

Respondent	Comments
Other	<p>Kent Police have no specific observations to make regarding these proposals, however in general terms we would expect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The legislation and advice given in the Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 3, and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016, is complied with. •The application meets the necessary criteria. •The safety of other road users is not compromised by the implementation.
On behalf of a Parish/Town/Borough/District Council in an official capacity	<p>Thank you for consulting with us on the above proposed improvements. Our engineer has kindly carried out a history search of drainage issues on this proposal and has listed the various enquiries below. As you will note there are currently some enquiries with the drainage engineer for further investigation, which he will be working on soon. However, please can you keep us updated so we can ensure all drainage issues are resolved so it does not hinder your works or we could collaborate on the works if improvements to the drainage system is required.</p>
On behalf of a charity, voluntary or community sector organisation (VCS)	<p>I am writing to you as Rehabilitation Worker and Mobility Officer at Kent Association for the Blind. I have taken a look at the Proposed Highway Improvements on the A20 London Road and can see many positives in the proposal. However I would like to enquire around the specific proposal to install a 'shared footway/cycleway' which 'does not have separate cycle lanes and footways marked out'. As a charity that supports people living with sight loss, I am aware that these types of 'footpath' where the pedestrian does not know which line to travel to keep them out of the path of cyclists, can be a reason that such routes become ones that cause the user greater fear, increase the chance of incident and can risk the user avoiding that route altogether regardless of the need. This I suggest could be the same for other groups of pedestrians, particularly those who may have reduced mobility due to age or other reason. Supporting the increase of cycleways is of huge importance on a local and national level, but I wonder whether when sharing that way with pedestrians is there not sense in at least some indication of which side the cyclist and which side the pedestrian should follow to reduce the risk of incident, and to reduce the fear of all users.</p> <p>I would like to enquire as to what the reasons that led you to conclude that an unsegregated path where 'all users have equal access' was the safest option for all involved.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your comments.</p> <p>With kind regards</p>
Local Resident	<p>Dear KCC Highways,</p> <p>I have just looked through the proposals for the A20 and notice you plan to remove the bus laybys.</p> <p>This will add further congestion to an already congested section of A road, particularly in the morning rush hour as busses will block the carriageway while school children board them.</p> <p>I would suggest making the laybys larger to allow more than one bus at a time and improving the curb height to allow better access to the bus.</p> <p>The traffic flows need to be improved and these proposals will do the opposite.</p>
On behalf of a Parish/Town/Borough/District Council in an official capacity	<p>Please see my comments below based on the information received.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please be aware that if columns need to be relocated to accommodate the NMU, then we will need the gaz references to check our structural testing records. It may be the case that columns will not be able to be relocated due to structural condition and might need replacement. This should be taken into consideration and allowed for within the budget of the scheme. If you can provide us with either the references or detailed location plans then we can check and advise accordingly. 2. A lighting level check will be required to ensure that the lux values are maintained on the road and footway. As the NMU cycleway is to be introduced, this will need to be included in the calculations. 3. We will need confirmation of equipment specifications for any new street lighting equipment to be introduced as part of the scheme, inclusive of the items to be located on the new splitter islands. I would however assume that this will fall under the detailed design when that is undertaken. 4. I note there are proposals to widen some of the existing refuge islands. We will need confirmation of the carriageway widths either side of the widened islands to ensure we are still able to maintain any equipment on those islands. This is also applicable to any new islands introduced as part of the scheme works. <p>Kind regards</p>
On behalf of a charity, voluntary or community sector organisation (VCS)	No Objection
Local Resident	We did not know of anything about this proposal or meeting until we read it in the Downs Mail which was delivered this morning - we hope more awareness is made of the decision of the works.
Local Business	Please could we have a drop curb for the in and out carpark access for our parents + children
Local Resident	*** was very knowledgeable + helpful 10/10 well presented information ALAS: KCC should be ashamed of the condition of the roads in Kent - in terms of flow-litter - flooding - potholes + repairs (gully cleaning is non-existent resurfacing is cheap + shortterm - need to address problem before roads become uneconomic to repair - short term thinking

Respondent	Comments
Local Resident	Residents have difficulty exiting Bradbourne Park Road into New Road turning right towards the A20, due to traffic queuing from the Wateringbury direction at the a20 traffic lights. When the lights change traffic also blocks our exit turning left into New road from Larkfield. A "leave clear" box should be provided to allow exit from Bradbourne Park Road
Local Resident	The proposed housing development should be limited to the maximum traffic carrying capacity in the a roads in the area
Local Resident	Existing parking issues on the left hand side of Oak Drive (when looking up to A20) on the footway are causing an obstruction. Can this be reviewed? Top of Bell Lane at the junction with Maple Close is consequently parked up with vehicles obscuring visibility. Can double yellow lines be implemented?
Local Resident	In implementing these proposals it agreed it will be important to: a) Make sure adequate signing of New Hythe Lane width restriction is kept b) The existing barriers along the pavement outside Wealden Hall a listed building are kept. It took years to replace previous "scaffolding" type barriers. c) I do have concerns about shared pedestrian/cycleway outside Morrisons. This is heavily used pedestrian area. d) For what it is worth note BT are about to remove the phone box close to Wealden Hall e) On completion of works yellow boxes "keep clear" etc need if affected to be replaced/renewed within a reasonable time.
Local Resident	Very well presented and explained. People from KCC very helpful and patient in the face of some strange questions and opinions! People get quite aggressive about their own views + issues which can't be pleasant to deal with. Some are not very considerate of others!! Thank you
On behalf of a Parish/Town/Borough/District Council in an official capacity	<p>a) New Hythe Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Length of existing parking on the westbound carriageway between number 781-784 and how this will affect the merge in capacity and safety terms? -Investigation of peak hour restrictions are they needed to ensure that the benefits of the scheme are achieved? - expressed concerns that there is too much going on prior to the right-hand turn into New Hythe Lane, is there too much going on? Frequency of buses at the reconfigured bus cages on the westbound carriageway to identified in order to establish if there is any likely conflict. - also highlighted that there is a lot going on the eastbound carriageway with the configured bus cages, access to the Turkish, bus stop, existing on street parking arrangements and nursery access and asked how this would impact on the scheme. -Highlighted that the bus shelter on the eastbound carriageway is heavily used by school children at peak hours and therefore could present conflict with cyclists and pedestrians wanting to use the improved foot/cycleway. <p>b) Larkfield Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Could cycle priority be provided on this and the other side roads? <p>c) Bell Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - queried if traffic would have the ability to pass buses owing to bus stops situated west of Bell Lane. SH confirmed that there is a carriageway width of 9.3 meters at this location so traffic would be able to pass any static buses. <p>d) Ditton Corner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommends peak hour restrictions on the exit of the A20 on Station Road, New Road on the approach to the A20 and the A20 west bound A20 merge.
Local Resident	<p>My main concerns are as follows.</p> <p>1/ Shared footway/cycleway. I feel that sharing a footway with cyclists and pedestrians is a very dangerous to both users as this could lead to injury or worse. If a pedestrian was unaware of an approaching fast moving cyclist a slight deviation by the pedestrian could lead to a collision that is likely to cause injury or worse to both parties. It is obvious that there is not enough room within this proposed scheme to provide a separate cycle lane and because of this the health and safety of both users is being disregarded in the name of traffic movement rather than pedestrian safety. I wonder if a risk assessment has been carried out and if so I would be interested in the results. I am sure if there were any fatalities caused by this scheme this would be required in court.</p> <p>2/ Parking for residents 527 to 541 A20 London Road Ditton. Most of the residents living in the above houses do not have off road parking facilities and therefore rely on parking outside their homes and in the layby that has been provided for this purpose. Because of this proposed scheme this facility will be removed with no other alternative for them to park. Can you please explain where and what alternative parking will be provided if this scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>3/ Right turn from A20 into New Road Ditton The proposal shows a stacking capacity of at the most three cars in front of the centre island, anything exceeding that will mean that the outside lane will be blocked by vehicles waiting to turn right into New Road, this may not happen that often at present but will happen much more frequently when the proposed 300 houses are build in Kiln Barn Lane. Does the model produced by Amy's take into account future development?</p> <p>4/ Noise / pollution levels. Has the model taken into account the increase in noise and pollution levels at the AQMA area at Ditton Corner as this will increase because of the higher road capacity therefore increase in traffic volume. Will this be acceptable to local residents affected by this proposed scheme, or do the local residents not matter in the scheme of things. I suspect that the priority with this scheme is not people but priority for traffic movement to satisfy the politicians.</p> <p>To conclude I would like to add my own observations by adding the following:</p>

