

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC Response
42105857		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	You do not mention M20 junction 5 or Hermitage Lane junction with the A20 and A26. These have already been severely impacted with all the new housing along Hermitage Lane along with the McDonald's. This has to be addressed as this servery impacts accessibility to Maidstone hospital.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42213665		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	The Key transport issues are comprehensive and well-reasoned. Every opportunity should be used to improve public transport, increase cycling and walking and discourage car use.	Comment noted.
38377665		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	We need to resurrect vital bus services that have been withdrawn. After the withdrawal of the 155 bus, we have one bus each way 2 days a week from Peters Village to Wouldham, Burham, Eccles, Aylesford and Maidstone and no bus at all to Medway. The most remote village in the mountains of North East Pakistan, the last village before K2, manages to have a better bus service than that, using specially built, small buses on a 4x4 chassis.	Comment noted. Bus services in Kent including the former 155 are operated commercially. The council is working with partners through the planning process to support the reintroduction of a bus service to these communities.
42442561		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Transport issues are not being properly considered, if they were local area congestion would not be so bad and set to worsen as approved schemes are delivered	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
25314625		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	For Hildenborough Parish: Consider improving cycle ways and paths; consider how new developments will be detrimental to other road users including cyclists.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
			KCC have continued to reduce their bus routes and bus links in the local area. Many secondary schools are no longer being supported by KCC and families are having to pay schools in excess of £1000 per year to access their private bus routes. This is over double the cost of a bus pass for a young person. This is not acceptable or affordable for families. Children are missing school because families cannot afford these costs. A roads needs to be widened to facilitate current traffic volumes.	Comment noted. Highway capacity will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. KCC is responsible for the provision of home-school transport.
42520801		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	The road quality in the local area is incredibly poor with poor quality remedial works infrequently. Increasing personal and business traffic adds to the congestion and pollution in the local area.	
42584097		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Do not allow building where traffic is already a problem causing hold ups affecting air pollution daily. what transport, we do not have appropriate pathing, and it would take hours to walk to get anywhere, there is no trainline and no buses in Burham Wouldham and PV. so unless you have a car you do not get around, there is only one small store and an over run medical practice which people struggle to get to. while we are on it, there is also no where to park with most households having 2-4 cars per household.	Comment noted.
42545281		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26		Comment noted. Most bus services in Kent including the former 155 are operated commercially. The council is working with partners through the planning process to support the reintroduction of a bus service to these communities.
42616033		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	roads cannot cope with existing demand	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42470433		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Kings Hill does not have adequate transport links - many families have to drive their children to secondary schools as the bus choices are limited and do not feed all schools e.g. weald campus in sevenoaks for Tunbridge boys grammar school, Weald grammar and Trinity faith school. There is no train station in Kings Hill (yes in West malling but this is 2miles away) - yet you are classing this as urban which it is not.	Comment noted. KCC is responsible for the provision of home-school transport.
42687265		0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Will you please stop mentioning Tonbridge for people who don't live anywhere near Tonbridge. We need better services in West Malling and Larkfield	Comment noted.

42585729	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>With regard to "Roads - Provide additional road and junction capacity only where this is necessary " - I have serious concerns that any development in Watlington, or in the immediate surrounding areas, will put huge strain on the Watlington crossroads. The crossroads are not suitable for expansion (will make pavements smaller and therefore less safe, lose the welfare benefit of the village garden and aesthetic area improvements already carried out, not help with pollution if being done to allow for increased traffic and would be an eyesore in a pretty and historic rural village). Upgrading of traffic lights to include traffic-flow sensors would help reduce the CURRENT pollution issues and congestion in the village. However, I don't believe that these improvements would mitigate any increased traffic due to housing or commercial development in Watlington, or in the immediate surrounding areas and I strongly object to development on this greenbelt area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus provision must be ultra-cheap, and very frequent to get people out of their cars.</li> <li>2. Trains need to be much better at carrying bikes of any type for free and at any time and in any number - bring back the guards van.</li> <li>3. Provision for cycling in the borough is very poor. It is not planned, put in in a piecemeal fashion, and in many cases positively dangerous. There is a mis-match between the rhetoric of encouraging cycling and the reality of cycling.</li> </ol>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42719841	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>The points below maybe well intentioned but equal thought needs to be put into providing local residents, local workers and cyclists living on and regularly using country lanes with the same protections and considerations given to those living on A roads. B roads in the Hadlow area are quickly outgrowing their status and are becoming more like A roads by the day. People literally take their lives into their own hands on these country lanes now.</p> <p>5.5.9 KCC is in the process of preparing a new Local Transport Plan (LTP) for Kent. It is expected that this will have a greater focus upon improving sustainable travel modes, including infrastructure for walking and cycling, in line with government policy.</p> <p>5.5.14 A new Active Travel Strategy (LCWIP) is being prepared to support existing and new communities. This will identify cycling and walking infrastructure priorities to support existing and new communities. This is essential to help tackle congestion, respond to climate change and to provide local people with transport mode choice.</p> <p>5.5.19 High quality place making remains key to the design of new developments, which will need to prioritise walking and cycling for local journeys and ensure that resident and visitor parking is adequate and well designed. Not only will this support sustainable living but benefit the health and well-being of residents.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Cycling infrastructure matters will be considered and reflected within evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. Most bus services in Kent are operated commercially, where possible TMBC works with KCC to secure additional funding for services.</p>
42723233	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Not mentioning the chaos created in Wouldham High Street &amp; Burham Church Street where, access to the new Medway bridge provided for Peters Village has dragged in new traffic from both South &amp; North of these two villages. These are unclassified roads in this area, tiny lanes at time single track. This is an example of dreadful transport planning.</p> <p>New Court Road does NOT act as "Burham Bypass" we still have the same amount of traffic through Burham using the Pilgrims' Way as a short cut North to South -- South to North as before and this will only worsen with any large development in the locality. On top of this these two villages have lost the vast majority of their bus service, increasing car traffic, creating more hazards for cyclists &amp; horse riders.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Securing funding to delivery</p>
42318689	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Not mentioning the chaos created in Wouldham High Street &amp; Burham Church Street where, access to the new Medway bridge provided for Peters Village has dragged in new traffic from both South &amp; North of these two villages. These are unclassified roads in this area, tiny lanes at time single track. This is an example of dreadful transport planning.</p> <p>New Court Road does NOT act as "Burham Bypass" we still have the same amount of traffic through Burham using the Pilgrims' Way as a short cut North to South -- South to North as before and this will only worsen with any large development in the locality. On top of this these two villages have lost the vast majority of their bus service, increasing car traffic, creating more hazards for cyclists &amp; horse riders.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Most bus services in Kent including the former 155 are operated commercially. The council is working with partners through the planning process to support the reintroduction of a bus service to these communities.</p>

