

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

07 March 2011

Report of the Director of Kent Highway Services

Part 1- Public

Matter for Recommendation to Borough Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)

1 TONBRIDGE PEDESTRIAN GUARDRAILING ASSESSMENT

Summary

The Board is asked to consider and comment on the proposals to manage sections of guard railing in Tonbridge

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 On behalf of Kent Highway Services, Jacobs have carried out a survey of pedestrian guard railing in Tonbridge and are seeking comments on proposals to remove sections of guard railing from some sites. The proposals are outlined in **Annexes 1 and 2**.

1.2 Context

1.2.1 There is an increasing emphasis on improving the streetscape by removing street clutter and providing better pedestrian accessibility whilst still maintaining road safety. Government is encouraging communities to assess street clutter and determine what improvements can be made.

1.2.2 It is recognised that where pedestrian guard railing is badly sited or over installed it not only alienates pedestrians but also looks unsightly, easily becomes damaged which in turn leads to increased maintenance costs and complaints. Indeed poor guard railing can lead to an increase in pedestrian crashes.

1.2.3 The main purpose of guard railing is to improve safety by trying to prevent pedestrians from crossing the road at an inappropriate place or from straying into the road inadvertently. Guard railing can also be used to offer some protection to pedestrians at locations where the swept path of large vehicles, such as buses and heavy goods vehicles, takes the vehicles close to the footway, sometimes overhanging it.

1.2.4 **Annex 1** is a report with the recommendations along with illustrated diagrams detailing retention and removals. Ringway would be carrying out the removals with the panels being recycled. If decorative or ornate railings and panels are

highlighted for removal, the Borough Council will be able to retain these for repairs or future use.

1.3 Options available

1.3.1 Before deciding its response, the Board will wish to be aware that the Borough Council is separately considering these proposals but it does not yet have a resolved position. The views of local Members will be collated and the proposals analysed in detail at the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board in June.

1.4 Implementation

1.4.1 Subject to the views of the Board, it is proposed to undertake the works site by site where damage has occurred to existing barrier to achieve value for money and efficiency.

1.4.2 Conclusion

1.4.3 The removal of guard railing which is not required for pedestrian safety or for other reasons is in line with national guidance to de-clutter streets. It will also reduce on-going maintenance costs and help improve the appearance of the public realm.

1.5 Recommendation

1.5.1 That a decision on this matter be held in abeyance while the Borough Council resolves its formal position in the light of the advice of the Planning and Transportation Advisory Board at its next meeting.

1.6 Legal Implications

1.6.1 Nil.

1.7 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.7.1 Funding will be provided by Kent Highway Services. A budget allocation has not been secured next financial year specifically for this commission.

1.8 Risk Assessment

1.8.1 As described in the report annexes.

1.9 Equality Impact Assessment

1.9.1 See 'Screening for equality impacts' table at end of report.

The Director of Planning, Transport and Leisure confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Rachel Best
08458 247800

John Burr
Director of Kent Highway Services

Screening for equality impacts:		
Question	Answer	Explanation of impacts
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	The effects of the works outlined in this report are neutral in terms of equality impacts.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	N/A	See previous answer
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		

In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above.