

TUNBRIDGE WELLS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Monday, 19 April 2021

PRESENT: Borough Councillors Bruneau, Lidstone, Scott and Lewis
County Councillors Hamilton (Vice-Chairman), Barrington-King,
Holden, McInroy, Oakford and Rankin
Parish Councillor Mackonochie

Officers in Attendance: Paul Taylor (Director of Change and Communities), Gary Stevenson (Head of Housing, Health and Environment), Nick Baldwin (Senior Engineer, Parking), Michael Josh (Project Manager, Business Delivery Unit), John Strachan, Paul Leary and Caroline Britt (Democratic Services Officer)

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

TB25/20 The Chair's introduction included an update on the action point at the meeting held on 25 January 2021 in respect of Cornford Lane/Halls Hole Road which included the following:

- It was agreed that Councillor Rankin and Councillor Hamilton would meet with Kent County Council Highway Officers to draft Terms of Reference that would better inform discussions going forward.
- The initial agreement was that the Terms of Reference would be circulated to Members of the JTB Board ideally by the end of February 2021.
- A meeting with Kent County Council Officers had taken place but due to the current exceptional circumstances details of this discussion had yet to be disseminated.
- Details would follow shortly, along with a letter to the Cornford Lane residents association.
- In advance of the details being sent to Members and the Cornford Lane residents association, a brief summary of the discussion at the meeting was given:
 - o It was important to note that any action would have to be evidence based.
 - o Collision data (last available three years up to 30 September 2020) showed no recorded personal injuries on Cornford Lane. Halls Hole Road recorded two personal injury collisions (1 slight, 1 serious) but with no identifiable pattern or trend.
 - o Traffic speed data for Cornford Lane suggested good levels of compliance with average speeds below the posted speed limits.
 - o Traffic speed data for Halls Hole Road also suggested good levels of compliance with average speeds significantly below the posted speed limits.
 - o Cornford Lane was listed on Pembury Parish Council's Highway Improvement Plan, but was listed 15 out of 17 in terms of priority.
 - o In the light of current evidence it was the conclusion of Kent County Council Highways that attention and resources had to be prioritised where evidence suggested they were most needed. As such they couldn't support any proposals for one-way compulsory movements and a 6'6" /2.0m prohibition of traffic width restrictions on Cornford Lane and Hall's Hole road.

- In terms of the way forward, the Highways Improvement Plans and an equivalent for the unparished areas of the Borough could play a significant role.
- This issue affected more than the immediate area and any group would have needed to include a broad range of people.
- Concerns about traffic displacement would be a significant factor.
- An apology was given that the level of engagement wanted had not been able to take place but at this time the County were not in a position to do anything further on this issue. It was suggested the residents continue to speak to their elected Members.

APOLOGIES

TB26/20 Apologies were received from Councillors Stanyer and Woodward.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

TB27/20 There were no disclosable pecuniary interests or other significant interests declared at the meeting.

NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK

TB28/20 Mr Howard Mackenzie, Friends of Cornford Lane had registered to speak on Agenda item 4.

Councillor James Rands had registered to speak on Agenda Item 5. In addition 3 members of the public had registered to speak on this item:

- Mrs Pippa Collard – local resident
- Mr Adrian Berendt – on behalf of RTW Town Forum
- Mr D McIntyre – local resident.

Mr Paul Mason, representing TWBUG had registered to speak on Agenda Item 8.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 25 JANUARY 2021

TB29/20 Mr Howard Mackenzie, Friends of Cornford Lane had registered to speak which included the following:

- It was suggested that a fair balance on the discussion on Cornford Lane/Halls Hole Road was not included in the minutes and it was requested the following be comments be added:
 - o 'Nobody in their right mind would use Cornford Lane to save even 10 minutes as evidenced by their depiction of the lane like a mad max movie.'
 - o 'I completely agree with all who have spoken that a working party is a good idea and should include those adjacent to the road and those affected by changes'.
 - o 'We know what the problems are, I would support some sort of traffic restriction that makes it virtually impossible for HGV's and even commercial vans to use this route. As soon as lockdown comes off, traffic wants to get back to previous levels. We cannot attack motorists, we must carry on supporting motorists.'