		Given 5.5.16 states "In the north of the borough capacity issues on the road network are closely tied to growth and travel demand arising from Maidstone. Congestion occurs on the A20, A26 (particularly at Watringbury) and the A228 and A229 corridors" it is NOT clear why 5.5.22 does not include Watringbury given 5.5.22 states "The modelling identifies that the existing hotspot areas (2019-based), where there are concerns about junction performance and the capacity of the network, are located at these broad areas in the borough" : but Watringbury is not listed?	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42443361	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	We believe to be robust & a solution in the local Plan this needs to be recognised at all levels particularly given the roadside Air Quality measurements for NO2 are twice or more the recommended 40 micro grams per cubic metre at Watringbury being 60 2020/2021 during Covid & in the 70's since 2019 at the crossroads. These should be reconciled with the roadside Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/air-qualitystatistics/nitrogen-dioxide">https://www.gov.uk/air-qualitystatistics/nitrogen-dioxide</a>	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42556065	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	The Local Plan will only lead to these key transport issues being exacerbated.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42772033	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	With regard to "Roads - Provide additional road and junction capacity only where this is necessary " - I have serious concerns that any development in Watringbury, or in the immediate surrounding areas, will put huge strain on the Watringbury crossroads. The crossroads are not suitable for expansion (they will make pavements smaller and therefore less safe, lose the welfare benefit of the village garden and aesthetic area improvements already carried out, not help with pollution if being done to allow for increased traffic and would be an eyesore in a pretty and historic rural village). Upgrading of traffic lights to include traffic-flow sensors would help reduce the CURRENT pollution issues and congestion in the village. However, I don't believe that these improvements would mitigate any increased traffic due to housing or commercial development in Watringbury, or in the immediate surrounding areas and I strongly object to development on this greenbelt area.	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42792609	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	As highlighted in TBMC Local Plan 5.5.16 Watringbury suffers congestion and has one of the worst recorded areas of pollution in the County created by traffic at the A26 crossroad in the village. The reference to consideration of future housing development particularly at Fields Lane with such close proximity to the said crossroad would further increase air pollution.	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42794625	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Access would be onto the A26 adding to the congestion and said pollution which is so well documented. The pollution danger to the villagers and environment along with road congestion, safety , disturbance and access issues would make such site and any other in such area completely unacceptable. To all the above should be added the fact that the local medical surgery cannot cope now with current patient levels and also the impact on village school capacity.	Comment noted.
42800865	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	Agree	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42806945	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	No mention has been made about congestion on the A227 / A20 Roads are near or at capacity in large parts of the borough. More development will need road improvements which should be undertaken with the least damage to the rural nature of the environment	Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