Respondent	Comments
Local Resident	<p>My comments below are in reply to your request for feedback from local residents with respect to the above scheme. 1) The proposal for shared-use paths raises two problems: i) Some sections of the paths are too narrow for simultaneous use by both pedestrians and cyclists. This raises a safety issue, unless the right-of-way is made clear, eg. by signs stating: 'Cyclists must give way to pedestrians at all times.' ii) Other pedestrian areas are shown wide enough to have separate lanes for cyclists and pedestrians. However, these areas are currently used as temporary parking places for a variety of vehicles. This reduces these areas to single use lanes again creating a safety issues if they are shared-use areas. An effective solution would be to install bollards along the A20 to prevent off-road parking. 2) The main cause of congestion and pollution on the a20 is not the flow of 'through' traffic. This traffic can use the M20. The main cause is due to local traffic trying to turn off the A20. In addition, there are severe problems of congestion and pollution due to local traffic wanting to turn onto the A20, particularly from New Hythe Lane, Station Road and Bell Lane. This second problem is not addressed in your proposals. Re-phasing the traffic lights at either junction might help to reduce one of these problems, but only at the expense of making the other problem worse. 3) The underlying cause of these problems is that piecemeal developments have merged Ditton, Larkfield and other estates into a conurbation the size of a town. This conurbation is larger than the northern half of Tonbridge. It is too big to move around on foot, local bus services have little impact and so local residents use this section of the A20 to access local services, etc. that are distributed around and on both sides of the A20, eg. supermarkets, schools, stations and places of employment such as small business -estates. 4) The current proposals will not reduce congestion, nor will they make travel more convenient for local motorists. Any effective solution would be dramatic, unpopular and very, very expensive. The first step would have to be a major traffic survey within the area to identify and quantify the many ways that the A20 is used. This survey alone would cost more than the money currently on offer. So the congestion and pollution problems will not be solved in the foreseeable future. All we can do is avoid making the problem worse. This conurbation must not be allowed to expand, ie. Any applications for developments around the edges must be refused. A reply from you would be appreciated.</p>
Local Resident	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I write with regard to three crossings, two in Ditton and one on the way from Ditton to Larkfield. The crossings can be found a) by the old barn and Oast Houses nearby the entrance to Ditton Court Place b) the crossing by Justin Lord hairdresser opposite the petrol station and c) crossing the road to and from the Nat West Bank on the way to and from Larkfield.</p> <p>I thought this was an ideal time to point these out as the A20 is being considered for upgrading. If you visit these crossings they are near impossible for a wheelchair or scooter to cross and require quite a distance to travel to find a safe place. The New Road/Ditton Corner or the crossing above Bell Lane. If you are on your own you could easily find yourself stranded. Stuck on the slope and unable to move or at worse your wheelchair tip you out.</p> <p>The footpath by the Bank is particularly treacherous and people have been tipped back into the road. It is particularly steep and going to Larkfield wheels lift from the ground and on the return trip you have to be careful not to roll into the road.</p> <p>I would be grateful to give this your consideration in view of the danger to users. I would say I am a wheelchair user and speak from experience.</p> <p>Regards</p>
On behalf of a Parish/Town/Borough/District Council in an official capacity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relocated bus stop near New Hythe Lane to the Mini Garage – may need to facilitate 4 buses which is the maximum I have seen in the morning peak, they tend to park up closely to each other so no one can move until the 1st bus moves on. You may also need to consult with the mini garage in the way the cars are loaded/unloaded so there is no clashes between the buses and their activities. See plan (1) 2. Parking along London Road west bound west of New Hythe Lane Junction may need reviewing if it is hoped to have 2 lanes of traffic to the signals at New Road. See plan (2) 3. Can the footway shared area with cyclist be unsegregated as the footway is not over used and the only areas where there may be a collection of pedestrians or school children are at the bus stops where cyclist could be asked to dismount if necessary. See plan (3) 4. Would prefer where feasible to keep the bus lanes so the buses can stay off the road or partly of the road so that traffic can still pass. See plan (3)

Respondent	Comments
On behalf of a charity, voluntary or community sector organisation (VCS)	<p>fundamentally ill-conceived, the proposals will not even achieve the stated objectives.</p> <p>Kent County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 contains an ambition to make Kent "a pioneering county for active travel ." KCC will not achieve that ambition without proposing pioneering schemes that enable and prioritise active travel, embracing 2nd generation cycling infrastructure design guidance.</p> <p>Substantial revisions should be made to the design to make the A20 less, not more attractive for motor traffic, particularly 'through motor traffic', which can easily use the M20. If the latest cycle design standards were used, this route could become an excellent corridor for active travel into Maidstone and contribute to KCC's objectives of increasing active and sustainable travel, improving health and reducing pollution.</p> <p>Ill-conceived project</p> <p>The M20 runs parallel with the A20 and was built specifically to carry east-west 'through' traffic. The A228 was upgraded in recent years to cater for motor traffic from the south to access the M20. There should be no need for motor traffic to use the A20 as a cut-through. A concept that is more in line with the KCC strategy of increasing active travel and reducing pollution would be to downgrade the A20 to a local road for access by local residents and businesses to Leybourne, Larkfield and Ditton. Priority should be given to the needs of local residents and businesses and to pedestrians, bus users and cyclists.</p> <p>Stated objectives will not be met</p> <p>The first paragraph of the proposal states two objectives:</p> <p>"[1] to improve cycle links along the A20 London Road between the junctions of New Hythe Lane and Station Road, [2] reduce congestion at these two junctions by increasing the number of straight ahead lanes to two each way, upgrade all of the existing islands and install a new island in the vicinity of the old Suzuki garage."</p> <p>As proposed, the scheme will not achieve either objective. It fails all roads users – pedestrians, cyclists and motorists:</p> <p>1) Pedestrians: the shared footpath brings them into conflict with cyclists and there is no</p>
A local business owner	<p>A20 - comments</p> <p>It was most helpful that you gave us a 'heads up' on this one earlier in the year.</p> <p>Having read the consultation document carefully, can I please add to earlier comments</p> <p>(i) the bus service here operates throughout the working day and week - can all the bus stops please be 24 hour bus clearways?</p> <p>(ii) London Rd westbound opposite Morrisons - there is ?unregulated parking on the south side of the westbound A20 - I would suggest that this needs to be 24-hour restricted as parking here impedes the flow of traffic in the queue for the New Road lights</p> <p>(iii) London Rd eastbound opposite Morrisons - there is a need for the approach to and exit from the re-sited bus stop outside the Mini showroom to have regulated 24-hour parking restrictions to afford buses a clear run in to the stop and exit from the stop, which is one of the busiest in the area and has an intensive service. Any bus stop 'cage' here needs to be designed to accommodate two buses at a time.</p> <p>(iv) Station Rd, Ditton Corner (especially Aylesford-bound) - there is a very long-standing problem here which we have raised, unsuccessfully, over many years, and which continues to worsen. Tailbacks from traffic entering Station Road foul the A20 eastbound in the vicinity of the signals - these tailbacks are caused by unregulated parking outside the row of cottages just inside Station Road (and before the K sports club). This kerbside parking - which has recently begun to include light commercial vehicles - occupies the entire 'northbound track' and forces all northbound vehicles into the Station Rd southbound lane at the Ditton Corner approach. There is probably room to accommodate kerbside parking on the east side of the road but the presence of parking in the mouth of the Aylesford-bound road needs to be addressed to prevent a cause of significant congestion on the A20.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>

Respondent	Comments
Local Member of Parliament for Chatham and Aylesford	<p>I am writing in response to the current consultation regarding the A20 London Road Junction Improvements as the local Member of Parliament for Chatham and Aylesford I would like to say from the outset that following several years of consistently raising the issue of chronic congestion along the entire A20 corridor in my constituency on behalf of local residents, I welcome that KCC have now drawn up a set of proposals that I very much hope will improve journey times. While many will rightly welcome the proposals to reduce congestion in principle, I know that there are some aspects of the scheme's design which local residents do have concerns about, including the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on a shared cycle pathway; the sequencing of traffic lights; the potential impact of narrowing the carriageway to accommodate the new pathways and the impact on parking provision. I have therefore urged local residents to contribute to the consultation directly so that KCC and its Councillors are able to consider their concerns carefully. In doing so, KCC must ensure that if the proposals go ahead, that the final scheme design does in fact achieve a greater flow of traffic along the A20 without reducing pedestrian, cyclist or motorist safety or indeed creating new or unintended pinch points. Although I will continue to press both KCC and TMBC on behalf of for local residents regarding the current and proposed development of the area, including the lack of infrastructure to support it, I do hope these proposals will serve as a step in the right direction in improving the appalling congestion along the A20</p>
On behalf of a Parish/Town/Borough/District Council in an official capacity	<p>the proposed removal of the westbound bus gate at the junction of New Hythe Lane as this provides a limited advantage to buses, to the detriment of capacity through the junction for all vehicular traffic. We also support the revision of the dedicated eastbound right turn lane at New Road Ditton, to increase vehicular throughput. We however wish to raise the following concerns about the draft scheme design;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Parking – Existing on-street parking bays are not shown in all current locations on the proposal drawings. Whilst removing on-street parking bays can be controversial none of the existing provision is allocated to existing dwellings or businesses premises. We would like KCC to consider the merits of reducing or rationalising this parking to ensure that carriageway capacity is maximised, i.e. full two lane widths between the junction of New Road East Malling and New Hythe Lane, in both directions. Perhaps a local parking survey could inform the final scheme design? <p>On-street parking is also hazardous to cyclists who can be forced to move around poorly parked vehicles and opening doors. TMBC does not have resources to retrospectively address this matter, should retained on-street parking be detrimental to the effective functioning of the proposed improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Cycling – Improvements to cycling infrastructure are welcomed. However we consider that the proposed shared use footway/cycleway will not be used by all cyclists due to its design, and may therefore in practice have a limited beneficial impact upon the number of cyclists who use the A20 corridor. <p>Established principles of good cycle route design require routes to be; safe, direct, coherent, comfortable and attractive to use. It would therefore be preferable to continue the 1.5m wide mandatory cycle lanes through the scheme, to provide a consistent standard of segregated provision which currently continues towards the Mills Road/Hall Road junction. We note that some of this existing provision will be removed in the vicinity of the Station Road/New Road junction. Given available highway land we understand that it is not possible to retain and continue the on carriageway lanes, the proposed infrastructure therefore represents a deliverable option.</p> <p>The proposed shared use paths will however, require dismounting with no priority at respective side junctions and surface treatment (London red route principals). If the paths are not attractive to use less confident cyclists won't consider them and confident cyclists will otherwise remain in the carriageway, leading to potential unnecessary conflict with some motorists, who may consider that cyclists should be on the shared paths. The required signage for the shared paths may be significant and be considered as street clutter by some.</p> <p>The proposals are otherwise not clear if advance stop lines will be provided for cyclists who remain on the carriageway. In any case these would be less effective without feed-in on carriageway lanes. The outcome will be poorer provision for confident road cyclists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bus stops – We appreciate the principle of keeping buses in the vehicular running lanes, as often motorists are unwilling to allow buses to pull-out leading to delayed journeys
A local resident	Has it been considered that a lot of this could be achieved with better traffic light controls.
A local resident	The scheme is long overdue and will hopefully address the significant disruption that the congestion causes.
A local resident	Widening the road will increase traffic speed, at present there are no speed monitors and the only time speeding is reduced is when there is heavy traffic
A local resident	IF you have 2 lanes at the traffic lights then all you do is increase the risk of collisions as they then have to get back into the single ahead lane to continue. WHEN cycles are taxed as we drivers are then I'd be more amenable to spending loads of cash to make it safer for THEM ! Shame that many of them put themselves in peril by not obeying the highway code ! They deliberately jump the lights and ride 2 or 3 abreast !
A local resident	I don't see how making the junction 2 lanes of traffic at station road, but then quickly becoming 1 lane again is going to improve traffic congestions in the A20 all it will do is shift the problem slightly and increase the chance of accidents. The improvement to cycle/footpaths is ok.
Other	<p>The scheme should definitely not go ahead. It fails all roads users - motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>1) The cycle lane proposed is a 1st generation design and will not increase the numbers cycling. Shared use footpaths should be avoided, because it brings conflict with pedestrians. It is also not continuous across junctions. Attached is an article showing how substandard infrastructure is worse than no infrastructure. https://bit.ly/2NHLC1G</p> <p>2) The proposal to increase the number of lanes of motor traffic will not improve congestion. The more space that there is for motor vehicles...the more motor vehicles. There is plenty of evidence to show that reducing congestion requires the removal of road space for motor vehicles. See attached item for just one example https://bbc.in/32dmRgS</p>

