concern is that (as a resident of York Road) it is quite common to not be able to find a parking space on the road, especially if returning after 8pm. I wonder that if there are no single yellow lines (which offer a few extra overnight spaces currently) are changed to double that the parking will become even more difficult for residents. I don't know if consideration could be given to extending the times for which the road offers permit only parking to extend to overnight (replacing the current 5-8pm ruling)?

Response 3

I am a resident of York Road and I object to the planned changes, mostly as there would be no way to drive out of the road between certain times.

That shows quite a bizarre lack of planning and foresight, and would seriously inconvenience anyone living here.

Please urgently arrange a proper consultation with the residents so that an appropriate decision can be made instead. The proposals to lower the speed limit and reduce parking were clearly made with the residents in mind, so I don't see why the rest of the planned changes shouldn't take us into consideration as well.

Response 4

I live in York Road, at the west end, near the Common. When you proposed the closure of Mount Pleasant from its junction with York Road, did you consider how residents in York Road (which is a one way street) are to access the London Road?! It would mean I would have to take almost a mile detour to end up 50 yards from York Road!

Response 5

1. This will leave traffic wanting to access the town centre via Dudley Road and York Road, creating residential "rat runs" which is a reverse of the restriction to the roads implemented some 20 years ago. Lorries and vans delivering to the shops and businesses in Monson Road are to be diverted via Newton Road via a Sign, yet another residential Road. 2. Newton Road is often blocked by lorries delivering to the rear of the shops on Calverley

Road as there is only 1 loading bay at the far end of the road. This will create grid lock on Newton Road and the surrounding Roads, or.....3. Push lorries and vans down Monson Road leaving them to create 3 point turns (or more in the case of artic's) in the middle of the road as there is no exit for them. 4. By closing Mount Pleasant Road you will be sending all the traffic up to the Carrs Corner roundabout which is incredibly difficult to navigate with normal traffic flow, again forcing more people to use the residential roads to get around the traffic. 5. By pushing more cars down Dudley Road, you will be sending more traffic through phase 1 of your Town Centre cobbled area which is already breaking up.

Response 6

Given the already extremely limited Sunday parking and waiting areas in Tunbridge wells despite the proposed expansion of the Victoria shopping center and influx of new residents from London I strongly appose this proposal.

Response 7

Naturally 20's Plenty for Us supports the change of speed limit on Mount Pleasant Road to 20mph. However an opportunity has been missed to make surrounding streets 20mph: Monson Way, Civic Way, Monson Road, Calverley Road, Garden Street, Calverley Street, Grover Street and Camden Road down to its junction with Garden Road. The proposal is "to extend the 20mph speed LIMIT..." whereas the existing 20mph scheme is a ZONE. We support this change of designation from a zone to a limit scheme, not least because it reduces the need for signing. The reference to Newton Road "from its junction with Newton Road to its junction with Mount Pleasant" looks to be an error. We assume that this means from MONSON Road. We note that the speed limits in (e.g.) Monson Road, Monson Way and Civic Way, all streets with heavy footfall, will be 30mph, sending the message to drivers that 30mph is acceptable in streets where vulnerable road users and motor vehicles mix, contrary to World Health Organisation guidance -. Including Monson Road, Monson Way and Civic Way could be done at no extra expense. Just two signs would be needed – one at the junction of Monson Road / Calverley Road and one at the junction of Civic Way and Crescent Road, instead of the two signs proposed on Monson Road at its junctions with Newton Road and Mount Pleasant Road. 30mph cannot be deemed a safe speed in any of the streets mentioned above. If there were to be a casualty in any those streets, we suggest that KCC might find itself liable for setting an inappropriate speed limit, as highlighted in Yetkin vs. Newham - <http://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2010/776.html>. The reason given for extending 20mph to Mount Pleasant is for "health improvements". Such logic would equally extend to the surrounding streets noted above. NICE guidance advises authorities to set "20 mph limits without physical measures to reduce speeds in urban areas where average speeds are already low (below around 24 mph) to avoid unnecessary accelerations and decelerations" - <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng70> We suggest that the proposal should extended to include Monson Way, Civic Way, Monson Road, Calverley Road (to Carrs Corner) , Garden Street, Calverley Street, Grover Street and Camden Road (to its junction with Garden Road.)

Response 8

It has come to my attention the proposed plans for change to traffic flow from York Road and as a home owner, and council tax payer, in Norfolk Heights, Church Road I write to express my concern. The entrance to our allocated parking is in York Road and as such I, and every other resident of Norfolk Heights, will suffer the same fate as residents of York Road. I understand that you propose from 2019 we will no longer be able to turn right onto Mount Pleasant Road; I must register my dissatisfaction and object strongly to the considerable impact this proposal will have. * From 2019 we will have to drive 0.7 miles, not 100 yards, to

reach Church Road and onward journeys. This addition to every single car journey will increase not only exhaust emissions but traffic congestion in the surrounding roads which is already difficult throughout the day.* From 2019 more traffic and lorries will use York Road as they will no longer be able to access Monson Road via Church Road. The additional traffic will, again, not only also lead to considerably increased exhaust emissions in York Road but turn a narrow residential road into a very busy thoroughfare. York Road is simply not suitable for this purpose. I also understand there are no current plans as to how traffic will exit Monson Road onto Mount Pleasant Road. I would ask that you explain how these plans benefit this area of Tunbridge Wells and what purpose they serve. Am I really to believe that these changes are to facilitate a form of pedestrianisation in a short stretch of road (whilst still allowing a strong flow of bus traffic) which doesn't serve as a retail area? Surely not. I look forward to hearing from you.