42831361	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>There are some areas where fundamental road issues have not been addressed (e.g. north and east tonbridge bypass). Ignoring these and adding further housing will lead to stagnation and destroy a desirable borough.</p> <p>Whilst public transport is key, it is unrealistic to bring the roads to a standstill and expect people to be happy to remain living there.</p> <p>Impact studies must be completed re traffic and its impact on communities such as Watringbury. I feel there is no such actual evidence of this other than authorities trying to put more traffic through communities such as Watringbury .</p>	<p>Noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42745121	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>identify alternate routes</p>	
42745121	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Developments must have impact study. For instance Watering cross roads is at capacity and a very polluted area. Local developments must not put more traffic through communities such as this to the detriment of the community, its safety, its clean air and quality of life of residents. It often appears Watringbury is considered as a traffic pinch point rather than a historic conservation area.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42832929	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Transport requirements will change with electric and hydrogen vehicles, driverless vehicles and other technologies which all need to be factored into the plan which must focus on sustainability and environmental protection.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
43417889	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Key Transport Issues</p> <p>Q 21. I agree with all the points</p> <p>* 22 Walking and Parking are the most important issues.</p> <p>Q.23 Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed. This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Highway works including temporary traffic managemnt matters are co-ordinated by KCC Highways.</p>
		<p>Which facilities require 'capacity studies'?</p>	
43418465	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Roads: The A25 through BG is already over-used due to the lack of a link slip road from the M26. The spur roads from the A25 (the High Street, Western Road, Quarry Hill Road and Wrotham Road) are often beyond capacity at certain times of the day. The junction of Quarry Hill Rd and the A25 is no longer safe due to lack of junction traffic light controls and the significant increase in traffic from the Quarr area new-builds and the surgery. The Dark Hill trunk road is not a preferable option as the lghtham roundabout is already at capacity at peak times. Any plan to develop the empty field by Reynolds Gym would require additional road planning and/or extensive additional traffic to the gate at Drylands, currently a cul-de-sac. Adding traffic to BG should not be seen as a 'benefit', but as quite simply dangerous.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
43548193	38432225 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Q.21. Do you agree with the key transport issues identified above? Yes/No Please explain</p> <p>No comment.</p>	

out in TMBC Local Plan - Regulation 18. Please see attached documents with individual objections. My family and I have lived on Kings Hill since 2000, initially at Lapins Lane and latterly at Redwell Grove. Across the course of the years that we have lived on Kings Hill, we have seen many changes to the environment and would therefore like to set out further objections to additional dwellings based on our own personal experiences and concerns:

Access to Transport:

Road Systems: The road system serving Kings Hill (A228) and the surrounding areas is woefully inadequate as it currently stands, let alone with the addition of further dwellings rising into the thousands and their associated cars. Amongst countless examples over the past few years relating to how these road system inadequacies regularly affect residents in the locality, I would draw your attention to the most recent incident of Thursday 20th October, when severe weather and a damaged car on the A228 towards Mereworth caused several hours' worth of delays to motorists with considerable knock-on effects to all those involved. On a normal day, it can take up to 15 minutes for residents to leave Kings Hill at peak times due to the volume of traffic attempting to leave Kings Hill, or drive past the area.

Additionally, the A26 at Wateringbury regularly has long tail backs simply due to volume of traffic at the lights. Wateringbury is an old village and the buildings around that junction are too close to the junction to allow for a greater flow of traffic.

Rail Systems: Kings Hill has never had a good enough rail system for those commuting to London, with exceptionally limited services for both the West End and the City of London. In a recent change to the timetable from West Malling station, residents were informed that a new hourly service will open up between West Malling and London Charing Cross. Whilst this is something to be celebrated, we were not told that this service was at the expense of the West Malling to Blackfriars train, which, should anyone spend any time down at West Malling station, would note is a well-used and typically overcrowded train. Not a win situation for anyone who uses that train.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

43873729

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

5.5 Transport

We strongly believe that all the key transport issues specified in the Regulation 18 Local Plan should be addressed: bus - provide funding to establish new bus services which can become commercially sustainable; rail - improve access to and facilities at local stations, especially for cycling, walking and disabled passengers; cycling - improve the availability of dedicated and segregated cycle routes across the borough; walking – improve the footpath network especially in rural locations where pavements may be inadequate and provide safe crossings; roads - provide additional road and junction capacity only where this is necessary; parking – the provision of sufficient parking in residential developments and urban areas - with a minimum of one electric car charging point for every four spaces in council car parks in addition to the one electric car charging point for every new dwelling required by the change to the Building Regulations made by the government in June 2022.

Comments noted. In preparing the regulation 18b Local Plan the Council will be working with partners to further refine transport requirements, these will be informed by the emerging KCC Local Transport Plan 5 and will be set out in an updated infrastructure delivery plan.

25296065

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

[extract]

MEREWORTH PARISH COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS TECHNICAL APPRAISAL OF PROPOSALS WITHIN TONBRIDGE AND MALL-ING BOROUGH

COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031 REGULATION 19 PUBLICATION VERSION

Les Henry Associates Limited

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Les Henry Associates Limited have been instructed by Mereworth Parish Council to provide this Technical Appraisal of impact of the proposals for residential development promoted within Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council's Local Plan (2011-2031).

1.2 My name is \*\*\*\*\* I am an Incorporated Engineer, a Fellow of the Institute of Highway Engineers and a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.

1.3 I have been involved in highway and traffic engineering issues for over 35 years in connection with new development and road safety schemes within both the private and public sector.

1.4 I have assisted numerous Parish Councils in Kent with regard to many development proposals and highway improvement schemes since 2007 when I represented and supported Wrotham Parish Council's objections at the Public Inquiry in respect of the construction of a new concrete block manufacturing plant at the existing Celcon plant in Borough Green (Ref: TM/03/2563) which included the provision of the Borough Green by Pass.