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	While widening the junctions to allow 2 lanes is good, it will only cause issues when they have to merge, as they currently do at the junction with New Hythe Lane anyway-the cars still have to go to 1 lane which is the true issue with this section. A better plan would be to reduce the pavements and green patches which are quite wide along parts of this route and make two lanes the whole length of this section, providing a cycle/pedestrian lane on one side of the road only (and an ordinary pavement the other side) to allow this to happen. Improving the road for cyclists is likely a priority due to green initiatives but the reality is there are many more cars using this route than bikes and that is unlikely to change long term (in fact, it will likely only get worse and it is already very bad during rush hours or god forbid the M20 is closed when it is just static), instead people will change to more eco friendly cars than bikes, so they should be the highest priority for the road space.
A local resident	Disruption needs to be kept to a minimum and planned correctly to avoid potential traffic problems
A local resident	Whilst on the whole it will improve traffic flow subject to correct operation of traffic lights (currently not set up for good flow of A20) I have reservations about pedestrian / Cycle footways particularly at the New Hythe Lane section due to width and your plan to extend merging lanes past the Wards Estate agents. With the high hedge around the car park visibility is poor and elderly people will be at risk from cyclists.
Other	Consideration for separate pedestrian / cycle lane on the footpath, or a separate cycle lane on the road way.
A local resident	I would like to know how the council plan to engage with cyclists to encourage them to use the cycle paths. The existing cycle paths between the Farm Shop on the A20 and Station Road are often not used by cyclists at all. While I agree that cyclists should be safer on the roads, and cycle paths support this, there is no evidence that they are used enough to warrant the spend on them. If cyclists were encouraged to use the paths I can see their value.
A local resident	<p>The cycle lanes, whilst adequate for children on their way to and from school or the shops, will probably not suite most cyclists. I say this because as they are pavement based you have to slow down and prepare to give way at every side road. If the cycle lanes were road based, as in Ditton-Aylesford part of the A20, then the cyclist would have right of way over side roads as do other road users. Constantly slowing down and stopping and starting at the side roads will mean most cyclists will ignore the pavement type cycle lane and cycle on the road. In order for a pavement based cycle lane to work it must have the same priority as the road it is on. This means placing the give markings on side roads further back to give the cycle lane right of way.</p> <p>Basically cycle lanes on the pavement are to keep pedestrians safe from those who ride on the pavement. They are not designed to get road cyclists off the road. I therefore disagree that these will " improve the links for cyclists " however, they will improve the pavements for pedestrians.</p> <p>I say this as a resident who two years ago bought a bike for local journeys after it took 40 mins to travel from Teapot Lane to B&Q in Larkfield. I regularly cycle to the shops and friends and post boxes in this area but looking at these plans will still use the roads. As I mentioned above, the road based cycle lanes between Aylesford and Ditton are excellent, but I have never transfer to the pavement based lanes at the farm shop end.</p> <p>Hope this is helpful.</p>
A local resident	Although there is provision for shared pedestrian/cycle path it is NOT continuous across 'joining roads'.
A local resident	Firstly, I am a committed pedestrian and do not own a motor cycle or car. It appears that this whole project is all about cyclists. Most of whom care not for we pavement pounders. Where provided, Cycle lanes are ignored and the idiot cyclists who just speed along the FOOTway. Surely money would be better spent enforcing the present cycle lane usage and when the cyclists have proven that they are committed to using them then spend money of providing more cycle lanes. AS fir moving the bus stop to a place where the footway is wider it is hyprocy. In Lunsford lane there was a bus stop located in a safe place where there was 3m of footway and because some counilor decided that it would be better elsewhere it was removed to a place where the footway is barely 1.5m wide
A local resident	Currently if cycling down the A20 I would have right of way at each junction and therefore could continue unimpeded for the length of the route without any need to stop. Under the new proposal as a cyclist using the shared path not only would my route be impeded by pedestrians, but I would also need to stop and give way at every junction. So basically whilst this arrangement might benefit casual, the youngest and oldest cyclists, most would continue to use the road, because the new route would be very inconvenient. Most likely this would annoy motorists too as they would not understand why a cyclist wouldn't use the new improved facility. . . . Proper cycling infrastructure please.
Other	Shared cycle lanes and footpaths do not work. Majority of cyclists are arrogant and entitled. They neither understand nor care that pedestrians have rights as the most vulnerable road users. Yes put in a separate cycle path but can guarantee only a minority will use it. The rest will be illegally cycling on the pavement or on the road jumping red lights and ignoring the rules of the road.
A local resident	Dont feel its actually going to make any difference. There is just too much traffic. Unless you can make it all dual carriageway then you are just moving the hotspots to where each section of 2 lanes merge. And for the love of god, please dont start it whilst the M20 is being wrecked.
A local resident	In principle I agree with the proposed changes to road layout. My only concern is the sharing of the footpath with bicycles without marking delineating the limit of there territory. I use the word territory deliberately as I have found that common séance goes out the window when different modes of transport are required to share facilities. The new shared pedestrian space is a goo example where pedestrians and delivery vans play chicken on a regular basis.
Other	Cycles/electric bikes/Scooters and pedestrians do not mix. Cyclists are aggressive to pedestrians, they belong on the road.
A local resident	This proposal is very poor for cyclists. Although the existing on road cycle path isn't ideal, it does allow cyclist to proceed at a reasonable pace. The proposal requires cyclists to give way at every junction and will also involve having to use multiple traffic light controlled crossings. As a result many cyclists will simply not use the shared path. In addition the proposal will cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.
A local resident	Will this stop the buses from queuing/parking up directly in the bus stop directly on the left of New Hythe Lane? At the moment they all wait there, sometimes I have counted 5 waiting "in" that tiny layby to make up their time meaning no one can get out of New Hythe Lane. This, coupled with the fact that the 'no parking after 7.30am restriction' on the top (A20 end) is not policed; meaning people are invariably parked there after 7.30am, means the whole of that junction is grid locked every weekday morning.
A local resident	anything that gets cyclists off of the road. Also cyclists should be made to use the provision and not the road.