Response 9

I have received a copy of the proposed changes parking on York Road Tunbridge Wells. I would like to object to these changes. I work in Hastings and often park on the SYL after 7pm but I always leave by 7am the next day. The parking always has been and continues to be very challenging but I felt that these changes would make the situation impossible. At the very least the changes should also include a change to the allocated street parking to be solely for Residents ONLY. I would advise that the majority of people parking in the area (especially York Road) overnight do not live in the area.

I am writing with one objection, two approvals and some comments on Tunbridge Wells Public Realm Project Phase Two. The main message is in the attached document. Objection As a resident / Council Tax Payer of York Road since 2005 I object to a new disruptive limit outlawing a right turn out of York Road. This comes on top of living on a one-way street with a left turn restriction also imposed after my arrival. I seek a resident's vehicle exemption. I believe the proposed restriction will add to pollution by imposing a 0.7-mile detour on journeys to my daughter and other destinations. Approval I applaud the 20 mile an hour limit. I applaud the proposed new "Any Time" parking restriction (and assume this is a 7 day/ whole week restriction?) Comments Communication Most of my neighbours heard of this project in the last two weeks and some only by the posted statutory notices, which were not delivered to every household but affixed to doors of multiple occupation buildings. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council is a manifestly poor communicator, starting with the name of the project. "Mount Pleasant new pedestrianisation zone" would have made more sense. VFM In the widest sense "who benefits"? It is hard to imagine that money could not be better spent on more pressing social needs. Phase one muted the pedestrian crossings, caused endless expense and time by changing grey bricks for tarmac, worsened by the contractor's installation of defective materials. Much of phase two aims could be achieved just by effective signage. Consequences In York Road given the very limited off-road parking, the multiple occupation of many houses and the need for private transport in order to work could the North side bays be made residents' only? The current Police parking bay is not essential if Tunbridge Wells keeps its police station. If there is no police station it is imperative the police are on standby at weekends close to local bars and pubs. The proposed changes may divert lorries away from a Church Road approach to Monson Road to that of access via York or Dudley Road. Was this considered? What provision /planning is there for vehicles approaching Mount Pleasant in error from Monson, York and Dudley Roads? At the moment drivers approaching the Phase One restriction from the east can turn off without incurring a penalty. I anticipate vehicles trying to avoid penalties by reversing the wrong way down York and Dudley Roads or attempting a u turn at the western end of Monson Road. Signage at entry to all access roads will have to be erected as well as at the immediate point of entry to the restricted zone. Implementation Can any contractor be legally contracted (with penalty clauses attached) to ensure that vehicles can exit York Road at all times, or, if needs must to

provide temporary signage and help to permit vehicles to exit York Road against the one way system?

Response 10

I write to you, as a resident and council tax payer at York Road, in relation to the proposed plans for traffic restriction on Mount Pleasant Road and parking restriction on York Road. In regard to the proposed traffic restriction, I believe it would: 1) Force existing traffic on York Road (and possibly Dudley Road?) that intends to head south (or north!) along London Road or south down Mount Pleasant Road to take a long detour via Monson Road, then right at a set of already congested lights onto Calverley Road then sharp right back on itself at a small roundabout and down Crescent Road, which: a) increases pollution in the centre of Tunbridge Wells - cars would travel a lengthy detour b) introduces a public safety risk: not only are cars travelling further through pedestrian areas - which in itself is dangerous - but the aforementioned roads are narrower and more hazardous than Mount Pleasant Road. There are significantly more people crossing those roads arbitrarily, whereas most people cross Mount Pleasant Road at the traffic lights outside Cote. c) worsens the congestion at the easterly junction (Crescent Road) of the Mount Pleasant Road / Church Road intersection 2) Encourage traffic - including lorries from London Road to travel down and pollute York Road - a narrow road - in order to get to Monson Road, because they can't get down the large, open, non-residential Mount Pleasant Road. I feel the traffic restriction is poorly thought through and potentially very detrimental to the safety and welfare of residents and visitors. I understand the principle of extending a pedestrianised zone but this only seems to be meaningful if done so contiguously - and where benefits quite clearly outweigh risks and any detrimental impact. In this case, I don't see that they do and I therefore object. With regard to parking restrictions on York Road, on a daily basis there are many cars parked all over the south side pavement, where double yellow lines already exist - the council seems to allow this through inaction. Your proposals do nothing to address this, so it appears that the only material effect of introducing double yellows along the entire length of York Road on the south side would be to stop people parking in the one place where they're not causing a problem: outside 1-9 York Road. Although we barely use these spaces ourselves, our neighbours certainly do. Without them, there will presumably be even more demand for bays on the road. The introduction of the 20mph speed limit is sensible. On a side note, I feel that a few cryptic notices on lamp posts in the winter isn't really sufficient notification of a relatively major change. The timescales for residents' comments are unreasonably tight and the justification for the changes in online documents are very brief.