1.5 I have also more recently assisted Borough Green and Hildenborough Parish Councils and private individuals and companies in Kent with highway safety and development related proposals.

1.6 This Technical Appraisal identifies several problems associated with development proposals within the proposed Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan, and the supporting documents provided in

Comments noted. Highways capacity and mitigation will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

44304385

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

junction analyses and again there is no way of checking the modelling to validate the results.

#### 4.0 Site, Highway and Transport Characteristics

4.1 The proposed redevelopment area lies to the north of Mereworth and to the east of A228 Malling Road and Ashton Way. The development site to the North of Borough Green and Platt is situated further away to the northwest but will have some impact on B2016 Seven Mile Lane.

Figure 1: Site Location Plan

4.2 A228 Malling Road in the proximity of the junction of with Kent Street is a narrow two-lane single carriageway with no system of street lighting and a single footway on alternate sides of the carriageway.

4.3 West Malling Railway Station is approximately 2.5miles away to the north and provides regular services to London Victoria, Ashford International and Canterbury West.

4.4 The local bus services can be boarded in the centre of Mereworth Village with services throughout the day to surrounding towns and villages as follows: -

Route 7 Tonbridge Wells, Tonbridge, Hadlow, Mereworth, and Maidstone.

Route 77 Tonbridge, Mereworth, Kings Hill, West Malling Station.

Route 151 Kings Hill, West Malling, Snodland, Halling, Rochester, Chatham.

4.5 There are also a number of school bus services that are available and Bus Timetables are provided in Appendix B.

Figure 2: Highway Context Plan

Comments noted. Highways capacity and mitigation will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Parking design and standards will be considered at a strategic level within the local plan and within Design Codes at a later date.

parking standards as the following two standards are quoted, the first being taken from Kent Highway Services Interim Guidance Note 3 dated 20 November 2008 quoted in Appendix G (Parking Standards — Residential Development) and the standards quoted in Appendix H: (Parking Standards — Non-Residential Development) as shown below.

#### GUIDANCE TAPLC FOR RCSDCNTIAL PARKING

Figure 3: Appendix G — KCC Interim Guidance Note 3

Figure 4: Extract of Appendix H — TMBC Local Plan

#### 6.0 Traffic Generation

6.1 An analysis of the industry standard TRICS database identified very few suitably comparable sites for mixed private and affordable housing to identify the traffic that could be generated by the development proposals.

6.2 The TA produced by Mott McDonald does not state what sites from the TRICS database were used to calculate the proposed development traffic but I have selected a single large development within Kent to provide a reasonable assessment of the likely level of vehicular traffic that could be generated.

6.3 The trip rates and total vehicle numbers for each phase of the development are summarised in the Tables 1 and 2 below and the full TRICS data is provided in Appendix C.

Comments noted. Highways capacity and mitigation will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

AM 0800-0900hrs

44304385

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26



10.12 The roundabout junction of A228 Seven Mile Lane, A26 Tonbridge Road and B2016 Seven Mile Lane would appear to be approaching capacity in scenario I with extensive vehicle queuing predicted on A26 North and A228 South in both the am and pm peak periods.

Arm

AM Peak

PM Peak

Comments noted. Highways capacity and mitigation will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Max RFC

Max Queue

Max RFC

Max Queue

A26 North

44304385

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

0.996

The County Council recognises that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified in the Local Plan, however, it is advised that the PRow network is specifically referenced. KCC would recommend that in respect of paragraph 5.5.3, consideration should also be had to the ROWIP.

In reference to the role of the County Council in paragraph 5.5.8, KCC is the Local Highway Authority for the PRow network and therefore has a wide range of responsibilities. This includes involvement in all legal processes and aims to create a network that provides a safe, sustainable means of travel but also delivers the benefits that access to the network, countryside, coast and green spaces can make to improve the quality of life for Kent's residents and visitors.

The proposed Active Travel Strategy (LCWIP) in paragraph 5.5.14 must include the PRow network, with specific recognition of PRow as a valuable component of active travel. It is noted that the County Council has been engaged on the production of this Active Travel Strategy to date.

KCC supports the objective in paragraphs 5.5.19 and 5.5.20, for development proposals to show commitment to encouraging modal shift from short car journeys and towards active travel. The County Council would recommend that the ROWIP is included here as KCC policy regarding PRow, walking, cycling and equestrian use incorporation within development.

The County Council agrees with the risks presented in paragraph 5.5.25 regarding a failure to shift to sustainable transport modes and would draw attention to the aims and objectives of the ROWIP to reduce these.

Within paragraph 5.5.26, the County Council would request that reference is made to the 'PRow network' as opposed to "Footpath Network". Enhanced connectivity for walking, cycling and equestrian activity across the borough, provides a range of sustainable transport options available for the public and opportunities to access high quality open space. While the existing PRow resource provides extensive opportunities for active travel and outdoor recreation, there are gaps in the network and accessibility issues that need to be addressed. Future growth and development should help to address these issues and enhance the PRow network, so that the benefits of this access resource can be maximised by residents and visitors.