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>Rather than removing the bus lane and forcing the buses to stop on the A20 which will stop the traffic flow, wouldn't it be better to extend the existing bus lanes so they are more use-able by the buses and keeps the traffic flowing past them when they stop?</p> <p>Converting parts of the A20 to two-running ahead lanes would be great, if it was two lanes ahead throughout, but as it is basically just going to be a very short over-taking lane at each junction, all it does is cause more issues. This is because people in the over-taking lane try to push-in past the people in the left lane and people in the left lane bunch up because they don't want to let people in from the over-taking lane and it causes even more of a bottle-neck. I can't see this making it any better - just more stressful!</p> <p>This can already be observed at the A20 junctions that are already two-running ahead lanes.</p>
A local resident	<p>Complete waste of time and money..... This is just tinkering by making the road into 2 lanes then merging them back together shortly after the junctions. This is dangerous and will not be a suitable solution. The A20 is a dangerous road and I know of many deaths on this section of road mainly due to multiple lanes. ... died at the junction of Bell Lane with the A20, it was three lane with the centre lane for overtaking. He was sat in the centre lane facing Larkfield when a car moved into the centre lane and hit David on his cycle killing him instantly. The benefit of any of these changes doesn't warrant the increased risk of potential collisions. Particularly considering the low volume of cycle traffic.</p>
A local resident	<p>Long needed</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposals.</p> <p>The plans in the consultation booklet are extremely unclear, showing pedestrian only sections of path in the same colour as shared pedestrian/cycle areas and providing no measurements for the clearly variable width of the "wide" shared path. They also show shared use areas adjacent to zones where the on carriageway cycle lanes will remain in place. What is clear is that the proposals would deliver 20th Century shared use conversions of pavements that create conflict between people cycling and people walking whilst continuing to prioritise motor traffic movements at all crossings, side roads and junctions. There is no discernible safety dividend to vulnerable road users.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment makes reference to widened traffic islands to accommodate "cycles" whilst the main consultation booklet states " bicycles". The apparent discrepancy is telling. If the design of the widened traffic islands cannot accommodate the current cycle design vehicle from IAN195/16 (2.8m long and 1.2m wide) then both the scheme and the Equality Impact Assessment are fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Kent County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 contains an ambition to make Kent "a pioneering county for active travel."</p> <p>KCC will not achieve that ambition without proposing pioneering schemes that enable and prioritise active travel.</p> <p>The scheme will not deliver modal shift from motor transport to active travel choices. The scheme will increase congestion and pollution whilst offering nothing but disadvantage to those choosing either public transport or active travel modes.</p> <p>I am opposed to the scheme.</p>
Other	<p>I use this stretch of road daily for commuting (avoiding the nightmare of HE's M20 Smart Motorway works).</p> <p>I have just read the booklet and it seems to me that this is a well-planned, sensible scheme which seems to admirably take into account the needs of all road users. A nice piece of work which has my full support.</p>
A local resident	<p>The overall idea is good.</p> <p>I especially like the idea of a wider pavement for pedestrians, even if this has to be shared with a limited number of cyclists.</p> <p>All too often walkers are forgotten about, and if we are to encourage more people to walk their kids to school, then schemes like this are vital.</p>
A local resident	<p>Think on the whole it is a practical solution to the traffic jams we get on a20. The ditton cross roads 3 way lights don't help.</p>
A local resident	<p>This all stems from very poor planning/design by KCC previously in installing the bus lane at the New Hythe Lane junction. It is only down to the S.102 backhanders from developers that anything is being done to undo the previous mistakes.</p> <p>The deletion of bus stop lay-bys will severely restrict traffic flow as when a bus stops, there will be absolutely no room to safely pass because of oncoming traffic. The carriageway needs to be widened around these pinch-points (such as the existing traffic islands) but instead you are going to narrow it significantly. The reasons you state (manoeuvring the buses) for deleting the lay-bys is down to the poor driving skill of the bus driver and poor placement of the bus stop shelters. There is plenty of room to widen these stops, instead you plan to delete them.</p> <p>Absolutely nothing has been mentioned about the problem of nuisance parking outside the "Happy Times" takeaway and in the "New Road" slip lane opposite. As TMBC have chosen to abandon their duties by not enforcing this, it falls to KCC to eliminate this by design.</p>
A local resident	<p>I have no objections to the plan as a whole but I do strongly disagree with the proposal to convert the pavements on either side of the corner of the A20 with Ditton Place into shared footpaths/cycle ways. This is because it is a blind corner, creating a significant danger of cyclists colliding with pedestrians coming around the corner. Also, on one side, it is at the bottom of the hill, which means that it is likely that cyclists will be travelling fast when they come around the corner. It is a busy pavement at school times, with many small children using it.</p>
A local resident	<p>a shared cycle lane/ foot path is not the way forward a single cycle lane away from traffic and pedestrians would be better. this could be done by using one of the forward lanes as a bus/cycle lane as the road is used the other side of station road to Aylesford retail park. you should be trying to get people out of their cars . less cars less congestion</p>

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	I think the plan will help traffic flow, but unless additional measures are in place will cause road safety issues. I live on ... and my child goes to the preschool in ... We have to cross the road to walk through streamside. Doing this with a toddler and a baby in a pram feels really dangerous. When traffic is moving it is often faster than 40, and to cross you need to walk out onto the road to see past the parked cars. As there are 2 preschools and a primary school in Ditton I know lots of people who do this with kids. I think the traffic speed needs to reduce to 30 and another pedestrian crossing be put in, currently it's often only possible to cross, or in fact to turn out of bell lane, if there is congestion. In addition I feel bell lane needs to be a 20 limit, the speed humps don't stop people speeding down, and both our cars as well as neighbours are hit regularly. Ideally the road system needs to change to stop this being used as a cut through to new Hythe lane.
A local resident	This will cost thousands of pounds and simply move the congestion to different parts of the A20. You simply cannot have 2 lanes going down to 1 in several places on a short stretch of road and expect not to have congestion. By closing the bus lanes all you are doing is enforcing bus parking on the single carriageway of the A20 thus causing even more holdups. I do not know what the answer is but it certainly isn't this.
A local resident	The idea of a cycle lane is good but in other places a cycle lane has been provided cyclists remain on the road and do not use the cycle lane because they cannot be bothered to stop and cross junctions etc... and they cycle faster on the road. The removal of bus laybys creates traffic hold ups. (Look at Tonbridge High Street).
A local resident	Agree with more cycle lane provision. Agree that the traffic island near Morrisons needs re-aligning. At the moment it is awkward driving in the London direction. However, the bus stop outside the Wealden Hall will need to be moved if there becomes two forward lanes of traffic, as otherwise the buses will have only a short distance before pulling across two lanes of traffic to access New Hythe Lane. Don't agree with the removal of the bus layby at Bell Lane. There is sufficient area to improve it. Definitely, feel bus lay-bys improve traffic flow and are safer. How, can there be a cycle/pedestrian lane between fish shop and hairdressers? - the pavement is quite narrow and below the height of the road. What is happening to the refuge island on the Maidstone side of Ditton Place?
A local resident	I cycle from Maidstone to Addington and back most days for work. Putting the cycling path on the pavement is a stupid idea. it will completely interrupt the flow of cycle traffic and treat cyclists like pedestrians, causing them to have to stop at each road junction. We will have to compete with pedestrians (most of them school children) and street furniture. The plans discourage cyclists from cycling
A local resident	these "improvements" will force increase the risk to pedestrians and cyclists by forcing them together and will significantly increase cycling times for people commuting on there bikes, by making cyclists wait at every side road crossing.
A local resident	are there any plans to improve the pedestrian crossings at the new hyth lane junctions
Other	Shared pedestrian/cycle ways do not work. They are dangerous to both pedestrians and cyclists. This will just force cyclists onto the road which will likely bring abuse from car drivers. This proposal is all about motorist when councils should be looking at ways to take cars off the road! Improve the safety for cyclists and improve bus lanes/make public transport cheaper!
A local resident	Just worried where the bus stop will be relocated too.. as have health problems with walking, and I walk from east malling to get bus,so not going to be happy if its further away
Other	1. Anyone cycling along the A20 will be forced off the highway and onto shared use paths, meaning at every junction through this stretch cyclists will be treated like pedestrians and have to give way at every side road. Clearly cyclists will also have to dodge pedestrians and street furniture too. 2. Those cyclists ignoring the signage/ directions to exit the carriageway and onto the shared use paths will no doubt be subject to abuse and "punishment passes" from drivers.
A local resident	Contravention of the Highway Code
A local resident	It will only move the problem further up the A20 to the Larkfield Priory junction. There needs to be a roundabout at both junctions. Traffic lights just cause endless delays. It may make situation better here but when the new housing is built it will revert to chaos.
Other	This is outdated and unsustainable solution: Creating 2 lanes for traffic will continue to pollute the local area, divide the local community further and ruin the landscape. Maidstone has the 3rd most polluted road outside of London. Will you next suggest a 1960's style zig zag pedestrian bridge to add to the proposed scheme? This will not encourage cycling: joint footpath and cycle lanes are a hazard to pedestrians and cyclists alike: they are an unusable token gesture. If you really want to create the modal shift to cycling which you talk about, I challenge you to think outside the box: as a minimum, create a segregated cycle lane along this road, separate pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles. Avoid building 2 lanes: consider a better bus lane which goes long distances, may be combined with the cycle lane, consider a guided bus way. When people stuck in traffic see the bus and bicycles sailing past them, they will reconsider. You built a motorway to take the additional traffic and yet the A roads are becoming more like them. Please don't lose yet another opportunity to make a sustainable solution (as you did with Newnham Court/Bearsted Road). Maidstone deserves better than the proposed scheme!
A local resident	Like the addition of more cycle lanes
A local resident	wherever there is a "right feed" on the A20 never enough space for cars so blocks the straight ahead lane Make right feeds bigger=stop congestion make the "right feeds" the appropriate length = better flow - note: the New Hythe Lane "Backs up" to traffic lights due to parking opposite Labernum Close
A local resident	The scheme as a whole is positive and needed. As a resident along London Rd I walk along this route daily with my 3 children with pushchair and bicycles. I feel the scheme addresses some needs with widening islands but then still doesn't provide a safe crossing point for families. currently when crossing we don't fit with pushchair wheels & bike wheels overhanging. However I strongly feel a proper formal crossing point somewhere between Bradbourne Lane & Ditton Place would be hugely beneficial. ie a zebra/pelican. my son wants to venture out to visit friends on the other side of London Road but with just an island & no formal crossing. I do not feel that he would be safe as traffic is constant and often at speeds above 40mph. Also with houses & shops on both sides of the highway should the speed not be reduced to 30mph