Responses 11 and 12

As residents of York Road, Tunbridge Wells we wish to comment on the proposals set out by the Council and Kent Highways to change our road layout without discussions with the residents of the consequences. Firstly, we welcome the proposed parking restriction, double yellow lines and 20mph limit, there are always problems with inconsiderate parking on the pavement. One of our concerns is, if there is no right turn on to Mount Pleasant Road to access London Road we would have to take a detour via Monson Rd then on to the Calverley Rd roundabout and attempt to turn back onto Crescent Road and Church Rd. It would seem no consideration had been given to the amount of extra traffic that will occur in the area as there will be traffic from Dudley Rd and through traffic from London Rd via York Rd. We envisage major traffic congestion at the entry to Monson Road, the right turn at the Camden Rd lights and the Calverley roundabout. Another major concern is that if cars and indeed heavy traffic cannot continue to access Monson Road via a left turn from Church Road/ Mt Pleasant Road then it would seem that York Road is the only alternative for a major traffic route. York Road is a quiet residential area, the road is narrow as are the pavements. The additional traffic will result in increased exhaust emissions and more noise

in a quiet conservation area. Along with other residents in York Road we should like to request that that the consultation period be extended beyond 3rd December so that the ramifications and consequences of the proposed changes can be discussed with our group.

Response 13

First I am a resident/council tax payer in York road, upon receipt of a leaflet highlighting proposed changes I am frustrated as most of the changes just make the current situation worse. The only change which I am in agreement with is the restriction of speed limit to 20mph as I agree car do travel down our road at dangerous speeds. The restriction with regards to parking at any time on Trinity Arts South side of York road for me is the worst as I rarely arrive home before 6pm after work and do not get a parking space and therefore being able to park on opposite side of road overnight until I leave for work the next morning works well and believe this to be the case for a lot of residents. The updates to Mount Pleasant Road will just make for extended journeys and more traffic flowing through York road which makes for a more dangerous road making the speed restriction a bit pointless. I would like to highlight on this email my objection to the proposals.

Response 14

I am a resident of Suffolk Mews York Road and object to these new proposals for York Road.

Response 15

As a council tax paying resident of York Road, and parking permit holder, I would appreciate clarification as to why decisions have been taken about our access and parking in and out of York Road without consulting residents.

The York Road junction is not a point of congestion. The only effects resulting from your proposed decisions in Tunbridge Wells Public Realm Project Phase Two is that we, the York Road residents will:

- Increase our petrol consumption (already increased by the constant need to circle the block to find parking, for which we pay an annual fee, but seldom have access to, because of non-resident shoppers/parkers, and general shortage of parking spaces.)
- Increase car emissions for the entire proposed access route down Monson Road, Crescent Road and Church Road because a 100-yard car journey to the Church Road junction will now increase to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile.

(Yet any vehicle wanting to exit Monson Road onto Mount Pleasant Road presumably will be allowed to. How is that fair? Or is there no plan in place for that either?)

- Be penalised for living where they do. We already struggle to find resident parking; being bullied with vehicle removal every time Kent County Council Highways, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council or private bodies, want access to York road or parts of it, for whatever their reasons, and never with any prior request or (civil) communication with us. (York Road, at present has lost three parking spaces to scaffolding since October 2018, yet we were not informed of this nor is there any notice this has been agreed with KCC or TWBC. I would like to know is either Council being paid for this? Are we as permit holding residents going to be reimbursed for the lost spaces?).

We have to pay for a permit to park on our street and are rarely able to do so consistently, having instead to park as far as the bottom of London Road, which is a frequent experience – that is 0.5 miles away from where I live. This is only after checking all parts of Zone C, within close distance of York Road, for available spaces, multiple times, which can take up to 30 minutes driving around and waiting.

The existing parking shortage already makes doing ordinary things burdensome, such as having to carry one's weekly shopping half a mile, uphill, to one's door. Consider residents

Agenda Item 7

with young children to manage, people carrying an injury that makes walking difficult or elderly or disabled family members. These are the everyday issues that we, as residents, have to manage when gaining access to our home by vehicle, most of the time with real difficulty.

I believe that tax paying residents should, be accorded some basic considerations, that do not, continue to, make our lives unnecessarily awkward on a daily basis:

- York Road residents should be allowed unequivocal access to the south side of York road, without penalty irrespective of yellow lines, to load, offload and wait for parking spaces to Page 2 of 2

be freed up on the north side of York Road if they need to (which is a constant requirement for several residents every day.)

I do, however, appreciate the proposed efforts to prevent parking on the south (Trinity) side of York Road, as long as they are targeted appropriately.

I have had to reverse half the length of York Road several times because of Sunday shoppers parking on the south side of York Road, specifically where the road is narrowest. Parked cars on the south side of York Road are a significant and regular obstruction issue every evening and weekend, much to residents' consternation and to the detriment of the emergency services.

On several occasions, I've had to help direct ambulances and fire engines, under blue light status, to reverse because of parked vehicles along York Road. If a life was lost because of this delay, I wonder where the liability would lie? These south side obstructions are an obstruction hazard in the weekday evenings and on a Sunday.

- York Road residents should be allowed to turn right into Mount Pleasant Road and given dispensation, without monetary charge, to do so. Considering the amount of times one must "drive around the block" because York Road is not resident parking only, this proposal increases not only our costs but also our petrol emissions and only adds to our already existing aggravations.

- Think and act considerately about York Road residents' parking: Imagine the constant frustration we endure regarding parking access, yet non-residents can park in front of our home for free. However, Tunbridge Wells Council supports decisions to make our lives even more difficult – arbitrarily decided by a body that does not live here or understand our usage issues and difficulties. This is unfair and does not serve and protect the [council] tax paying residents' interests.

Therefore, along with other York Road residents in dissention, I wholeheartedly oppose the decisions regarding proposed right-turn curtailment of York Road access to Mount Pleasant Road. I furthermore disagree with any decision, by any council, to make our already frustrating parking and vehicle access situation any more difficult than we endure now, or that incurs more cost to us and increases pollution where we live and the surrounding streets.

Enhancing the public realm should not be achieved at the detriment of the local tax paying residents. We should, at least, be involved in the decision-making process.

