Table 1 – Tonbridge Transport Strategy - Traffic Management Measures

	Total Carlo		
Proposal	Study Out Come	Cost Estimate	Programme
1. High St/Vale Rd	Traffic capacity of the suggested	£125k	0 - 3 years
Modify junction layout to change	change in priority at the junction		
the thoroughfare emphasis from	appears to be an issue, traffic signals		
the High St to Vale Rd.	would not assist with the aspiration to		
	reroute traffic away from the high street		
	so further work is required to review		
	potential gateway features to deter		
	traffic from entering the High Street.		
1a. High St/Pembury	Traffic capacity of the suggested	£200k	0 – 3 years
Road/Quarry Hill Road – Modify	change in priority at the junction	220011	o o youro
junction layout to change the	appears to be an issue, traffic signals		
thoroughfare emphasis from the	would not assist with the aspiration to		
High St to Pembury Road.	reroute traffic away from the high street		
riigii St to Ferribury Road.	so further work is required to review		
	<u> </u>		
	potential gateway features to deter traffic from entering the High Street.		
2. High St/Bordyke (A227)	Junction layout is at optimum so little	£50k	0 – 3 years
Modify junction layout to change	scope to alter within the confines of the	2001	Joans
the thoroughfare emphasis from	existing highway.		
the High St to Bordyke.	Calcula ingliway.		
3. Pedestrian Priority Flow on	An autlina sahama has baan	£500k *	0 10 40000
High St	An outline scheme has been	£3UUK "	0 – 10 years
_	developed. Further more detailed work		
Increased priority to pedestrian	will be required.		
movement leading to reduced			
road capacity and hence			
discouraging traffic from using the			
high St.			
4. Variable Message Signs	Recommended for the car parks east of	£200k	0 – 5 years
Providing advanced notice of car	the High Street along Sovereign Way		
park availability.	and around the Angel Centre		
7. Vale Rd/A26 Vale Rise	New traffic signal controlled junction is	£250k **	0 – 5 years
Roundabout	recommended.		
Increase in capacity may be			
required to cater for additional			
traffic diverted away from High St			
and from development			
8. Vale Rd (Residential section)	Traffic calming in the residential area of	£30k	0 – 5 years
Review/implementation of further	Vale Road is considered adequate, so		
rat running deterrent measures	additional measures have been put in		
3 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	place near the junction with Avenue Le		
	Puy		
9. Strawberry Vale	Traffic calming proposals could be	£40k	0 – 3 years
Traffic calming measures on	enhanced to deter rat running	~ 1010	J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J
Strawberry Vale and Priory Rd to	Simanood to dotor fat failing		
counter the potential diversion of			
traffic as a result of Proposal 10. Rail/Bus Interchange	An outling schome has been developed	£25k	0 5,4000
_	An outline scheme has been developed	£25k	0 – 5 years
Improvements Make bus/rail trips more attractive	for taking forward to local consultation.		
Make bus/rail trips more attractive			
and thereby reduce the number of			
car borne trips to the station.			
15. Implementation of UTMC	UTC is not recommended at the	£540k-	0 – 5 years
system	moment.	690k	
The Tonbridge town centre area	It is suggested that there is further	I	ĺ

including UTC, VMS, CCTV air	consultation, to determine, which of the		
quality monitoring aids – Is	proposals will give most benefit to		
	• •		
Tonbridge town centre suitable	removing traffic from the high street.		
(viable) for UTMC?			
16. Possible traffic signal	a) Implementation of traffic signal with	a)£100K	0-3 years
control at:	pedestrian crossing facility		
a) B245 London			
Road/Dryhill Park Road	b& c) Implementation of signals is		
b) A26 Hadlow	considered impracticable and therefore		
Road/Yardley Park	should not be proposed		
c) A26 Hadlow	all Minimal Is an after the surface.		
Road/Ridgeway d) A26 Hadlow	d) Minimal benefits therefore		
	implementation of signals not recommended		
Road/Higham Lane	recommended		
17. Hadlow Road/Cannon Lane	Provision of a kerbed island should be	£5K	0 – 3 years
junction	considered.	201	0 - 0 years
traffic light upgrade	oondidored.	1	
18. Review of signing strategy	This has not been assessed as part of	1	
	this report it is recommended that a	£20k to	0-1 years
	detailed signing strategy is	£30k	1-5 years
	commissioned.	£80k to	, , , , ,
	Implement signing strategy	£120k	
19. Lansdowne Road/High	Junction capacity is a big issue at this	na	0-5 years
Street/Bordyke junction	location. More detailed assessment is		
The proposed measure (outline	required to confirm impact from the		
design) need to be stronger in	proposed Lansdowne Road link. There		
terms of discouraging traffic	is limited scope for improvement		
through the High Street	without significant impact on capacity.		
Assume the Lansdowne link road			
will be delivered by TMBC so			
there would be increase in traffic			
using Lansdowne Road		0001.4	
20. Strawberry Place	Close the route to vehicles except	£30k to	0 – 5 years
Greater pedestrian priority to	emergency and maintenance vehicles	£40k	
enhance pedestrian access to	to create a pedestrianised area		
town especially from residential area to the south via Goldsmid			
Road/Vale Road		1	
21. Bank Street and Castle	Reduced vehicle access to High Street	£550k to	0 – 5 years
Street	with Lansdowne Road link in place	£700k	0 - 0 years
Greater pedestrian priority	therefore more pedestrian friendly	2,000	
possibly through surface	surfacing material can be used in these	1	
treatment	locations.		
22. A227 Controlled Crossings	Puffin crossing facility should be	£60 to	0 – 5 years
at York Parade	considered	£70K	
23. The Ridgeway – controlled	Puffin crossing facility should be	£60 to	0 – 5 years
crossing	considered	£70K	
24. Medway Wharf	Installation of traffic signals or mini		
Rd/Sovereign Way junction	roundabout is not appropriate at this		
improvement.	location. There is Potential to change	Change	
	priority on this junction, although it is	in priority	0-5 years
	recommended that further consultation	£5k	
	takes place with regard to the preferred	1	
	traffic assessments of suggested		
	making part of Medway Wharf Road	1	
	one way.	1	
	1		1

NOTES

The schemes referred to in the above table are shown on Drawings B1790900/01 rev A, /01A Rev A, /02 Rev A, /03 Rev A, /07 Rev A, /08 Rev A, /09 Rev A and /10 Rev A, relating to the proposal number. The schemes have been drawn up but have not been subject to a capacity check or safety audit.

- * This is the minimum likely cost using "standard" conservation kerbs and ordinary block paving. More expensive maerials (such as granite) will increase the cost significantly.

 ** Estimate does not allow for the purchase of a strip of land from the development site.