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	I accept that at busy times the road is frequently blocked at traffic lights and the queue can stretch a long way The box junctions have improve local traffic flow at New hythe lane but traffic light time needs to increase to turn left as it inhibits straight through traffic
A local resident	Glad to see the New Hythe Lane/A20 junction is being improved to help traffic flow, particularly in the rush hour. Can't see anything negative with the scheme.
An educational establishment, such as a school or college	From our perspective, we are concerned about our nursery parents coming in + out of our access to our carpark. Parents will have young children in + out and the obstruction of the bus will cause a problem. Would there be a possibility of having an in and out access to our carpark, that the council will allow and pay for a drop curb.
A local resident	To my mind this scheme is just tinkering with the problem and I cannot see any significant improvements that will ease the congestion issues. To address the congestion issue the capacity of the A20 needs to be increased to dual lanes in both directions - pinch points need to be eliminated and traffic management minimized. Changing from a single lane to double lanes and then back again generates congestion. You only need to look at what happens when a lane is closed on the motorway. The proposed in lane bus stops seem to be a backwards step.
Other	As a Cyclist who regularly uses this stretch of road to get to work in New Hythe and also to get to get to training and events at Leyborne lakes, having a shared cycle lane/ pedestrian path would be to dangerous for a large number of cyclists, my avg along that section is around 15mph to 20mph, for the avg person who may occasionally cycle this may help but it needs to be dedicated cycle lane along side the road, a similar improvement has been done in Harrietsham and there has been an in crease in the number of experienced cyclists being knocked off there bikes. also expanding the road to 2 lanes for such a short section only pushes the congestion further up the road, more needs to be done to fix the non smart M20
A local resident	Ridiculous, shared paths do not work, most cycling along this stretch of road are on road bike averafi g 20mph, if this was moved on to a shared paths it would endanger those walking.
A local resident	We know these are alterations for the A20 New Hythe Lane Larkfield to Station Road, Ditton. Living in ***** where the proposed houses will be at ***** - how will this problem be tackled Already queuing cars down New Rd Ditton to get onto the A20 - its getting worse & what will 300 new houses deal with this road
A local resident	Mixed cycle/footway does not work allowing cyclists onto pedestrian walkways has led to cyclists thinking they have the right to cycle on all and any footpath designated or not. If you dare to question then all you get is abuse All wheeled vehicles should be on the road
A local resident	1) Does not solve the problem - ie traffic needs to be taken away from A20 2) Shared area for pedestrians and cyclists does not work beside a busy road
A local resident	pedestrians should have priority - a cyclist can do damage to a pedestrian
A local resident	A shared cycle lane would help, but I think it should have a line down the middle, pedestrian on the inside (for safety) cyclists on the outside nearest the road, as they are a form of wheeled transport I think a roundabout would be better here for more freely moving vehicles
A local resident	I do agree these problems need sorting out I don't agree the plans proposed will be of much help . Shortening the ability to turn into new road Ditton will cause either more and more traffic using bradbodne lane to cut through or just block the 2nd straight on lane with cars waiting to get into the right hand turning lane . There is alot of traffic using this entry into the estate already and if new housing is given the go ahead even more will want to use new road . The return to a two lane straight ahead on A20 by Morrisons may help traffic towards easy malling ,but not traffic towards Maidstone...not if you move the Layin bus stop outside the flats to an in road bus stop outside the mini garage ,just as it narrows back down to one lane ,bringing traffic to a halt while each car tries to get passed a bus letting off passengers. New cycle lanes seem to be taking president over the actual problems of the bottle necks that cause the traffic problems on the A20.
A local resident	This scheme seems to be centred around cyclists & shared cycle paths. But the main problem that needs to be addressed is about cars! Very few cyclists use the London Road, & opportunities are being wasted to improve the traffic flows. Both junctions would benefit from being made into roundabouts, & there is plenty of space to do so. If the planned Quarry Wood roundabout is built, traffic would be much improved. Similarly the Winterfield Lane/Lunsford lane would benefit from two mini-roundabouts.
A local resident	1. Going from 1 to 2 lanes at junctions and then back to one lane only increases congestion and aggressive driving. There is no congestion advantage to short straight ahead dual lane junctions such as these. 2. Cycles and pedestrians are not compatible on the same path. Cycles should be a realistic alternative to travel by car and slow shared 'footpaths' combined with dismounting and crossing the road to swap sides slows travel even further making it not much faster than walking. Either create a separate cycle lane at the junctions to increase safety instead of the dual straight on car lanes, or leave the bikes on the road. 3. Tactile paving for pedestrian crossing is a sensible idea.
A local resident	The Ditton crossroad lights (Station Rd, New road) need a sequence change. This will alleviate the London rd congesting all day.
A local resident	Taking away bus lane and laybys is a retrograde step. The installation of bus lanes were to aid the flow of public transport thereby encouraging its use; it is therefore absurd to now remove them as this will result in public transport being delayed and thus discouraging its use. Similarly absurd is the removal of bus stop laybys. These take buses out of the flow of traffic when passengers are boarding and alighting. Removing them will result in delays to other traffic as a stationary bus will remain in the flow of traffic. Even if there are two lanes, one will be blocked by stationary buses. This is counterproductive.

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>I believe the proposed changes will increase risk to cyclists and discourage cycling as an alternative to travel by car. I regularly ride to work as an alternative to driving and travel along the A20. If I were to use the proposed shared use paths my journey would take too long and make travel by bike unviable as I would be forced to stop far more regularly and cycle at a much reduced speed as there will be pedestrians on the path.</p> <p>I believe most cyclists commuting, riding to the shops or visiting family and friends will simply not use the paths and stay on the road. This will inevitably lead to some drivers making 'punishment passes', (i.e. driving dangerously close to the cyclist) as they feel they shouldn't be on the road.</p> <p>What I believe would help cycling (and not hinder other road users) would be to have a cycling bay at the front of each set of lights. The few junctions that do have them offer a significant relief to me while riding to work.</p> <p>I believe there's a real opportunity to make cycling a viable travel option for lots of residents, which would lead to reduced air/noise pollution, reduced traffic and a healthier local population. However I fear that plans such as this may result in backward steps. If I felt safer on the roads I would certainly travel by bike more frequently. As it is I have to regularly endure close passes and occasionally unwarranted verbal abuse.</p> <p>As a driver, I'm not convinced the changes will offer significant improvement, as in both directions the road will go back down to single carriage, therefore creating a bottleneck. It's a problematic junction for all of us and I welcome investment to ease the situation, however I feel that there are better alternatives.</p>
A local resident	Great idea in principle, a few areas need more thought
A local resident	Any improvements made to that stretch of road can only be a good thing! I regularly make the journey past that junction towards Maidstone and the back up of traffic is always back to the Malling Bypass. With the further traffic lights/congestion past this junction it takes me 40mins in rush hour to get from The Malling bypass junction to the Ditton/Sports junction!
A local resident	I think having a shared cycling/pedestrian path with no demarcation between the different users is an accident waiting to happen. I cycle this route daily on my commute to work and would be wary of hitting pedestrians. The cycle route by Allington is either next to the road or clearly separated from pedestrians which is I feel is much safer. Also the removal of the bus layby would mean the bus would stop in the road therefore stopping traffic flow.
A local resident	<p>A20 London Road/ New Hythe Lane junction.</p> <p>The shared use footway cycleway is shown on both sides of New Hythe Lane. This means the crossing of New Hythe Lane will have to be made a toucan to allow its use by cyclists. The crossing as shown is too narrow. It must be 4m between studs. The footway on the east side of New Hythe is too narrow to accommodate both pedestrian and cycle traffic at the point where the crossing is located.</p> <p>The shared use footway cycle way is also shown on the south side of the A20. This means the crossing of the A20 will also have to be a toucan to allow cyclists to cross between the two routes. The crossings shown are too narrow between studs. The island shown is far too narrow to accommodate cycle traffic. It would have to be at least 4m wide but is little more than 2m at the narrow end.</p> <p>The existing layby opposite New Hythe Lane is to be removed. I expect visitors to the businesses there still to park directly outside thus blocking one of the two new lanes to be provided.</p> <p>The existing KEEP CLEAR markings, only repainted in recent weeks, for traffic to and from the Wealden Hall has been deleted. This means these drivers will now have to attempt to get through three lanes of queuing traffic when turning in or out right uncontrolled with no help from the markings at the junction. This is makes an existing hazard worse.</p> <p>The removal of the bus lane is the most serious drawback of the whole scheme. It will adversely affect all 71, 71A and 72 services which correctly receive priority at the signals by its use. They will no longer benefit from direct access to the stopline overtaking any queue and no longer receive a priority mode green. Right turning 71 and 71A buses in particular will now have to give way to ahead westbound traffic when leaving the stop before they can even reach the right turn lane, assuming that there is room to join the queue there. This compares very poorly with drawing ahead directly to the stopline and then receiving an immediate priority green.</p> <p>Both the eastbound and westbound bus shelters are shown as being retained in the existing location but have become separated from the stops they relate to by a long distance. The westbound bus stop is shown far longer than it needs to be, more than twice the length of the existing and clashes with KEEP CLEAR markings that pass through it.</p> <p>The shared use footway cycleway alongside the westbound bus stop is too narrow to allow cyclists to pass waiting passengers safely..</p> <p>A20 London Road/ Station Road junction.</p> <p>Similar to above the shared use footway cycle ways on all four corners of the junction means that all of the existing crossings will have to be made toucans. They are all shown too narrow with central islands also too narrow between kerbs.</p>
A local business owner	Please do not dedicate excessive space to cyclists at the expense of traffic flow. The experiences in Central London show that this could be a backward step, no matter how 'socially responsible' it seems for KCC to follow this initiative. It is good to encourage cycling and provide safety for pedestrians but this should not be something that is pursued to the detriment of motorists (the vast majority of users of that section of road).
A local resident	I think trying to do these works whilst the M20 is still being extended is going to cause too much disruption to an already busy road. It will just create two extra bottlenecks where two lanes merge into one and will not solve the issues of the huge amounts of traffic using the road. If you have to do the works, can you at least wait until the M20 is finished, it takes me long enough to get along the A20 every morning and evening as it is
A Parish / District or County Councillor	I like the new dual straight aheads, I very much dislike shared cycle/pedestrian footpaths
A local resident	I drive this stretch daily and improvement is certainly needed.
A local resident	The use of combined cycle/footpaths is poorly thought out. Due to the high volumes of both user groups, particularly around school times they should be properly segregated to ensure appropriate levels of safety for all user groups. There is plenty of space along the A20 between The Ditton and East Malling sections. The advantage of properly segregated routes is that safe cycling routes would also enable parents to feel confident to allow their children to cycle to school. This would actually reduce car use along this busy section of road