I am an Inclusive Design Consultant who deals with the Equality Act and as far as I am aware, we still live in a democratic society. Arbitrary decisions should not be taken from Maidstone or Tunbridge Wells without first consulting with the residents or other parties who will be directly affected.

Response 16

Dear Mr Simon Jones

I have been informed that you are the person in charge of this project – if this is not the case I would be really grateful if you would be kind enough to let me know. Thank You.

I am one of 35 apartment owners in the Norfolk Grange complex whose private vehicles enter and exit the underground garages via York Road. So without waffling on let me be

succinct.

Double Yellow lines on the south side of York road – wonderful – we have been waiting for this for some time - it will mean that if necessary fire engines will be able to move down the road at night and at week ends. Currently the road is clogged with pavement parking.

But, to stop us and other car owners from turning right at the end of York road would lead to increased traffic jams and as a result increased pollution in the town centre. Repeat-increased pollution.

We wish you well Mr Jones but please let us turn right at the end of York road.

Response 17

As a resident of York Road, I wish to express my opposition against the proposal to extend the pedestrianised area along Mount Pleasant Road. York road is currently a one way road, this means that in order to access London Road by car, I have to turn right out of my drive, and drive 0.6 miles around the block which includes sitting at 2 sets of traffic lights to reach where the top of York Road is situated on London Road. If I were to simply turn left out of my drive, to reach the same point as previously mentioned, it would take seconds and virtually 0 mileage. However, I evidently cannot do this due to the current one way system.

The new proposal will extend my journey considerably more which seems utterly ridiculous to me. If I wish to reach the same point on London Road (where the top of York Road meets London Road), I have to travel an extra 1 mile than I should to do so. If I were to do this journey everyday, in one year I would have travelled more than the distance it takes to drive to Nottingham and back. This extra distance is an absolute waste of my time, my fuel and my money and moreover, releases an unnecessary amount of CO2 into the atmosphere. That's just the impact of my car. Imagine the impact from the hundreds of cars that will be affected by this proposal each year.

As an Environment student, I am keen to emphasise that sustainability should be a major influence in decision making. With the evidence of climate change and global warming growing stronger and stronger, we simply cannot continue to ignore the disturbingly high rate of pollution we currently produce at. It is the government's job, and thus also the council's job to issue policies and implement strategies in order to reduce our impact as much as possible. Failure to do so will exponentially increase our greenhouse gas emissions and result in a more rapid decline in natural resources. This proposal is regressive and ignores the considerable environmental impact that the increase in journey distance will have for a significant number of cars in and around Tunbridge Wells.

The Tunbridge Wells Council should place more attention on mitigating environmental degradation. Solutions could include expanding public transport in Tunbridge Wells, and reducing the cost of travel to make it more accessible for all. I study at, and there is a significant pollution problem here as a result of the number of cars on the roads. As a solution to this, the City Council strongly encourage bus use and it is hugely popular with student fares just £1.20 to travel up to 3.6 miles into the student housing area. Tunbridge Wells bus fares are too high, the buses themselves are infrequent and ultimately put off individuals from using to public transport as a way to get from A to B. Simply moving the traffic to a different area of the town centre by implementing this proposal will not help drive emissions down. It will increase distance travelled, time sat in traffic and this will hugely propel the emissions we produce as a town.

I hope you will seriously consider the reasons I have given against the proposal to pedestrianise Mount Pleasant Road.

Response 18

I am very disappointed that there has been no consultation/discussion with the affected parties concerning your plans to create an extension of the "Pedestrianisation/Restricted Zone" on Mount Pleasant Road from York Road down to the traffic lights at the Church Road

junction and to create a no parking on one side of York road at any time as opposed to 8am-6pm. Indeed the first I knew about it, was when one of the other residents of York Road, drew my attention to the notice attached to the lampposts on York Road via kindly leafleting us.

I strongly object to these proposed change for no right hand turn out of York Road and changes to access of Monson Road for the following reasons:

1. Firstly to drive from York road to the junction London road / Church road will be almost three quarters of a mile from the York Road/ Mount Pleasant Road junction compared to the 75 yards down to the traffic lights at the Mount Pleasant Road/ Church Road junction. In peak times this journey can take nearly ten minutes. All of this time our cars will be emitting fumes.
2. To restrict traffic turning at the traffic lights at Church Road to access Mount Pleasant Road and Monson Road, then that traffic will ultimately use York Road to do so, turning it into a rat run. This will lead to a significant increase in traffic on York Road and in particular it will now be accessed by delivery vans and lorries making residents more disrupted.
3. As currently proposed, vehicles can still enter Monson Road from Camden Road and Calverley Road but at some point before reaching Mount Pleasant Road they will have to turn around which will inevitably lead to chaos, making our journey to get onto Church Road even longer.

I object to full double yellow lines on the full length of York road on the right hand side for the following reason

1. By restricting parking to the zone C bays on York road it will be even more difficult for residents to park after 6pm. It is already incredibly stressful and difficult to park anywhere on York or Inner London road. About 3 years ago you proposed to make zone C York road and Inner London road residents only apart from 11am-3pm where parking for one hour would be permitted. This was an excellent idea and I have no idea why this was dropped. By putting double yellow lines in, and not restricting zone C parking to residents beyond 8pm, it means that residents returning home from about 7.30 pm onwards will really struggle to park at all. Even extending the restrictions of zone c will mean that some evenings there is nowhere to park if we cannot park on the other side.

Response 19

I support the 20 mph speed limit.