17.1 Berkeley agrees with the transport matters set out in the consultation document:

- Bus - Provide funding to establish new bus services which can become commercially sustainable.
- Rail - Improve access to and facilities at local stations, especially for cycling, walking and disabled passengers.
- Cycling - Improve the availability of dedicated and segregated cycle routes across the borough.
- Walking - Improve the footpath network especially in rural locations where pavements may be inadequate and provide safe crossings.
- Roads - Provide additional road and junction capacity only where this is necessary.
- Parking - The provision of sufficient parking in residential developments and urban areas

17.2 It is right to focus on mass public transit, and more 'active' ways of travelling. However, it is important that a balance is found in providing for each of the modes, and challenges presented above. It is likely that technologies will intervene in transport movements in the near future. Electric, and autonomous, vehicles will need specific infrastructure support and could need greater road capacity, which would not be at the same expense to the natural environment as traditional combustion engine vehicles.

The Council values the partnership working that it has with KCC team including countryside access. In drafting the Regulation 18b Local Plan as well as the publication draft of the LCWIP, the policy team will ensure that the PRow network and ROWIP are appropriately referenced. KCC colleagues will be engaged in the detail of the borough's LCWIP through the project steering group, so that all appropriate opportunities to secure network improvements are identified.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

44422593 0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

44463361 25366913 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

It is recognised that TMBC faces some key transport issues during the plan period, particularly in relation to the strategic road and main road network as set out in paragraphs 5.5.22 and 5.5.23 of the Reg 18 LP. It will be extremely important that the transport evidence is published as early as possible for consideration, well ahead of any Reg 19 LP. It is for this reason that Fernham Homes strongly considers that Option 3 represents the best spatial strategy: it will locate development within or adjacent to the settlements with the most services and best nodes for public transport, thereby maximising opportunities for active travel and use of public transport, and minimising trips by private car.

Land at Maidstone Road, Hadlow is located adjacent to the RSC of Hadlow. It therefore represents a highly sustainable location for development, with substantial opportunities for active travel and public transport use.

As set out in Section 25 of this representation, safe vehicular access – in line with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – can be taken to/from the site, with existing direct pedestrian links to Hadlow and the surrounding countryside through existing PROWs.

Goldings Yard, Stocks Green Road TMBC reference 59615 is located adjacent to the main urban settlement of Tonbridge, and in close proximity to the RSC of Hildenborough. Furthermore, Hildenborough station is in very close proximity: approximately 900m from the site. It therefore represents a very sustainable location for development, with substantial opportunities for active travel and public transport use. TMBC is encouraged to seek opportunities to further improve access to the station, particularly by cycle and pedestrians.

As set out in the Available, Suitable and Deliverable document included as part of this representation, safe vehicular access – in line with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – can be taken to/from the site, with existing direct pedestrian links to both Hilden Park and Hildenborough through existing PROWs.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

44459553

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

Transport challenges of today the local plan recognises; 2 of 4 TMBC congestion hotspots are located within the Medway Gap and Medway Valley (A229 and A298), without improved road infrastructure the additional development (domestic housing, mixed use and or industrial / employment opportunities) proposed will increase congestion and reduce other important objectives of NPPF objectives, for example environmental and social wellbeing.

Within the local plan document there is no mention of the impact that the Lower Thames Crossing will have on major and minor roads within the Medway Gap and Valley. National Highways have already stated that A229 and A228 traffic volume will increase between the M2 and M20 junctions which are always congestion hot spots. Both motorways are the primary routes either side of the Medway Gap and Valley and are a key part of the transport plan and developer assumptions to keep local traffic moving without additional congestion.

National Highways, implies that KCC are responsible for A229 and A228 traffic management and required improvements. Although TMBC local plan suggests there is close cooperation between them and KCC, there does not appear to be an appreciation of the impact the Lower Thames Crossing will have on the local plan transport assumptions and what improvement plans are being considered. Is it really conceivable that a greater use of electric vehicles will reduce the local pollution levels as congestion increases, due to new proposed developments and the Lower Thames crossing as National Highways suggest?

To offset the carbon footprint that additional traffic will create, there are National Highways plans for natural regeneration, planting trees etc within the designated areas of the Medway Gap, it's not clear whether these plantation locations are also a designated area for development.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Parking design and standards will be considered at a strategic level within the local plan and within Design Codes at a later date.

#### Active Travel Opportunities

To date "planners" (assume KCC) and various developers have made provision for safe pedestrian and cycle paths within their individual development areas, to promote active travel walking and cycling and to reduce local traffic congestion. However, paths and routes should be a connected

36594049

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

The Reg 18 LP acknowledges at para 5.5.7 that there are existing significant transport challenges for the Borough in terms of managing congestions on local roads and in responding to the impacts of air quality.

Paragraph 5.5.25 of the Reg 18 LP identifies that failing to address known transport challenges could lead to a worsening of congestion and air quality, which has implications for local economic growth and quality of life including public health.