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>I welcome anything which improves traffic movements along this corridor. The removal of the bus lane at Larkfield Wealden Hall is particularly welcome as it has not worked since it was installed. As I am not sure what further questions are going to be asked I would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>1) Traffic lights at Larkfield Wealden Hall left hand turn into New Hythe Lane from Maidstone direction need resyncing. Almost every time I am turning right from New Hythe Lane onto A20 at Morrisons several cars come through what to me is a green signal so should be red at the Wealden Hall. This happens too regularly for it to be people jumping the lights and must be a timing issue.</p> <p>2) The layby in front of Simon Miller Estate Agents (New Inn) is shown as being filled in - this is welcome but my understanding is that the layby is in the ownership of the building and not part of the highway</p> <p>3) I understand the rationale of removing bus laybys but have concerns that traffic will get held up behind the buses as they stop to pick up passengers.</p>
A local resident	<p>As there is already accommodation made for cyclists I think that this is change for changes sake.</p>
A local resident	<p>I agree with removing the bus lane outside the Wealden Hall back to how it was before. I also think new pavements between Bradbourne Lane and Wealden hall are well overdo. However I don't see how any of the junction changes will particularly help anyone other than cyclists. Either side of all the junction improvements that you propose are bottle necks that can't be overcome and as we will still have the same amount of traffic needing to get through I fail to see that anything has been solved by this expensive project. It strikes me that making these proposed changes are more about saying you've changed the junctions so can now approve all the extra house building. The EMR Brampton field extra traffic will remain a problem for the small estate roads around Ditton. We are personally most concerned that changes made on the A20 could exacerbate turning in & out of Bradbourne Lane. As when the traffic is flowing no one lets you out, we can sit there for ages. It's particularly difficult turning right out of Bradbourne Lane and can be quite a gamble when the traffic is flowing.</p> <p>We have a lot of elderly and frail people who walk daily from Ditton to Morrison's and I am concerned about how they will manage sharing the path with cyclists, a lot of elderly are hard of hearing and won't hear a bike coming. Indeed there was an incident recently where a deaf pensioner did knock a young cyclist off his bike on a pavement by Morrison's, the cyclist and his friends set on the man and put him in hospital! I am also aware of two local young blind men whose daily exercise involves a walk from swallow rd to the banks in Larkfield. Please address this issue of putting cyclists on the pavements that are used by our elderly and disabled community.</p>
A local resident	<p>This is already a very busy road with cars travelling at high speeds in both directions. A number of accidents have occurred along this road.</p> <p>Bell lane is already a cut through for traffic and as a resident I feel that this will not improve the area it will have the opposite effect.</p>
A local resident	<p>I have strong reservations about one area of shared footpath</p>
A local resident	<p>I currently am put off using my cycle along the A20.</p>
Other	<p>The proposed scheme will do zero to encourage people out of cars and to walk or cycle instead. In fact, it will do the exact opposite. The proposals marginalise cyclists and pedestrians and will further increase the volume of motor traffic and knock on detriment to air quality in the local area.</p> <p>This is not 21st century road planning. Here is an opportunity for KCC to use local street space to create something that incentivises people out of cars and to use a more sustainable form of transport. I believe KCC has declared a climate emergency. How does this solution support that declaration - in any form?</p> <p>Please find a solution that prioritises cyclists and pedestrians like other forward thinking towns and cities are starting to do.</p>
A local resident	<p>The proposals to move bus stops from lay-bys to in-running-lane stops is likely to cause significant delays, especially given the high volume of passengers (school children) in the morning peak and the times for these numbers to board. This could encourage vehicles to pass buses at stops in to the path of oncoming vehicles or to the detriment of pedestrians crossing nearby.</p> <p>The A20 has capacity issues, mainly associated with the operation of the signals at New Hythe Lane and Station Road and increasing capacity at those junctions should be a priority. This could be done by;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationalising the bus facilities at New Hythe Lane (remove the bus slip and priority call) and 2. By removing the southbound Station Road to eastbound A20 slip that is little used (the majority of traffic would have used Hall Road) and this would free-up junction space and signal cycle time.
Other	<p>PLEASE do NOT use 2 lanes that go in the same direction - this leads to road rage as it is NOT clear who has right of way.</p> <p>The junction by Morrisons needs improvement. There are 2 lanes heading towards Maidstone so why not the right one for ahead and the left for turning left? I have had several near misses here.</p>
A local resident	<p>The main problem is the timing of the traffic lights at Ditton Corner/A20/Station Road/New Road junction. Not enough time is given to the main A20. Traffic queues all the way back to Aylesford or Larkfield (sometimes beyond) and then completely clears once you are through these lights. From the Larkfield towards Aylesford direction does seem to be the worst.</p> <p>Moving the bus stop will help</p>
Other	<p>The relocation of road space away from cyclists and buses for general traffic is a concept, that should have passed years ago. The only way to encourage cycling and increase public transport use is to provide quality cycle and bus schemes none of these 'improvements' achieve that. This corridor should be a key cycling route with a number of schools in the area and the corridor as a strategic bus route I would see this area with segregated cycle facilities and dedicated cycle provision at the junctions.</p> <p>Providing shared cycle footways does nothing for cyclists or pedestrians, it just creates areas of conflict. For examples of quality cycling infrastructure then look at the work done in London boroughs such as cycle Enfield or the work done in Kingston.</p>
A local resident	<p>I would like to see the refuge islands at Larkfield Rd, Bell Lane & Orchard Grove upgraded to zebra crossings. At the moment if you are crossing the road at any of these points the traffic will not stop to let you proceed across. There are lots of mums with children that use these refuge islands.</p> <p>The speed limit should be brought down to 30mph. Yellow boxes should be applied at Station Rd - New Road Bell Lane Bradbourne Lane New Hythe Lane.</p> <p>The proposed shared footway/cycleway needs to be marked clearly, some cyclists have no consideration for pedestrians. Otherwise good idea to put this in.</p>
A local resident	<p>add cameras at junction of New Hythe Lane and London Road</p>
A local resident	<p>Phase one</p> <p>Traffic calming measure? 30mph speed limit? Parking on double yellow lines in Larkfield Rd & Bell Lane to be enforced. Pinch point between Bell Lane & Orchard Grove. Move bus stop at Bell Lane away from junction. Extend lay bay at banks box junction at New Hythe Lane to be retained. Traffic lights</p>
A local resident	<p>New Hythe Lane parking could be look at - when no parking is in place the traffic move much better</p>

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	* In particular a reason why I have chosen to agree with this scheme is because I believe it will promote the use of bicycles. * Moreover the idea of reduced congestion is also beneficial.
A local resident	This needs to be addressed urgently
Other	Whilst I welcome the proposal to improve the cycling provision along this section of the A20, I do not think that the scheme has gone far enough in addressing that provision. Current standards of design have moved on and this scheme does not reflect this. For example where cyclists are put back on to the carriageway this should be set at a different height to the carriageway and the pavement to aid the segregation of pedestrians, cyclists and motorised traffic. At junctions the various give way lines should be moved to enable pedestrians and cyclists priority of traffic when crossing at the majority of these junctions.
A local resident	The extra straight on lanes proposed at the junctions will only shift the congestion a few car lengths further on. The traffic light sequence between Lunsford Lane and Station Road plus the joining roads causes more problems as they do not let the traffic move away before more is trying to join. Yes the traffic does get bad at times and it is a problem but even these proposals will not help when/if all the new houses that are proposed are built it will just be gridlocked
A local resident	Seems to be more about cycle lanes than road improvements
A local resident	Cycling routes not only needs to be improved, but treated as priority, as many more people will consider the bike option over driving, if safe routes are in place!
A local resident	We agree with the proposed road layout for the A20. However, as a resident of ..., my concern would be that customers visiting the local banks opposite, will continue to use the footpath/cycleway as a parking area. If the footpath is to be changed, I suggest that double yellow lines and possible bollards along the edges are to be installed to prevent the blockage for pedestrians/cyclists, and for the safety of Walnut Tree Court residents pulling out onto the A20.
A local resident	The proposal omits any yellow boxes, I suggest that these will still be required to reduce gridlock. I am aware that New Road East Malling is just outside this proposal but to assist traffic flow and additional yellow box is required at the junction between New Road and Bradbourne Park Road. Currently when driving to the junction of New Hythe Lane and London Road turning right on a green light, traffic is still turning right from London Road into New Hythe Lane. I am not sure if the is a system issue or red light jumping. The proposal shows the removal of the layby outside Simon Miller the estate agents. I agree with this change, but I understood that it is a private layby.
A local resident	I feel that with all the disruption caused locally by the work taking place on the M20, it would be better to wait until that work is completed before putting local people through another lot of chaos.
A local resident	We live on the London road and am very concerned about the noise levels we will experience once the road is widened. We already have to watch tv with the subtitles on and i anticipate this will get worse. Will the council be taking any steps to prevent this?
A local resident	I live in... AM a walker, who cycles and drives. I have concerns about a shared Cycle and Pedestrian pavement. Currently there is a cycle lane and further down the A20 By Homebase there are separate lanes for each. if the Shared system is put in Place Pedestrians MUST have Right of way. Very clearly marked. If not there will be accidents where cyclists hit pedestrians. The second point I would like to see incorporated into the scheme is a white box keep clear box covering both sides of the A20 across the entrance to Ditton Place, similar to the one across Bell Lane. Trying to turn either Right or Left out of DP is difficult and can be dangerous. This will be compounded by the additional surge of vehicles coming down from 2 lanes to one from Ditton Corner lights. The issue is further compounded when there is an incident on the M20. We have Bumper to Bumper traffic and regrettable people will not let cars in or out of Ditton Place.