My suggestions to improve and amend your plans would be

1. Allow parking on York Road near natwest bank and up to where the left hand zone c parking begins as the road is wide here and can easily accommodate parked cars on the "wrong" side of the road and double yellow the rest where it is harder to park and give enough space for emergency vehicles.
2. Make zone C inner London road and York and Dudley road residents only at all time and offer 1 hour free parking in the town car parks instead for visitors.
3. Allow a right hand turn out of York Road as it is now to reduce congestion around Monson road and Mount Pleasant road and prevent a "rat run".
4. Keep the proposed 20 mile an hour limit

I look forward to my email and other resident views receiving full consideration.

Many thanks for the Public Notice & Map through my letterbox on Friday 8 November 2018.

Changing the parking restriction:

" Existing 8am-6pm Mon to Sat waiting restriction to be changed to 'At Any Time' ".

Me and many of my neighbours applaud the proposed parking restriction on the South Side (Trinity Theatre Side) of YORK ROAD as we had lots of problems in the past.

Ambulance, supermarket delivery vans, etc. can't get through the road - during the days, nights, on Sundays.

Most recent evidence (attached 3 photos Friday 29 November 2018 around 13:50) shows

the problem very clearly.

Additionally residents have to walk in the street during the day or night as parking on pavement is tolerated; it should not be allowed.

Response 20

I am writing to object to the above changes.

There is no need for a 20mph speed limit along York Road as there is no school or other reason for reducing the speed limit. The number of pedestrians using York Road is not likely to change with this project.

The single yellow line on the south side of York Road allows for parking at weekends/evenings and changing this will put more pressure on the existing parking spaces. There are enough cars parking on the single lines to completely fill the south side of the road. If this becomes double yellow lines where will everyone park?

I do understand that there may be occasional difficulties for emergency services to access the road but the road is short and there is normally access at either end which is free.

Also making changes to Mount Pleasant Road will put more pressure on York Road.

It is a narrow road and it is likely that more lorries would use York Road if the access to Monson Road from Mount Pleasant Road is removed.

It is not a suitable road for large lorries to drive along and I object to the increase in fumes which can be quite bad at times.

You are also adding to the pollution by requiring people to drive an additional 0.7 miles to access Church Road.

Why would there be a restriction in turning right at the end of the road and someone doing this could be fined?

People turning out of Dudley Road and Newton Road can turn into the pedestrian/bus area without this happening.

I do not understand why there was no public consultation with affected residents about the proposed changes and only a letter drop and street signs within the last couple of weeks.

There was no indication of changes to parking along York Road in any of the publicity surrounding this project.

The 'table top' design you talk about for the exit from York Road is one that will require a lot of maintenance.

Other roads that have had this done have places where the bricks have broken and it may also cause water to build up behind this along York Road.

How are people to access their property between 79 and 83 Mount Pleasant Road if they cannot turn into Mount Pleasant Road? You can't have a no access area with some cars allowed to go along it.

You are also proposing a bus stop blocking their entrance. Surely this is illegal?

The pedestrian paving has not worked well around the clock outside Costa Coffee. How will you ensure that any surface installed are robustly installed?

What will happen to the farmers market that takes place in Monson Way? You are taking away half the available space.

I do not wish for your proposed changes to go ahead in their current form.

Response 21

I am a resident of Suffolk Mews York Road Tunbridge Wells. I find the above project absurd for the following reasons, to get to anywhere in the south of the town other residents like myself will have to drive almost a mile to get to Crescent Road traffic lights this will cause more noise, pollution, chaos on Monson Road, Calvary Road the round about at Carrs Corner will be vastly increased. What is the reason? Is it just to make a small semi pedestrian area? Who will benefit from this?

York Road is a very narrow road and already we have a vast amount of traffic using it as a

rat run, will this not increase the use of the road?

I support the plan to put double yellow lines down the south side of York Road and the 20 mph, which is much overdue, but will it be enforced especially on Sunday's ?

I think the residents group of the above road should have the opportunity to meet with Highways/KCC to discuss this proposal

Responses 22 and 23

Hi

I am writing with one objection, two approvals and some comments on Tunbridge Wells Public Realm Project Phase Two. The main message is in the attached document.

Objection

As a resident / Council Tax Payer of York Road since 2005 I object to a new disruptive limit outlawing a right turn out of York Road. This comes on top of living on a one-way street with a left turn restriction also imposed after my arrival. I seek a resident's vehicle exemption.

I believe the proposed restriction will add to pollution by imposing a 0.7-mile detour on journeys to my daughter and other destinations.

Approval

I applaud the 20 mile an hour limit.

I applaud the proposed new "Any Time" parking restriction (and assume this is a 7 day/ whole week restriction?)

Comments

Communication

Most of my neighbours heard of this project in the last two weeks and some only by the posted statutory notices, which were not delivered to every household but affixed to doors of multiple occupation buildings. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council is a manifestly poor communicator, starting with the name of the project. "Mount Pleasant new pedestrianisation zone" would have made more sense.

VFM

In the widest sense "who benefits"? It is hard to imagine that money could not be better spent on more pressing social needs.

Phase one muted the pedestrian crossings, caused endless expense and time by changing grey bricks for tarmac, worsened by the contractor's installation of defective materials. Much of phase two aims could be achieved just by effective signage.

Consequences

In York Road given the very limited off-road parking, the multiple occupation of many houses and the need for private transport in order to work could the North side bays be made residents' only?

The current Police parking bay is not essential if Tunbridge Wells keeps its police station. If there is no police station it is imperative the police are on standby at weekends close to local bars and pubs.