- 'I am aware the congestion has been bad here for a long time.'
- 'The matter generated the largest email response I have ever received. The Reynolds Lane closure approved through the Emergency Active Travel Scheme was probably an analogous situation. Traffic that uses rat runs doesn't evaporate, the same cars appear further up the road, challenging the notion that restrictions on rat runs causes car Armageddon on the main arterial routes.'
- 'It's a rush hour problem and I have some empathy with residents. If we set this precedent setting up a working group, every other lobbying group will want one as well.'
- 'We currently have no plans to revisit, but will of course await any information that comes forward.'
- 'We have had two work parties previously on the JTB. Work parties are very, very beneficial. Parishes and KALC would be very supportive to a working party.'
- 'It is understood that officers said they could not prioritise this matter so Councillors Hamilton and Rankin should be able to sort out the Terms of Reference for the working group without officers. I would be amazed if a working group didn't include residents'.
- 'This long standing lobby group, a very well-resourced eloquent persuasive and armed with an impressive address book, which is why they are here.'
- 'I go back to 2014 on this one when as the present Leader, Alan McDermott will attest, and the past Leader, David Jukes, we had a nasty surprise when we only found out about a potential closure of Cornford Lane through the back door. It was almost ad hoc and to say that we were incandescent without being consulted on this would be understated. In Pembury when I put this out to the wider populous they were equally incandescent that they were not aware of the closure'.
- It was stated that some of the comments were directed at individuals rather than facts.
- The statement referring to the closure of Cornford Lane was challenged by numerous Council records that clearly evidenced that Councillors representing Pembury were involved throughout the preceding 8 months prior to the closure.

Members made the following comments:

- It was noted that the minutes were not a verbatim record of every comment made during the discussion.
- The minutes should be fair reflection of what was discussed and it was suggested that several of the supporting comments for action to be taken and for a working group to be set up were omitted.
- Amendments to the minutes could only be proposed by Members of the JTB.
- There was an objection to the minutes being an accurate record and a vote was therefore taken.
- No amendments to the minutes of the 25 January 2021 were proposed.

A vote to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 25 January 2021 was requested by the Chair of the JTB:

Agreed:7
Against:1
Abstain:1

RESOLVED – The minutes of the meeting dated 25 January 2021 be approved as a correct record.

PUBLIC REALM 2

TB30/20 Mrs Pippa Collard had registered to speak and provided the following statement:

“Thank you for allowing me to speak.

At the JTB in January 2019 residents of York Road first expressed their concern over the impact of Public Realm Phase 2 on this narrow residential road due to the inevitable increase in traffic volume and rat running caused by cars wishing to access the town via Monson Road.

*On 20th December 2019 (pre Covid) in a half hour lunchtime period, residents, together with the Chair of the Town Forum, carried out a traffic count to gain an initial understanding of traffic flows down York Road. We counted a total of 45 cars using York Road, 27 cars going to Monson Road and 18 cars to Mount Pleasant.

*Precisely a year later, enforcement in place and despite Tier 3 Lockdown, another traffic count, same half hour period, showed a total of 57 cars using York Road and of them 39 going to Monson Road. So, a significant increase in cars accessing Monson Road at a time of normal traffic and subsequently at a time of supposedly reduced traffic due to the pandemic.

Hence proving the anticipated trend that York Road is a major trajectory and is bearing an increase in cars accessing Monson Road due to the new traffic enforcement.

I would now like to draw your attention to the fact that a meeting was held at the Town Hall on 20th November 2019 between residents of York and Dudley Roads and various council and KCC members, including David Scott, Jamie Watson and Gary Stevenson.

I read to you from the minutes taken by David Scott at that meeting and the recommendation therein: -

‘The preferred and concluded option was to introduce an experimental road closure of York Rd and Dudley Rd using road signs. A temporary barrier could be installed (say a plastic barrier) for a period to determine whether this improved traffic reduction or caused emergency, utility and delivery vehicle problems.’

‘The experimental phase would run concurrently with consultation.’

‘Proposals should be kept at minimum costs if possible, to ensure they can be implemented.’

It was agreed that Jamie Watson was to straightaway prepare a high-level document for the politicians to progress.

This temporary road closure did not happen, we are told due to the pandemic and we ask that now, rather than as an afterthought, you implement it without further delay.

This is a system effectively put into place in many other towns across the UK and which will have the following positive impacts:

- a) Stop rat running down a small, unsuited residential street.
- b) Reduce very real safety concerns for pedestrians crossing Monson Road.
- c) Reduce parking issues for residents of York Road.
- d) Reduce safety concerns for pedestrians crossing York Road at the town end.
- e) York Road residents to thus access London Road at the west end, thereby stopping the need to drive the extra $\frac{3}{4}$ mile imposed by the PR phase 2.