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>I am a regular cycle commuter and until I moved house I frequently cycled along this section of the A20 between my home in Maidstone and my place of work in Wrotham.</p> <p>I welcome the attention that this section of road is being given, and the intention to improve facilities for people cycling, but I have serious reservations about the value of the changes for the majority of bike users.</p> <p>Shared use cycle/footways are great for children and people making very short journeys, but they're just not practical for anybody trying to use their bicycle instead of a car for journeys of 5-10 miles, like I do. This is because it will no longer be safe to ride at 15-20mph due to the need to cycle considerably around pedestrians and to give way to motorised traffic at every side road junction.</p> <p>I note that you're proposing to retain a hatched area in the centre of the road over most of the length. I appreciate the value of this for maintaining the flow of motorised traffic when vehicles are turning, but it does mean that about one third of the road's width is under-utilised. I suggest removing this and using the space which is freed up to implement an on road cycle lane over the full length of the scheme. This may result in some delays for motor vehicles if someone is trying to turn right in heavy traffic, but it would be hugely beneficial to bike users and therefore accords with principle 2 of the KCC Tonbridge & Malling Cycling Strategy which states "Wherever possible measures will be provided which give cyclists priority over motorised traffic in terms of accessibility and journey time". Additional zebra or pelican crossings would improve the safety of pedestrians crossing, especially at busy times. The removal of refuge islands would further benefit cyclists using the road because they encourage drivers to squeeze past when there is insufficient space.</p> <p>I believe that the scheme as designed will result in the following adverse outcomes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who choose to cycle on the shared paths will find the slow pace frustrating and be encouraged back into their cars, especially if the scheme reduces congestion and car journey times. This is contrary to principle 2 of the KCC Tonbridge & Malling Cycling Strategy, quoted above. • People who attempt to continue to cycle on the road will be bullied by car drivers who think that they should be using the shared path. This increased friction could lead to additional casualties which is contrary to KCC's duty under the Road Traffic Act 1989, in which KCC has a duty to promote road safety and act to reduce the likelihood of road casualties occurring. Additional and widened refuge islands will increase the frequency of close passes of bicycles by motor vehicles. • Some people will inevitably cycle faster than they should on the shared path. This will be intimidating for pedestrians, especially vulnerable groups like children, the elderly and vision impaired. This will create unnecessary additional friction between path users and increase the general animosity between people using different modes of transport. <p>If you decide to proceed with this scheme then I believe it is imperative that you include very clear signage indicating that cycling is permitted on the main carriageway as well as the shared path.</p> <p>I suggest that you also reduce the speed limit to 20mph to better enable cyclists to integrate with other road traffic.</p>
A local resident	<p>As it is to increase the flow of traffic, will the lights at New Hythe Lane (the local racetrack) increase the speed of vehicles in the lane as they enter + leave the lane! mostly 40 to 50 m.p.h.</p>
A local resident	<p>The footpaths at present are poorly maintained cyclist accid-I(?) ride on the footpath which is frightening when you are walking. I am a driver ... and walk every day along the A20. More and more the needs of traffic including cyclist, is taking precedent over pedestrians.</p> <p>Once these improvements took place the shared footpath would degenerate twice as quickly to the state they are in now.</p>

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>Our main concern is the shared pedestrian and cycle footpath. We attended the drop in centre to discuss the proposals. We questioned why there could not be separate designated areas for pedestrians and cyclists and were told there was not room for this facility. If there is not room then the area will not be safe for either pedestrians or cyclists especially where the areas will be used by mothers with children, pushchairs etc. and also elderly and disabled people. This is not a safe combination with cyclists especially when riders approach from behind and it is impossible to hear them coming. It would seem that it is considered more important to keep traffic moving than to keep people safe. It is a good idea to remove the dedicated bus lane opposite New Hythe Lane as this has caused traffic to back-up ever since it was installed. Restoring 2 forward traffic lanes at this point will be beneficial.</p> <p>Phase two of the development will result in the removal of the wide footpath that leads from the junction of New Road up to A20 lay-by outside of 543-551 London Road. This lay-by will also be removed and their visitors. At present both the wide footpath and the lay-by are used for parking by local residents. We raised this issue at the drop-in centre. The KCC officer present stated that these residents could park round the backs of their properties. This is incorrect. Apart from one private garage all of the parking spaces behind the cottages are privately owned and rented by the owners of the driveway who run a business from 4-6 New Road. There are no parking facilities for 541 London Road either as the owners request to build a drive was refused by Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council. We explained this fact to the KCC Officer who then stated that they would still be able to park on the path. If this is the case at this point the path would be shared with Pedestrian/cyclists/cars and dustbins on bin collection days. He also said they could still park in the road as there would be no yellow lines. If this happens then the newly formed traffic lane would be blocked at this point.</p> <p>We asked if the existing traffic signals would be changed from far side to near side. He did not know what we meant. Near side signals would cancel out the pedestrian crossing phase if the call button was pushed but the pedestrian managed to cross before that was implemented. At present if this situation arises the pedestrian phase still operates and all the traffic stops for no reason. If this change had been made a long time ago traffic flow would have been considerably improved.</p> <p>The provision of 2 forward Maidstone bound lanes will be impeded by traffic turning into New Road as the turning right refuge area will only hold 2-3 cars. This will result in straight ahead traffic being held until the turning right traffic moves. It will also cause motorists to attempt to pull over into the other ahead lane. Both lanes of traffic will have to do this anyhow almost as soon as they are through the lights. The turning right situation will only get worse when the proposed 300 houses are built in Kiln Barn Lane along with other housing developments in New Road.</p> <p>We spoke of our concerns regarding pollution. The KCC Officer stated that there would be less pollution as the traffic would always be moving. This is not true as every few minutes traffic stops when the lights are red. With the new scheme there will be two lanes of stationary traffic instead of one. We mentioned that this is a Air Quality monitoring area but he said that was nothing to do with KCC. Will Tonbridge and Malling Council be asked to carry out any assessment before this scheme is implemented?</p> <p>We are also concerned about noise pollution. At present a property opposite our home is the subject of a planning application. As part of this a noise report has been commissioned. The conclusion seems to be that at present it is not possible to meet required noise levels at the property unless all windows are closed. This is with the present road lay-out. This situation will surely worsen when the present two lanes of traffic become four and will also have the same effect on our properties.</p> <p>We are also concerned that this consultation is a paper exercise only. We formed this opinion at the drop in meeting when the Officer we were in conversation became irritated by is and said "Well you brought a house on the A20". Does the fact that we bought a house on the A20 forty years ago take away our rights to voice our Concerns?</p>
A local resident	<p>The scheme will be implemented, and I feel it remains to be seen how it transpires. How drivers respond to the changes. How much it will be affected if there is an incident on the M20 (RTC). - (Not Infrequent). At present, drivers on the A20 and emerging from Station Road disregard the box junction if there is a tailback from Larkfield. the result of which is that vehicles are unable to exit New Road, Ditton, traffic lights. Problems are then compounded.</p>
A local resident	<p>I strongly disagree with the scheme as the fundamental problem with the A20 on this stretch is that the phasing of the traffic lights at the Station Road junction is incorrect and this causes the traffic to queue back along the A20 to the New Hythe Lane junction and often beyond - the traffic lights need to remain on green longer for the A20 traffic. The second failing with the proposed scheme is that there is no point making the junctions 2 lane when the A20 itself is single carriageway - this will only encourage aggressive driving by people forcing their way in front of other road users. The road layout is not the problem - it is the phasing of the Station Road traffic lights!</p>
A local resident	<p>The booklet states "Developers have provided financial contributions to be used to improve journey times along the A20 between A228 and Coldharbour Roundabout". The whole scheme seems to be focused on providing cyclist facilities rather than improving journey times for the vast majority of the users which are motorists. Currently heading towards Maidstone on London Rd arrives at the traffic lights in 2 lanes but immediately the other side of the junction is only one lane. I have personally witnessed three accidents where one car has been forced into the central island. Extending this two lane section is essential, but the extent proposed is limited by the space now proposed to be taken over by a cycleway. This should not be the priority if the funding is to improve journey times</p> <p>I do not understand the proposal with regard to removing the bus layby near Bell Lane. If buses are now forced to stop in the main traffic lane, in order to make space for cyclists, then this will have a very significant impact on traffic movements, which the majority of users absolutely would not support.</p>
Other	<p>I have experienced frequent delays in both directions at the A20 London Road, New Hythe Lane junction. As an example, current traffic management indicates (Eastbound) that RH lane is straight ahead, but any vehicle must immediately move to the left after passing through the lights, and by that point is also at the position of a bus stop. Any traffic going straight ahead from nearside is also trying to use same space.</p>
A local resident	<p>We have hoped for improvements in this area for years, so this is extremely welcome. Each time there is a problem in the surrounding area, say on the M20, this area of the A20 can become almost unusable. At normal busy times, such as the start and end of the working day, the traffic flow can be very poor. The proposals look sensible and pragmatic. Improving the situation for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users as well as motor vehicle users is really, really pleasing. The current experience for mobility scooter users in particular travelling between Larkfield and Aylesford is pretty poor (try it yourself and see). Improvements will make a huge difference to everyone. The sooner the better please.</p>