The proposed changes may divert lorries away from a Church Road approach to Monson Road to that of access via York or Dudley Road. Was this considered?

What provision /planning is there for vehicles approaching Mount Pleasant in error from Monson, York and Dudley Roads? At the moment drivers approaching the Phase One restriction from the east can turn off without incurring a penalty. I anticipate vehicles trying to avoid penalties by reversing the wrong way down York and Dudley Roads or attempting a u turn at the western end of Monson Road. Signage at entry to all access roads will have to be erected as well as at the immediate point of entry to the restricted zone.

Implementation

Can any contractor be legally contracted (with penalty clauses attached) to ensure that vehicles can exit York Road at all times, or, if needs must to provide temporary signage and help to permit vehicles to exit York Road against the one way system?

Response 24

As residents of York Road, Tunbridge Wells we wish to comment on the proposals set out by the Council and Kent Highways to change our road layout without discussions with the residents of the consequences.

Firstly, we welcome the proposed parking restriction, double yellow lines and 20mph limit, there are always problems with inconsiderate parking on the pavement.

One of our concerns is, if there is no right turn on to Mount Pleasant Road to access London Road we would have to take a detour via Monson Rd then on to the Calverley Rd roundabout and attempt to turn back onto Crescent Road and Church Rd. It would seem no consideration had been given to the amount of extra traffic that will occur in the area as there will be traffic from Dudley Rd and through traffic from London Rd via York Rd. We envisage major traffic congestion at the entry to Monson Road, the right turn at the Camden Rd lights and the Calverley roundabout.

Another major concern is that if cars and indeed heavy traffic cannot continue to access Monson Road via a left turn from Church Road/ Mt Pleasant Road then it would seem that York Road is the only alternative for a major traffic route. York Road is a quiet residential area, the road is narrow as are the pavements.

The additional traffic will result in increased exhaust emissions and more noise in a quiet conservation area.

Along with other residents in York Road we should like to request that that the consultation period be extended beyond 3rd December so that the ramifications and consequences of the proposed changes can be discussed with our group.

Thank you for your attention regarding our concerns and we shall await your reply

Response 25

As a resident and Council Tax payer in York Road I have some serious concerns over certain aspects of the Council's proposed road and traffic changes.

A 20mph speed limit in York Road is sensible, as is stopping parking on the South side, which currently obstructs access particularly for emergency vehicles.

However, the changes to traffic flow in Monson Road and Mount Pleasant do not seem to have been thought through. Access into the west end of Monson Road seems to be only through York Road, which will completely alter the character of what is currently a nice quiet residential road, and for those of us living in York Road we will have a tortuous journey via Monson Road, Calverley Road and Crescent Road just to get to the old cinema crossroads, which is where most of our journeys start.

I trust that the Council will address these concerns, and I look forward to hearing more details.

Response 26

It has come to my attention the proposed plans for change to traffic flow from York Road and as a home owner, and council tax payer, in Norfolk Heights, Church Road I write to express my concern. The entrance to our allocated parking is in York Road and as such I, and every other resident of Norfolk Heights, will suffer the same fate as residents of York Road.

I understand that you propose from 2019 we will no longer be able to turn right onto Mount Pleasant Road; I must register my dissatisfaction and object strongly to the considerable impact this proposal will have.

* From 2019 we will have to drive 0.7 miles, not 100 yards, to reach Church Road and onward journeys. This addition to every single car journey will increase not only exhaust emissions but traffic congestion in the surrounding roads which is already difficult throughout the day.

* From 2019 more traffic and lorries will use York Road as they will no longer be able to

access Monson Road via Church Road. The additional traffic will, again, not only also lead to considerably increased exhaust emissions in York Road but turn a narrow residential road into a very busy thoroughfare. York Road is simply not suitable for this purpose.

I also understand there are no current plans as to how traffic will exit Monson Road onto Mount Pleasant Road.

I would ask that you explain how these plans benefit this area of Tunbridge Wells and what purpose they serve. Am I really to believe that these changes are to facilitate a form of pedestrianisation in a short stretch of road (whilst still allowing a strong flow of bus traffic) which doesn't serve as a retail area? Surely not.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Response 27

I was disappointed that there has been no consultation/discussion with the affected parties concerning your plans to create an extension of the "Pedestrianisation/Restricted Zone" on Mount Pleasant Road from York Road down to the traffic lights at the Church Road junction. Indeed the first I knew about it, was when one of the residents of York Road, drew my attention to the leaflet attached to the lampposts on York Road.

I live in Norfolk Heights which is an apartment block that fronts onto Church Road, with underground parking accessed from York Road.

I support change when you can easily see the benefits arising from it. To effectively pedestrianise the area from York Road down to Church Road has no benefit in my mind, as currently there is only one bank, two charity shops and a coffee shop on one side of the road with no buildings fronting onto the other side. Sadly maybe the definition of our high street is now charity shops and coffee shops.

The residents of York Road and the 35 flats on the Norfolk Grange Estate are going to feel the full brunt of the proposed changes. The consequences of the proposals are two fold. Firstly to drive from the back of Norfolk Heights to the front will mean having to drive almost three quarters of a mile from the York Road/ Mount Pleasant Road junction compared to the 75 yards down to the traffic lights at the Mount Pleasant Road/ Church Road junction. In peak times this journey can take nearly ten minutes. All of this time our cars will be emitting fumes.