Ultimately, this plan will improve the visual impact of the new 'pedestrianised' area and create more of a foot friendly, plaza type feel in the Town Centre as well as address the safety issue of the Monson Road crossing. Is that not what TWBC was trying to achieve?"

Mr Adrian Berendt Chair of RTW Town Forum had registered to speak and provided the following statement:

"The Town Forum supported the original aims of the scheme to improve the look and feel of the town centre and to make it more pedestrian friendly and generally approved the originally designed scheme. As the design developed, compromises were introduced which worsened the scheme. However, we are where we are and we now need to consider which further improvements are achievable in the short term and which need more time to consider and to resource.

You will have seen the results of the traffic and pedestrian counts carried out by the Town Forum before and after the scheme was implemented. COVID has meant that we need to treat them with caution, but they broadly support the KCC traffic surveys. Three important findings:

- a) The number of pedestrians far exceeds the number of people in vehicles. We must not forget this when designing our streets for people
- b) the share of vehicles using York, Dudley and Newton roads is significantly higher than from before the scheme
- c) most vehicles from those roads ARE now exiting along Monson Road, although some continue to use Mount Pleasant

Having spoken to others, the Town Forum broadly supports the proposals in the report, with a couple of additions and with the important caveat that we need to think about what longer term improvements can be made to further reduce vehicle movements in the centre of town, including a bus strategy for the area. The immediate additions we recommend are:

- 1) Change the road markings and traffic lights on Crescent and Church roads to discourage turning into the Public Realm (I can supply details).
- 2) Re-introduce the York Road closure / 2-way operation that worked so well before and include Dudley, if feasible. Making the scheme 24/7 at the same time would help to remove confusion.
- 3) Narrow the effective carriageway width at the Monson Road junction by

adding planters. Consider something similar along the centre of Mount Pleasant, to improve the ambience and to narrow the width of road that pedestrians have to cross.

4) Last and certainly not least, full public engagement about the scheme.”

Mr Donald McIntyre had registered to speak which included the following:

- A background and experience in highways and traffic management with a particular emphasis on the servicing of town centres by delivery vehicles in an efficient, economically and environmentally sound mode.
- The report did not include any reference to delivery vehicles.
- The rationale of discriminating between buses and delivery vehicles was not understood. Buses were delivery vehicles, delivering people to Tunbridge Wells Town Centre to shop for goods and services delivered by vans and lorries.
- Buses enjoyed unfettered access to and from the Town Centre via Mount Pleasant Road.
- Delivery vehicles were diverted by up to half a mile or more, either via York Road, Dudley Road or Calverley Road. This was imposing real economic, efficiency and environmental costs.
- PR2 imposed the ultimate nonsense on goods vehicles delivering west bound in Monson Road by having to conduct a U-turn to depart the way they came, rather than exiting Monson Road via Mount Pleasant Road.
- There was a solution to these issues, to allow the addition of goods vehicles to the existing exemptions for buses on Mount Pleasant Road. This would eliminate concerns around emissions, economic and the environment.
- The required signage modification would be relatively straightforward – adding the words ‘Goods Vehicles’ or using the sign as determined by the Traffic Signs Regulations. It would also require an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order.
- The current PR2 scheme imposed economic, efficiency and environmental costs on the delivery of goods and services. These costs could be eliminated if a pragmatic view was taken.
- Goods vehicles serving the Town Centre should be afforded the same facility as buses.

Councillor Rands had registered to speak and provided the following statement.

“This matter was raised at Full Council on 17 Jul 2019 when Sue Luck of Saltmarsh asked a question. The then portfolio holder Dr Basu gave a reasonably long answer in which he stated that there would be a review after 12 months of operation of the scheme. That review was to consider the "views of local businesses and residents".

I am not at all convinced this review does consider the views of residents. It looks like passes by have been interviewed, but not actually residents. Residents have been quite vocal throughout this period that they are not happy. In Nov 2019 a meeting was held including many of us in this room and representatives of York and Dudley Rd. At that meeting there was a lot of wait and see suggested, but those present may recall I laid out a large scale map and laid some pennies on it to represent

cars and asked where they would go if they were headed towards Monson Rd. The KCC staff who had been saying we needed to see how traffic flow adjusted did acknowledge there were only two routes. We know where the traffic is going to go.