Respondent	Comments
On behalf of a Parish / Town / Borough / District Council in an official capacity	<p>Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) strongly supports proposals to improve cycle links and reduce congestion along the A20, London Road between the junctions of New Hythe Lane and Station Road. The scheme outputs directly align with the vision as set out in Maidstone's Integrated Transport Strategy, which seeks to achieve an "efficient, sustainable and accessible transport system which will support a thriving and attractive county town and provide efficient and effective links with the surrounding villages, countryside and beyond."</p> <p>Although the scheme is not in the borough of Maidstone, the A20/London Road is a key route into and out of the borough. The proposed improvement works would therefore directly benefit those using the road to access Maidstone borough.</p> <p>MBC wishes to ensure that this scheme is considered in the wider strategic context of improvements along the entirety of the A20/London Road, into the borough of Maidstone; to ensure any works are cohesive and that this current scheme does not prejudice any future schemes further along the road into Maidstone. This continuity ensures the maximum benefit is realised for all highway users along the full length of the A20 London Road into Maidstone borough.</p>
A local resident	<p>The stated aim of the scheme "to facilitate safer and more convenient travel for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists" seems like a good one - but the proposal is actually just putting cyclists onto the pavement and removing priority for buses and increasing the lanes for motorists. As this area is already prone to motorists driving at excessive speed, this scheme would appear simply to encourage this kind of driving and to discourage people from using the bus. Making two lanes of traffic at both sets of junctions, but keeping the A20 as a single lane will most likely result in more accidents as drivers try to push in once the road becomes a single carriageway and is simply just pushing the problem further along the road.</p>
A local resident	<p>I partly agree to the improvements to the A20 road. However I am concerned about the shared footpath. The paths will not be very wide and in my experience as a walker, I have had to give way most times I have shared the path with cyclists. Consideration will also have to be given to wheelchair users, children, and the elderly.</p>
A local resident	<p>I don't see any strong evidence that the proposals will specifically improve traffic congestion, or definitive metrics proposed to measure its success. Without these, I do not see how you can assess its success.</p>
A local resident	<p>I would like to see KEEP CLEAR boxes at all junctions along this stretch of the A20 - Larkfield Road, Bradbourne Lane, Bell Lane, Orchard Close, Ditton Place</p>
A local resident	<p>I don't think this will speed up traffic along the A20.</p> <p>I don't think anything you do will speed up the traffic along the A20 all the time you have 2 lanes of traffic at the traffic lights, which then have to merge into 1 lane. This is always going to be a bottle neck. The buses used to have a lay-by that they could pull into to allow traffic to pass. All this does now is to hold back the flow of traffic while people are getting on or off of the bus. Every junction needs a hatched area to stop traffic stopping in it which again holds up the traffic. Needs hatched areas at each junction with a camera so that drivers are prosecuted as they are in London. If the M20 is closed this section is horrendous and the biggest problem is cars or lorries blocking junctions. Another problem that affects flow on the A20 is cars parked in New Hythe Lane between Morrisons and the Fire Station. These cars cause a large tailback to the A20 traffic lights. We should also not allow any more housing development along the A20. The planned building of 250 houses at 40 acres field will only add more cars to the A20.</p>
A local resident	<p>I do agree with the A20 London Road Highway Improvements Scheme, however, as a commuter I fear that this is going to still cause delay to my daily commute to London (what with the current M20 works). How long roughly is this anticipated?</p>
A local resident	<p>You have taken comments from bus companies to remove the pull in stops, this only makes it more dangerous for cars to pass whilst they are parked. Will our comments be listened too? The traffic build up is between New Hythe Lane and Station Road. You need to open the road at the bottom of New Hythe through the old SCA site to Station Road. This will ease the volume more than your proposal.</p>
A local resident	<p>This will be a complete waste of time and money. Not only will there be disruption for road users whilst this is implemented, but i do not think the scheme will be effective once put in place.</p> <p>It does not matter how many 1 lane into 2 into 1 sections you have, if the traffic lights are not in sync and timed right there will always be congestion.</p> <p>The best way to reduce congestion along the A20 is to open the road on the Aylesford Paper mill site between New Hythe Lane and Station Road.</p>
A local resident	<p>The current traffic situation is not acceptable, and this appears to be a good proposal</p>

Respondent	Comments
A local resident	<p>This looks like a lot of effort for very little gain.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned that there is no effort to improve safety at the Bell Lane Junction, right in the middle of all this. I have complained vociferously to our councillors about this. Cars are regularly parked at the head of the lane by the fish and chip shop. The yellow lines are totally ignored and as far as I can see never enforced. As a result traffic turning into Bell Lane from the West is often faced with traffic trying to get out of the lane but on the right hand side of the road, because of cars parked at the shop. I have personally been stranded at the junction with the rear half of my car sticking out into the traffic on the A20. It is extremely dangerous and will eventually cause a serious accident. All your so-called improvements may achieve is to increase the traffic speed even further. I can think of two solutions, either close the shop or install traffic lights. I would be pleased to hear an alternative proposal.</p> <p>Regarding shared footpaths, this will only work if there is enough room. There is no proposal to widen the road so there will be no extra room. Many of the parts of the pavement identified for this are clearly far too narrow. Also, what provision will be made at the various junctions for cyclists wishing to travel straight on along the A20?</p> <p>Regarding extra lanes at the junctions, this is completely wrong. Two into one merely moves the conflict further down the road, allowing the contestants to get even faster. They should be reduced to one lane for each alternative, eg at New Hythe Lane, travelling from the West on the A20, one lane for going straight on down the A20 and one lane going left into New Hythe lane (preferably physically separated but this is probably impractical, so at least with solid white line lane markings). Travelling West, one lane for turning right, while for straight on in this case there are two lanes available, but be aware that the south side of the road is used as a parking space.</p> <p>Essentially, extra lanes BEFORE a junction allows more traffic in to the junction and assists the flow of low speed traffic. Extra lanes AFTER a junction just creates a race-track. There is no improvement in traffic flow as the cars have to end up back in one lane. So unless you can bite the bullet and widen the A20, it is largely a waste of time and money.</p> <p>It seems to me that this so-called improvement is actually just an exercise to make it look as though something is being done, but the overall effect will be a decrease in road safety overall.</p>
A local resident	<p>1) Introduction As a local resident living off London Road, I have regularly cycled for many years along the A20 corridor for shorter journeys (1-2 miles) to local shops and amenities, longer journeys to Maidstone town centre and some recreational cycling. I try to minimise journeys by car as far as practical. Other family members do likewise. The A20 corridor between West Malling and Maidstone currently comprises a fragmented, incoherent mix of cycling facilities. There are key sections with no cycling provision, most notably the dual carriageway section around the Aylesford Retail Park / Hermitage Lane junction area, which is challenging even for experienced cyclists. Other sections are provided with a disjointed mix of on-road mandatory and non-mandatory cycle lanes and segregated shared cycle/pedestrian ways on one side of the road, with many crossings of the busy A20.</p> <p>In my view, the current proposals compound the issues along the corridor, do not cater for and indeed are detrimental to the safety of a significant proportion of cyclists using the route, do little to encourage wider take-up of cycling in the area and have arbitrary boundaries which do not align with main cycling starting points and destinations. Elements of the proposed design do not meet standards recommended in government literature.</p> <p>In short, I feel that the concept of the scheme is flawed, with narrow, ill-defined objectives, an incomplete understanding of likely use, poor integration with the existing and potential future area cycling infrastructure and significant safety concerns.</p> <p>While appreciating that the A20 is an important traffic corridor with significant congestion issues, the proposals for cycling feel like a mere "box ticking" exercise which do not align with principle 2 of the Tonbridge and Malling Cycling Strategy to give cyclists priority over motorised traffic in terms of accessibility and journey time or at least not further disadvantage cyclists from the current situation.</p> <p>2) Basis for My Views I have based my response on the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme website information. • A visit to the one of the public displays and discussion with staff. • The Tonbridge and Malling Cycling Strategy 2014-2019. • Local Transport Note (LTN) 02/08, Cycle Infrastructure Design(as referenced by the TMCS). • LTN 01/12, Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists (as referenced by the TMCS). <p>There is limited information on the scheme website about the objectives of the scheme in relation to cycling beyond general statements "to improve the cycle links along the A20", "to create a more pedestrian and cyclist friendly environment along this stretch of the A20" (Consultation Booklet) and "will improve safety for cyclists" (this questionnaire). No information has been provided on any alternative options that may have considered and the reasons for the selecting the proposed measures.</p> <p>It would be helpful if more detailed documentation of the data, assessments and audits that have been carried out to develop the proposals were published on the website to allow a more informed understanding of the scheme.</p> <p>3) Type of Cycle Provision – Why narrow non-segregated foot/cycle paths? LTN 02/08 and LTN 01/12 both recognise five groups of cyclist categories that should be taken into account in the design process, ranging from fast commuter/utility through to inexperienced / children.</p> <p>My observations indicate that although the route is dominated by traffic, it is used by surprisingly high numbers of cyclists, with a significant proportion of commuter / utility users for whom a shared , non-segregated path is not appropriate. I personally use the route to cycle a mix of short local journeys and longer commuter / utility type journeys. I would expect my observations to be supported by cycling use data for the area that has no doubt been collected to support development of the proposals.</p> </p>
A local resident	<p>The scheme as a whole is not broad enough to address the scale of the problem with traffic in the area. There is gridlock every day on the A20, even at midday, and if there are problems with the motorway it can take an hour to travel half a mile.</p> <p>Sadly, there is not enough developed infrastructure to cope with the sheer numbers of new houses being built in the area.</p> <p>This scheme is certain to cause extensive gridlock whilst being carried out and solve very little in the long run, even when completed.</p> <p>I have huge concern and worry over the impact this scheme will have on our household.</p>