The second major consequence is that since you propose to restrict traffic turning at the traffic lights at Church Road to access Mount Pleasant Road and Monson Road, then that traffic will ultimately use York Road to do so, turning it into a rat run. This will lead to a significant increase in traffic on York Road and in particular it will now be accessed by delivery vans and lorries. I applaud the fact that you are imposing parking restrictions on the south side of York road as it was always a concern for residents that emergency vehicles could not get through it. However, ironically, this is going to make it easier for the heavy goods lorries and vans to use it. I also applaud the 20mph speed limit.

The other major concern I have relating to your proposals, relates to Monson Road. As currently proposed, vehicles can still enter Monson Road from Camden Road and Calverley Road but at some point before reaching Mount Pleasant Road they will have to turn around which will inevitably lead to chaos, making our journey to get onto Church Road even longer. Hopefully, you can understand from the foregoing the reason I object to the proposals as currently presented. To make it more tenable maybe you could consider giving residents of York Road and Norfolk Grange permission to turn right at the junction with Mount Pleasant Road to get onto Church Road. You could also consider stopping lorries accessing York Road from London Road. You could also consider stopping vehicles accessing Monson Road from Camden and Calverley Roads but the shops would have something to say about that.

I hope that you find the above comments constructive and that you will take them into consideration before finalising the proposals.

Response 28

I am writing to you in regards to Tunbridge Wells Public Realm Project Phase Two. My partner and I, among others, are residents living on York Road, we are a council tax payers and parking permit holders, therefore, I would appreciate clarification on your proposal as to why decisions have even taken about our access and parking in and out of York Road without consulting residents.

The York Road junction is not a point of congestion. Firstly, your proposal would lead to an increase of fuel emission not only for York Road residence but also for the roads that are involved (Monson Road, Calvery road and Crescent road). Secondly, your proposal would lead to an increase of time spent in the car, trying to find a space to park due to the unavailability of parking. Lastly, your proposal would lead to penalisation for being residents of the York Road.

We have lived on York Road for many years and pay council tax every month and parking permit annually to be able to park on 'our' street. However, this is often a great issue due to a large number of non-residential cars; which have increased in the last few months greatly. These people do not pay for their parking on York Road nor contributing to the local environment/council e.g. paying a parking fee at parking machines. Therefore, parking on the South side of York Road is needed, especially when you come home after a long day at work/school and there is nowhere to park. Not to mention if you have a family/young kids or shopping to carry home; like us, residents will be unable to park on the single yellow at any time as you propose. In case of no parking on the South side of York Road, we residents have to drive around to find a space to park elsewhere.

Furthermore, York Road residents should be allowed unequivocal access to the South side of York Road, without penalty irrespective of yellow lines, to load, offload and wait for parking spaces to be freed up on the north side of York Road daily between 8 am and 5 pm, as well as park on single yellow on the South side after 6 pm daily.

The residents should be allowed to turn right into Mount Pleasant Road and given dispensation, without monetary charge, to do so. The increase in petrol emission and cost of our petrol would rise; as we would be unable to turn right at the end of the road. Not to mention that this proposal will increase the amount of traffic on already very busy Monson Road, Calvery road and Crescent road especially in peak times.

I am not aware why these arrangements for change were proposed.

Enhancing the public realm should not be achieved at the detriment of the local tax paying residents. We should, at least, be involved in the decision-making process.

Arbitrary decisions should not be taken from Maidstone or Tunbridge Wells without first consulting with the residents or other parties who will be directly affected.

Response 29

We write with regard to the above project which includes an alteration to the motor exit from York Road, namely no right turn out of York Road between 9am-6pm. We feel strongly that this and other changes will negatively affect all those who need to exit from York Road with a car.

Our objections are as follows:

- We have had little warning and no consultation with regard to this project and we are tax payers in Tunbridge Wells and specifically for York Road;
- You want to change a lot in order to pedestrianise an area which has nothing in it for pedestrians, namely one bank, two charity shops and one coffee shop on one side of the road with no buildings fronting on the other side.
- All of us needing to use York Road to drive anywhere in the town and onwards will find a journey from York Road to the traffic lights at Mount Pleasant / Church Road will no longer be a journey of 75 feet but one of nearly a mile. In peak times this journey can easily take 10 minutes – this will increase the emissions from all those making these journeys in areas

already identified as having dangerous pollution levels.

- You propose to restrict traffic turning at the traffic lights at Church Road to access Mount Pleasant Road, Monson Road and Camden Road. However, this traffic change will invite traffic to use York Road and it will be used both by HGVs and cars. It will become a 'rat run'.
- It does not seem to be clear what traffic will do once on Monson Road from Calverley Road and Camden Road – where will they exit?

We are however, very happy with the suggested speed restriction in York Road and with the removal of any parking on the south side of York Road.

We are members of the York Road Group of objectors and would be very happy if you would agree to meet us.

Response 30

First I am a resident/council tax payer in York road, upon receipt of a leaflet highlighting proposed changes I am frustrated as most of the changes just make the current situation worse. The only change which I am in agreement with is the restriction of speed limit to 20mph as I agree car do travel down our road at dangerous speeds. The restriction with regards to parking at any time on Trinity Arts South side of York road for me is the worst as I rarely arrive home before 6pm after work and do not get a parking space and therefore being able to park on opposite side of road overnight until I leave for work the next morning works well and believe this to be the case for a lot of residents. The updates to Mount Pleasant Road will just make for extended journeys and more traffic flowing through York road which makes for a more dangerous road making the speed restriction a bit pointless.

I would like to highlight on this email my objection to the proposals.

Response 31

As a resident of York Road and a local council taxpayer I am writing to object to the above plan.

My major objections are based on the inevitable increased traffic not only from additional journeys around Tunbridge Well but also through York Road.