The Local Plan presents an opportunity to support a modal shift away from private car usage, as well as supporting improvements to existing infrastructure, including new relief roads which could provide significant public benefits and alleviate existing congestion and air quality issues. The Reg 18 LP acknowledges this at para 5.5.2 which states the planning system can, through focusing development in locations which are or can be made sustainable, help to reduce congestion and emissions.

Comments noted. Transport modelling work to support the emerging Local Plan is ongoing. As you correctly identify, the transport evidence published alongside the regulation 18 consultation did not test spatial options and strategic sites. This work is ongoing and will be published to support the regulation 18b Local Plan consultation.

a. Transport Infrastructure

The consultation is supported by an Initial Baseline Transport Assessment (IBTA, July 2022) which seek to understand the baseline data and identify potential transport challenges and opportunities to inform the Plan strategy.

This is the first stage in the process of developing a transport strategy which will support the emerging Local Plan, however this is high-level and not as detailed as the evidence which had previously been prepared to support the withdrawn Local Plan 2018.

Appendix C provides a review of the IBTA which identifies:

- The IBTA provides background information regarding the operation of the Borough's highway

Transport - Any future transport development should acknowledge that at the heart of Tonbridge it is the archetype - one street town - which has given limited opportunity to expand or add additional roads within the locality. This one street layout has been one of Tonbridge's key defining features especially during times of conflict.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. New transport modelling will inform the spatial strategy and site specific decisions.

Over the years there have been various studies relating to additional roads either passing through or around Tonbridge which have all failed to materialise due to various cost or practical reasons. So, any new scheme that proposes any additional access routes, public realm facilities through the town for either green space, walking, cycling or other means needs to be carefully incorporated into a holistic Master Plan for the town's development and needs to incorporate the Mace and the Tonbridge Castle Consultations findings. One specific holistic area should focus on the river frontage from Barden Road through to Cannon Lane.

42821345 42821281 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

25406881 0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

We note that transport is identified in the consultation material as a strategic planning matter that needs to be addressed up to the period of 2040. We welcome that transport issues are being considered at the earliest possible stages of plan making. Development proposals must address the proposed impacts on transport networks, seek opportunities from existing or proposed infrastructure, promote walking, cycling and public transport uptake and consider environmental implications and high-quality place making. The Local Plan commits that planning policies prepared will support a range of mixed-use schemes to minimize the number and lengths of journeys required which is welcomed by us to reduce trip making at the source and therefore minimize impacts on the SRN.

A number of key transport issues have been identified which the local plan proposes to address including providing funding to establish new bus services, improve access to and facilities and local rail stations, improve the availability of dedicated cycle routes through the borough, improve the footpath network especially in rural locations where pavements or crossings may be inadequate, providing additional road and junction capacity only where it is necessary and providing sufficient parking for developments. Measures to reduce overall trip making and reduce the reliance on private vehicle are welcomed by us, particularly noting the congested nature of the existing SRN in this area. The Supplementary Baseline Transport Document identifies a high reliance on the private car for the borough with 86% of households owning at least one car, in comparison to 80% across Kent as well as public transport only being used by 14% of commuters in the region.

#### Baseline Transport Models – Kent County Model (VISUM)

As part of the Regulation 18 Local Plan development, we see that baseline transport modelling has been commissioned using the Kent Transport Model in conjunction with Kent County Council as highway authority. The future 2040 baseline forecasts the future operation of the highway network without the Local Plan in place but with existing permissions factored in.

Comments noted. We acknowledge that the future baseline forecasts a significant increase in traffic volumes. Spatial growth options will be tested using the Kent Model to inform a preferred spatial strategy and identification of strategic site options. We acknowledge that the impacts of this upon the local and strategic highway networks needs to be fully understood and any impacts mitigated. We appreciate that particular attention should be made to the M2 J3 and M26 J2a hotspots which have already been identified in the baseline assessment. National Highways are engaged in the progressing modelling work via consultants Jacobs, TMBC is grateful for this and expects that this will be ongoing to support the progression of the Local Plan.

3.59 As part of the Local Plan review, TMBC has undertaken baseline transport modelling work. The purpose of this work is to understand the current situation and identify potential transport challenges and opportunities that could help inform the plan-making process. The existing hot-spots are identified below:

- A20 corridor in the Medway Gap urban area
- A229, and M2, junction 3 in the Walderslade area
- M26 junction 2a with the A20 and A25, in the Addington and Wrotham area
- around Tonbridge Town Centre.

3.60 While the provision of circa. 41 dwellings is unlikely to have a significant impact on the highways network at Borough-wide scale, Croudace are aware of the sensitivities of highways impacts and have therefore engaged with a highways consultant at an early stage.