Do we have evidence to back up this hypothesis yet? Yes! We have the results from Dudley Rd which already show a rise in traffic use. Oddly the opposite appears to be true for York Rd. There is an issue here though the traffic survey commencing 12 Nov 2019 began the Tuesday after Remembrance Sunday. Members may recall there was a pressure to get the works done by Remembrance Sunday but it failed and digging equipment was stacked up at the Eastern end of the road thus achieving the closure residents had asked for. If those dates are correct they follow on immediately from the road having been closed and probably include a few days when it still was closed so I don't think that's a reasonable baseline for comparison.

The truth is we know that this layout turns those two roads into rat runs. We have discussed options. Closure at the Eastern ends of roads is the only suggestion put forward so far which is safe, achievable, reasonably priced and affords with the aims of the public realm. And though I am sure everyone is open to sensible alternative suggestions it has been two years now without any. I think we need to get on with addressing the issues which we know this scheme creates rather than kicking into it the long grass. I recall the first time I spoke to this board on that issue there was a general acceptance across the room that we TWBC and KCC had made a bit of a mess of this and really owed it to residents and businesses to acknowledge that and address it.”

Jamie Watson, Senior Programme Manager, Kent County Council introduced the report as set out in the agenda.

Discussion included the following comments:

- This was an ongoing situation that included a lot of disquiet among residents.
- A meeting that took place before the pandemic made some suggestions as to how the feel and look of the area would be made better (and safer).
- The suggested sign improvements were welcomed.
- It was suggested that a series of planters be installed in the middle of the road on the raised areas of the PR2 (e.g. in front of the war memorial, on Monson Road and Church Road). The installation of planters could be accompanied by cautionary signs. It had the potential to be an attractive solution to the problem.
- Officers were open to suggestions for planters including using them as a gateway feature. There would need to be a discussion about their maintenance and an assurance that vehicles could negotiate them safely (e.g. emergency services).
- Funding would also need to be addressed. Residents Associations might be interested. Tunbridge Wells in Bloom was also suggested.
- It was further suggested that a temporary blockage of York Road and possibly Dudley Road should be trialled.
- The report included some encouraging progressions - in terms of signage that needed further clarity and with enforcement, with the use of cameras.
- The message to the public that the money received from enforcement would be ring fenced for highways improvements was important.

- The proposed traffic survey mentioned in the report could be taken forward quite quickly, probably within the next month.
- There was concern that the traffic flows on narrow residential roads such as York and Dudley Road were not comparable to others in the County.
- The traffic survey would take in account both traffic flows and traffic speeds. The more data captured, the more informed recommendations and decisions could be given.
- One of the main concerns for officers related to York Road was the ability for vehicles to turn around.
- Pedestrianisation should be encouraged.
- Access for delivery vehicles delivering to Mount Pleasant Road was permitted, but not for HGV's using Mount Pleasant Road as a through route.
- It was also permissible to use Newton Road to access both Mount Pleasant Road and Monson Road (eastbound).
- Delivery vehicles could also use the area outside the times of the restriction.
- If a decision was taken to make the restrictions 24/7 further discussion would be needed in respect of delivery vehicles.
- Although it may be an ambition at the moment, but could a smarter solution be the use of buses as a delivery vehicles?
- Making the centre of Tunbridge Wells more of a plaza should be something the Council should consider. Accepting that there would be an element of traffic displacement.
- Local businesses should be supported but a solution to the mix of pedestrians and HGV's in the town centre was needed.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGE UPDATE

TB31/20 John Strachan, Parking Manager provided a verbal update on Electric Vehicle Charging which included the following:

- This related particularly to charging for shoppers, visitors and those working in Tunbridge Wells. It also related to residents who didn't have off street parking or access to charging facilities.
- In March 2021 TWBC joined a Kent CC procurement project (one of 7 Kent Authorities who had joined). The project sought to partner with an organisation that would provide electric vehicle charge points. This would primarily be in car parks. The charge points would be provided on a profit sharing basis.
- The chargers themselves were quite expensive – the fast chargers were about £3,000, the rapid chargers were about £23,000.
- If the agreement went ahead it would be for up to 15 years.
- The procurement exercise was currently underway and Kent CC hoped to award the contract in May 2021. Installation would commence in June 2021.
- TWBC had offered nearly all of its car parks as potential hosts. For the surface car parks the charging regime was likely to be fast chargers. The rapid chargers would be placed in car parks used by shoppers.
- TWBC were also seeking its own arrangements for external providers to host these chargers. This was being undertaken so that a

- comparison to what was being offered by Kent CC was available.
- Grant funding from Central Government was available, particularly from the Office for Zero Emissions. This funding was dependent on the chargers being available to residents.
- Two rapid chargers, close to the railway station had been installed on Mount Pleasant Road, one to be used primarily by taxi's.
- TWBC were also finalising documentation to install another taxi and car charger in Commercial Road East Car Park in Paddock Wood.
- To date TWBC had received little interest from residents for chargers. The use of chargers currently installed in the car parkers was not widely used. Although this might change when the move to electric vehicles took place in 2030.