This arises from the planned restriction on a no right turn at the end of York Road adjoining Mount Pleasant Road and the planned restrictions on traffic being able to access Monson Road via Church Road.

As a resident I will be forced, and on which I have not been consulted, to make complete detours around town to access Church Road and the lower part of Tunbridge Wells and exit South. This will along with other fellow residents will not only cause me additional expense and time but will also greatly increase pollution levels, noise and general levels of traffic through York Road, Monsoon Road and around the town. What may be a plan in one area only succeeds in forcing congestion into other areas. Already the traffic passing the Assembly Halls is high but the proposal will only succeed in adding to traffic in this area with consequent increased pollution. I assume it is known that many children access the Assembly Halls.

The plans also make it inevitable that traffic and lorries will be forced along York Road to gain access to Monson Road. York Road is not wide enough and as a residential street is totally unsuitable for such traffic. There is likely to be damage to parked vehicles and unacceptable increased levels of pollution in a narrow residential road which previously has won street awards and was not designed as a main thoroughfare.

I cannot understand how this will improve Tunbridge Wells town centre. I believe it will eventually cause a drop in visitor numbers.

I hope the Council will reconsider these plans please,

Response 32

As a resident of York Road, Tunbridge Wells, a council tax payer in Tunbridge Wells and holder of a resident parking permit in Zone C, I am writing to object to the public realm project referred to in the subject of this email.

In particular, I object to the proposal that in 2019 residents of York Road will be unable to:

- turn right at the end of York Road between 0900 and 1800
- unable to park on the Trinity Arts (south) side of York road
- Stopping traffic exiting Monson Road onto Mount Pleasant road

As a resident permit holder in Zone C who uses their car for work and arrives home in the evening I can assure you that it is nigh on impossible to find anywhere to park other than the Trinity Arts side of York Road, which is occupied in the evening exclusively by resident permit holders who are unable to find an alternative place to park.

These cars arrive after 1800 and are cleared by 0800 the following morning. They do not obstruct the passage of cars down the road and the presence of them overnight is not an inconvenience for through traffic. Where does the council propose that residents who are unable to find parking in zone C should park once the ability to park on this side of the road overnight is removed? It seems illogical to me that the council is prepared to collect money from residents for a parking permit yet provide no feasible place for the residents of York road to park.

The restriction to turning at the end of the road will create a disproportionate detour for all residents of York Road to access the street- it is already a one way street requiring a route through 2 sets of traffic lights to travel from the road back to the entrance.

Preventing traffic turning right will require residents to drive the best part of a mile to exit and re-enter the road. Given the time that residents of the street have to drive to find a parking space; this is an unreasonable inconvenience. The restriction to other roads (Monson etc) are likely to increase the volume of traffic down York Road to access the town centre. We do, however, support your proposal for a 20mph speed limit.

Response 33

I refer to the proposed alterations to traffic management in Tunbridge Wells, in particular not being able to turn right out of York Road between 9am and 6pm.

As a resident of York Road this will create problems in Increased journey times when leaving York Road to then join the A26, the junctions at Calverley Road, Crescent Road and Mount Pleasant Road become very congested now and will only become worse.

To avoid the above there will be a temptation to reverse along York Road to cut significant time from journeys, an important factor given the amount of home deliveries.

Increased cost in taxi fares when the 100m distance to Church Road is increased to approx 1200m.

Increased traffic in York Road, together with increased emissions in a heavily populated Road where additionally pedestrians and front doors are very close to the traffic.

This part of your scheme does not appear to be thought through, there has been little or no consultation with the residents of York Road who will be greatly inconvenienced by this part of the scheme.

I would however say that the speed and parking restrictions mentioned are greatly needed. The parking that is "allowed" on the south side of York Road often creates a situation where an emergency vehicle would not e able to get through, as well as preventing wheelchairs, baby buggies etc from using the pavement.

I look forward to your reply.

Response 34

I live at Norfolk Heights with vehicular access via York Road which, as you know, is a one-way narrow residential street, running west to east.

Norfolk Grange has I believe 35 apartments in total. When the social housing is added together with houses and flats in York Road itself the total number of residential units using York Road probably exceeds 100. Most have cars which are probably used most days. Add to that number the number of vehicles (many of them commercial vehicles) which use York Road as a rat run and the number of vehicle movements per day escalates even further.

I use my car most days and more than 50% of my journeys involve turning right into Mount Pleasant Road and then right again into Church Road. Assuming that half the vehicles using York Road follow the same route it becomes clear that a considerable number do so.

At this point the implications need to be addressed:

The alternative journey from York Road will now involve turning left into Monson Road, then onto Calverley Road and Crescent Road. Scaling roughly off an internet road map of Tunbridge Wells suggests the following:

From York Road to Church Road is about 100 yards.

The alternative which your scheme from York Road to the Church Road traffic lights entails is about 1000 yards. This will increase the air pollution in that area by a factor of 10 which would represent a gross violation of the UK's carbon omissions reduction plans, and a consequent decrease in the health and wellbeing of the residents and users of central Tunbridge Wells.

The wrong-headedness of the proposal is therefore self-evidently astonishing.

And for what? The convenience of the buses? The sacrifices which that logic imposes on the citizens is totally unreasonable.

Since I assume that this proposal is based on studies and environmental impact assessments I would be grateful if you could please provide the following:

- The number of vehicle movements per day in York Road separated into private and commercial.
- The estimated additional air pollution anticipated by the increased journey (described above).
- The anticipated benefit which it is anticipated will accrue the long suffering and high council tax-paying residents of Tunbridge Wells.

Yours sincerely