3.61 Access to the site will be taken from Crouch Lane. Currently, the speed limit along Crouch Lane is 60 miles per hour. These speeds are unlikely to be achieved given the nature of the carriageway. However, our proposal includes extending the 30 miles per hour speed limit, where Crouch Lane enters Borough Green. We would only be required to extend this speed limit by 160m in order to ensure safe access to the site while also creating a safer and more inclusive environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

3.62 While there is a pinch point in the Crouch Lane carriageway arrangement, our proposals would also involve a number of alterations to the carriageway between Tillmans junction and our proposed site access. Our proposals would include the widening of the carriageway adjacent to Tillmans to 5.5 meters in order to enable two vehicles (an HGV and a car) to pass along this section. The widening of the carriageway would allow for a directional priority right of way to be established. This would allow a vehicle travelling northbound priority along the single carriageway section, with signage and a give-way line. As a result, forward visibility between vehicles on Crouch Lane would improve

Comments noted. The preparation of Local Plan transport modelling work is ongoing and further evidence will be published to support the regulation 18b consultation. TMBC is not able at this stage to comment upon site specific matters, these will be taken into consideration within the site selection analysis and selection process.

42819617

0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

Transport

3.71 The Regulation 18 Local Plan identifies a number of capacity issues across the Borough and identifies congestion at the A20/A26 at Watlington. In addition, if approved the delivery of the Lower Thames Crossing project will consume capacity on key routes linking the M20 and M2, requiring mitigation including junction improvements which are not currently funded.

3.72 Croudace appreciates that there are significant concerns regarding the capacity of highways within a number of areas in the Borough. Therefore, they have previously sought specialist advice regarding highways on this site. The initial investigations determined that the A26/B2015 junction is operating at capacity in its existing situations resulting in delays. A development of 60 dwellings will have a low impact on the junction with minor increases in delays.

3.73 Despite the negligible impacts of the development on the operation of the A26/B2015 signal junction, Croudace appreciate that traffic issues are often a major concern for local residents and has included mitigation measures as part of the proposal. The proposal would seek to incorporate junction capacity improvements by widening the A26 (east) arm to provide additional carriageway width for vehicles turning right to be accommodated within the junction. At present vehicles on the A26 (west) arm are blocked with one vehicle turning right onto the B2015. The capacity improvement seeks to allow one vehicle to assume this position without impeding the flow of passing traffic, by forcing the A26 (east) arm traffic to follow a path through the junction to the south of that currently taken. This enables vehicles from both arms to turn right without blocking ahead and left turn movements, and therefore would increase the capacity in the junction. It is expected that with these mitigation measures that traffic flows handled by this junction will fall below 90% of saturation level a significant improvement on current levels.

Comments noted. The preparation of Local Plan transport modelling work is ongoing and further evidence will be published to support the regulation 18b consultation. TMBC is not able at this stage to comment upon site specific matters, these will be taken into consideration within the site selection analysis and selection process.

42819617 0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

46022337 0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

The roads are very congested now without more traffic from new houses.

Comment noted.

I am against increased traffic on our narrow lanes.

I am for better provision for walkers and cyclists.

Comments noted

46090945 0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26

I want a speed limit of 20mph in our villages.



46162977	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Transport. I am retired now, but my work involved frequent commuting to London. This required me to travel to Tonbridge rail station. For a time I used buses. There was a good daytime timetable but buses were often delayed because of traffic congestion. Buses after 6pm were very infrequent and either resulted in hanging around for up to an hour for the next one or my wife having to drive to Tonbridge to collect me. My only other option was to pay for a taxi. The buses were so unreliable that we were forced to buy a second car (and add to the morning congestion causing delays to the buses). Cycling to the rail station was not an option for me because of the dangerous nature of the roads and the volume and speed of traffic on some sections. The public transport situation has not improved.</p> <p>Traffic. There are insufficient employment and secondary education opportunities locally. The lack of public transport options forces residents to travel by road for those and other purposes. The A228 and A26 form the only route linking the M20 and Tonbridge with no current alternatives. Consequently, the majority of HGVs and other vehicles using that route are simply 'passing through' causing noise, vibration, and the congestion at peak times creates air pollution. An M25 Junction 5 link from the M26 to the A21 (southbound) would provide an alternative route between the M20 and Tonbridge. It would reduce the volume of HGVs and other through-traffic on unsuitable roads. It would also reduce bottlenecks at A228 Kent Street, A26 Seven Mile Lane roundabout, A26 Hadlow, and A26 Hadlow Road and Cornwallis Avenue in Tonbridge. The real answer to reducing the</p>	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
46162977	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Primary Transport Routes. Traffic congestion is one of our biggest problems. Reducing our dependence on roads can only be addressed by increasing public transport options or reducing the need to use vehicles in the first place. There is a limit to the distances possible between destinations if active travel is the only alternative.</p> <p>Industrial and retail parks rely heavily on haulage and should therefore be located close to primary transport routes to avoid HGVs travelling through residential areas and small villages.</p> <p>Rail access would provide employees and customers with an alternative to using vehicles.</p> <p>*image*</p>	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
46162977	0 5.5.1 - 5.5.26	<p>Public Transport. Connectivity with minimal congestion between towns and the central zone is crucial. Reducing the use of cars is only achievable by reducing the need to travel or by creating better public transport options. Buses that use the same roads as cars will not reduce car use unless their frequency and reliability is guaranteed. Alternative transport such as trams on dedicated lines would not be subject to congestion and could form a more reliable and pleasant form of transport. The location of terminals is also critical to successful uptake.</p> <p>*image*</p> <p>We need a slip road to take the traffic off the A25 and small roads around</p>	Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42362561	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>A 30 mph speed limit needs to be implemented on the small roads for safety because people drive to fast and nobody wants to walk on them</p>	Comment noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
42461121	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>Better motorway links to remove congestion from (my) local roads.</p>	Comments noted