Discussion included the following comments:

- A number of residents in the St John's area had expressed an interest for the provision of on street parking chargers. Residents were able to email Mr Strachan direct.
- A questionnaire was going to be sent to permit holders and season ticket holders to try and gauge the appetite for residents to own electric vehicles and to establish whether the lack of charging facilities was a barrier.
- TWBC were working on ways to provide on street charging in densely populated areas. The use of lamp posts presented a number of difficulties and was not currently appropriate.
- There were a couple of car parks in the St John's area that had been identified as a possible location for electric chargers.
- Currently the price of electric cars were prohibitive for many drivers.
- The life of the chargers was of concern. At present, charge point technology was reasonably stable and it was hoped that any commercial company that supplied chargers would want to ensure the most up to date technology was being used.
- There was interesting VOSA data on the trends of sale between rural and urban areas. Also, the technology that allowed charging to take place via the wheels.
- The use of electric vehicles and the availability of chargers was in a bit of a chicken and egg position at the moment.
- Regenerative charging used the action of the car braking as a mechanism for charging the vehicle. Inductive chargers used inductive waves on the road surface as the car travelled. But both initiatives were still in the early stages of development.
- Short duration trips were not conducive to the use of electric vehicles. The heavy batteries required were better equipped for longer trips.
- The lighter the vehicle the better, e.g. electric scooters and bicycles as they required the minimum amount of charging.
- The provision of electric charging points in residential streets, particularly those streets with terraced houses presented a number of issues.
- Car companies were also now investing in hydrogen cell technology.
- Concern was raised regarding the shortage of Lithium (from 2027), an important component of electric batteries and therefore something that could prove detrimental on the use of electric vehicles going forward.

HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME

TB32/20 Julian Cook, Tunbridge Wells District Manager at Kent CC introduced the Highways Works Programme that provided an update on the works scheduled for 2020/2021 financial year and some of the works proposed for 2021/2022 financial year.

Discussion included the following comments:

- The surface treatment sites for 2021/22 had not been included but would be available at the next meeting. Details would also be available shortly on the Kent County Council website.
- Confirmation was requested regarding that the £600k funding for the A26 cycle way was still available. Kent CC didn't have the latest information available but said they would revert after the meeting. Following the meeting, Kent CC were able to provide the following information ' The local growth fund manager at Kent CC is currently working on an agreement in principle to have the available funds in question transferred directly to TWBC so that they, alongside TMBC can continue to explore options for appropriate infrastructure between the two town centres.'
- The zebra crossing on London Road was very welcome.
- A pedestrian crossing at the Church Road, London Road junction was desperately needed. Due to the presence of steps on the northern side, the crossing was inaccessible to wheelchair users and those using prams. Following the meeting Kent CC confirmed that the SPD project manager had been informed.
- The failure to use red bricks when repairing pavements in the heritage areas was a concern. The use of tarmac wasn't appropriate.
- Kent CC were proposing to bring a report to the JTB later in the year on the use of red bricks. Some of the problems revolved around the presence of tree roots. If the tree roots were large, it was not possible to use red bricks. Tarmac was often used as a temporary measure until a permanent resolution could be found.
- Where new trees are planted, a tree pit was included so that the roots went down rather than across.
- The use of embossed pavements had been used by other Councils and had been trialled in other areas of Kent, whilst it looked good when first put down, it did not wear very well and within 12 months looked very unsightly.
- There had also been incidents of cars driving/parking on red brick footways. Red bricks were never designed to take the weight of cars and this had caused them to break.
- There was an ongoing issue with sink holes across the borough. There had been a particular problem with sink holes in Pennington Road due to the presence of a water line that had been dripping continuously, causing erosion. Southern Water had been called out numerous times and would be called in again. Kent CC were aware of the sink hole on Holden Park Road which was now under investigation.
- The cause of sink holes were often due to historic water leaks.
- Members were very appreciative of the work undertaken by the Highways Team.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

TB33/20 Paul Mason, Tunbridge Wells Bicycle Users Group (TWBUG) had registered to speak which included the following:

- The JTB was the only forum for discussions of plans made by TWBC but that needed Kent CC to implement.
- There were a number of plans that were rarely discussed at the JTB and for which it was suggested they now be included.
- Some examples of suggested topics that should be considered as standing items for the JTB included:
 - o Carbon neutral status by 2030.
 - o Walking and cycling targets in the Kent Active Travel Strategy.
 - o The cycling network as set out in TWBC's Cycling Strategy.
 - o TWBC's Transport Strategy.
- Last year the Government published 4 radical documents:
 - o Decarbonising and Transport Plan.
 - o Gear Change.
 - o Changes to the Highway Code.
 - o Design Manual for Cycling Infrastructure.
- A proposal was requested for a single agenda item that encompassed these elements perhaps under the banner of Active Travel.

Discussion included the following comments:

- The proposals from Cllr Scott were about de-carbonising. Additionally with regards to electric vehicles, it was about private enterprises bearing the cost of these items. The Council would be the enabling body that would provide the facilities for light vehicles. It was also about reducing the number of heavy vehicles in the centre of town.
- In the first instance Kent CC agreed to take the information away regarding the use of light electric vehicles for further consideration regarding viability and funding.
- The second proposal from Cllr Scott related to the bus and pedestrian area around Tesco's. Better bus provision and enhanced pedestrian areas would be beneficial for local residents and businesses. Further discussion with officers would be necessary before a decision could be taken to take it forward.
- Cllr Lidstone requested that Cornford Lane/Halls Hole Road be included as a future agenda item (picking up from the action point at the meeting on 25 January 2021). Details of next steps should be brought forward at the next meeting.
- The concept of having something similar to a Highways Improvements Plan (HIP) in the unparished areas of the borough could be beneficial for issues such as Cornford Lane. The model of the HIP could be a good way of taking this forward.
- It was suggested that a contact at TWBC (Highways Team) could liaise with Kent CC to consider and prioritise issues with the view of making an Action Plan similar to what was done in the Parishes.
- Finding solutions to traffic problems was something that Councillors were entrusted to do.
- A vote was requested for 'Next Steps for Cornford Lane and Halls Hole Road' to be included on the next agenda.
- There was concern about what putting Cornford Lane on the next agenda would achieve. Kent CC Highways had made clear unless

and until new evidence was available, no further action could be taken at this time. It was highly unlikely that Kent CC officers would move from their current recommendations.

- There should be an opportunity for Councillors and residents to sit down and listen to concerns raised.
- It was noted that there had been many discussions with residents on this issue. To discuss further must include a realistic outcome, which was not possible at this time.
- Public money must be used where it was most useful.
- A new document produced by Kent CC called Vision Zero took much more account of potential injuries and risk, rather than actual injuries and risk. This new strategy might well assist the residents of Cornford Lane to get their issues promoted higher up the list of priorities.
- It was suggested that there should be a watching brief on this issue and as and when new evidence was available then bring it back to the JTB. It would have a better chance of an outcome being achieved.
- The issue of Pembury Road was also a major concern which would require a radical solution. Until the issue of Pembury Road was addressed the conflict with traffic on Cornford Lane was likely to continue.
- There was support for including Active Travel as an item on the JTB.
- Decarbonising and improvements to the Environment should also be included. It would be better to have a broad title.
- Kent CC's Vision Zero looked at transport in its entirety, cycling, footpaths, road junctions, road casualties etc. This would make a good standing agenda item.
- It was agreed the document should be circulated to all Members in advance of the next meeting. The document would then be reviewed by Members and discussed at the next meeting.
- After the initial discussion Members would be able to decide on individual items to discuss in more depth at future meetings.
- An all Councillor Member Briefing was also requested.
- Members agreed that Vision Zero would be included as a discussion item at the next JTB meeting.

A vote was taken that Cornford Lane/Halls Hole Road be only brought back to the JTB as and when there was evidence to support a review of the current position.

Agreed: 6
Against: 3
Abstain: 0

RESOLVED - Cornford Lane/Halls Hole Road would not be included as an agenda item at the next meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TB34/20 The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 5 July 2021 at 6:00pm.

NOTES:

The meeting concluded at 8.55 pm.

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