42721793	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>Cycling is the least developed with poor interconnecting routes. For instance there is not a safe (by Dutch standards) cycle route along the Medway valley from Tonbridge to Maidstone connecting the communities. We built the footpath but not the adjacent cycleway. The link from Kings Hill to Maidstone has stalled. In many cases there are large verges which could have cycle ways provided. This needs a radical investment. A Borough cycling strategy would facilitate growth, health and school access.</p> <p>A strategic approach to a county wide bus provision under a single elected official should be tabled and considered. At present, the private provision is not working. We need to learn from the London mayor effect on transport there. Affordable bus access for children, the elderly and low paid workers would assist growth</p>	<p>Comments noted. A new Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan. Most bus services in Kent are operated commercially, where possible TMBC works with KCC to secure additional funding for services.</p>
42723233	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>Country lanes and Quiet Lanes in and around Hadlow area - as outlined throughout this document B roads are fast becoming no go zones as they become cut through/boy racer areas. Pedestrians are at particular risk. Proper deterrents need putting in place and effective and appropriate signage that drivers don't just ignore.</p> <p>In recent years country lanes such as Ashes Lane in Hadlow have seen an increase in the volume of traffic and an ever increasing range of unsuitable vehicles using the lane with its narrow road and blind, sharp bends. These vehicles include: 4x4 cars, articulated lorries, huge car transporters, coaches, large vans and motorbikes all of which either race through the lane/struggle to pass stationary vehicles belonging to local residents.</p> <p>Congestion in and around Hadlow and Tonbridge is terrible. Every journey has to be planned carefully otherwise you will inevitably become stuck in congestion i.e. it can take up to 30/40 minutes to get from Hadlow to the Sainsbury's superstore depending on traffic volume or multiple traffic lights and diversions many of which seem to be in place at the same time on critical routes. For example there have been numerous road works taking place on Tonbridge/Hadlow Road at the same time as Shipbourne Road. It's nonsensical, to main routes in and out of Tonbridge and Hadlow are compromised at the same time.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Highway works including temporary traffic management matters are co-ordinated by KCC Highways.</p>
42443361	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>It is not just about transport investment it is also about including in the Local Plan the right selection &amp; assessment of sites, limiting development to areas with good infrastructure - the investment should be given to maintaining that infrastructure to a good standard.</p> <p>The T&amp; M Borough Council should not just move bottlenecks along, roads that are currently a bottle necks such as by East Malling Station by the King &amp; Queen pub as well as Wateringbury Village &amp; Mereworth should NOT be put under additional traffic pressure by additional development - Tonbridge/Waderslade/Snodland with connections to trunk roads leading to the motorway network should be prioritised &amp; Maintained as development &amp; infrastructure developments.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
42832929	0 5.5.27-5.5.28	<p>Any other development should couple homes/dwellings &amp; employment to avoid travel. Get all needed motorway slip roads constructed to reduce heavy traffic from minor roads, even if it inconveniences the Foreign Secretary at Cheevering</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Key Transport Issues

Q 21. I agree with all the points

\* 22 Walking and Parking are the most important issues.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Q.23 Parking is already an issue for the residents in the area. Cars therefore park on the pavement. This in turn creates an issue for those walking, especially disabled, young mothers with prams and families with children who must therefore go into the road to pass as the pavement is obstructed.

This was highlighted recently when the A25 was closed for emergency repair. All traffic was diverted down Western Road, upon which cars had parked. There was no room for two lanes of traffic, plus parked cars, and the result was gridlock most mornings for many weeks.

43412865 0 5.5.27-5.5.28

Q.22. Which transport issues matter the most to you?

No comment.

Q.23. What are your reasons for selecting these particular transport issues as priorities for the Local Plan (outline briefly)?

43548193 38432225 5.5.27-5.5.28

No comment.

Q.24. Would you support the implementation of cycling and walking schemes where a reduction in road space including on-street parking may be required in some instances, to provide a network of high-quality urban cycle routes?

Comment noted

In principle, yes we believe it is right to support all measures that increase the desirability of walking and cycling.

43548193 38432225 5.5.27-5.5.28

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at East Peckham and Hale Street, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas. Poor weekend Bus transport to link East Peckham to surrounding areas such as railway stations

Comment noted. It is for TWBC to identify required transport mitigation for development arising in their area.

45732929 0 5.5.27-5.5.28

I am concerned about the potential impact of development within Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in particular the proposed development at East Peckham and Hale Street, on traffic generation for neighbouring areas. Poor weekend Bus transport to link East Peckham to surrounding areas such as railway stations

Comment noted. It is for TWBC to identify required transport mitigation for development arising in their area.

45733345 0 5.5.27-5.5.28