

# TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

## JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

### MINUTES

Monday, 7th March, 2022

**Present:** Cllr P J Montague (Chairman), County Cllr H Rayner (Vice-Chairman), Cllr R P Betts, Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr R I B Cannon, Cllr D A S Davis, Cllr M Taylor, Cllr D Thornewell, County Cllr Mrs S Hohler, County Cllr M Hood, County Cllr S Hudson and County Cllr A Kennedy

Councillors D Harman, R V Roud and K B Tanner were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No. 15.21.

Councillors Mrs J A Anderson, M D Boughton, G C Bridge, C Brown, A E Clark, M A Coffin, F A Hoskins, D Keers, Mrs A S Oakley, M R Rhodes and H S Rogers participated via MS Teams and joined the discussion when invited by the Chairman to do so.

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Mrs T Dean, P Stepto and the parish council representative M McKinlay.

### PART 1 - PUBLIC

#### **JTB 22/1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

#### **JTB 22/2 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held on 22 November 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### MATTERS FOR THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

#### **JTB 22/3 ON-STREET PARKING FEES AND CHARGES**

The joint report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services and the Director of Finance and Transformation sought approval to progress a formal consultation exercise with regard to on-street parking fees and charges across the Borough.

The actions to be taken to invite comments and/or objections were detailed in the report and it was proposed that formal consultation would

start in March 2022 and be open for a minimum of 21 days. Any responses received would be analysed and reported to the June meeting of the Joint Transportation Board.

Careful consideration was given to the proposed charges as detailed in the Traffic Regulation Order advertisement attached at Annex 1.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the consultation for proposed on-street parking fees and charges be progressed as outlined in the report; and
- (2) the outcomes of the consultation be reported to the next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board

**\*Referred to Cabinet**

#### **JTB 22/4 KINGS HILL PARKING REVIEW**

(Decision Notice D220031MEM)

Members received an update on the outcome of the recent formal consultation on a parking review for Kings Hill. A large number of responses had been received and these were detailed in the report.

Careful consideration was given to the level of need within the community to manage and regulate parking. Members also had regard to the strength of feeling set out in the consultation responses. However, it was recognised that the Borough Council's parking review would be unable to address the historic planning issues in the area. It was also recognised that the proposals were based on the principles of the Highway Code and were intended to maintain access through the estate in a safe manner for residents, public transport providers and emergency services.

Local Members supported the proposals in principle but felt that consideration should be given to the use of yellow lines along Milton Lane and Hazen Road rather than the removal of parking in these locations.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the significant number of formal consultation responses received be noted; and
- (2) in principle, the objections received should be set aside and the proposed changes, as set out in the Traffic Regulation Order (attached at Annex 2), be supported, with implementation delayed to allow further consideration of proposals for yellow lines in relation to Milton Lane and Hazen Road

**JTB 22/5 PARKING ACTION PLAN, ACCESS GROUP 6**

(Decision Notice D220032MEM)

The report covered the formal consultation on proposals in Access Group 6, a subset of the Parking Action Plan, where the Borough Council had applied a streamline process for the consideration and promotion of minor changes to the Traffic Regulation Order.

A list of all the locations, the issues raised and a recommendation for each was set out in Annex 1.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the recommendations for each location in Access Group 6, shown in Annex 1, be adopted and where appropriate the proposals be implemented.

**JTB 22/6 PARKING ACTION PLAN, PHASE 13**

(Decision Notice D220033MEM)

The report covered the investigation and informal consultation stage of the parking restriction proposals contained in Phase 13 of the Parking Action Plan and sought approval to proceed to formal consultation. A list of all the locations, the issues raised and a recommendation for each was set out in Annex 1.

The views of local members were sought on a number of recommendations and where appropriate and/or practical these would be reflected in the final proposals.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the recommendations for locations Ph 13-01 to 13-11, 13-13, 13-15, 13-16, 13-20, 13-22, 13-23, 13-25, 13-26 and 13-30 to 13-33 for Phase 13, as set out in Annex 1 to the report, be adopted and where appropriate the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation; and
- (2) the views of local members having been sought; the following recommendations be adopted:
  - (i) Ph 13-12 (Upper Mill/Mill Street, East Malling) the proposal be amended if practicable to reflect a short extension to double yellow lines in Upper Mill and taken forward to formal consultation;
  - (ii) Ph 13-14 (98 Lunsford Lane, Larkfield) the proposal be taken forward to formal consultation;

- (iii) Ph 13-17 (The Croft, Leybourne) the proposal be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (iv) Ph 13-18 (Ashburnham Road, Tonbridge) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (v) Ph 13-19 (Chiltern Way/Cheviot Close, Tonbridge) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (vi) Ph 13-21(Priory Road, Tonbridge) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (vii) Ph 13-24 (Vale Rise and Woodgate Way, Tonbridge) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (viii) Ph 13-27 (44-46 Woodbury Road, Walderslade) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation;
- (ix) Ph 13-28 (Churchfields, West Malling) the proposal be abandoned; and
- (x) Ph 13-29 (A20 London Road, Wrotham) the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation

### **MATTERS FOR THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

#### **JTB 22/7 PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE WAITING RESTRICTIONS - PLATINUM WAY, PLATT**

The report of the Head of Transportation at Kent County Council gave details of proposed single yellow line waiting restrictions on the A25 Maidstone Road and Platinum Way, Platt. These proposals aimed to reduce the danger to pedestrians and other road users by better management of parking at this junction during school peak times

It was reported that the scheme was being funded and installed by KCC Education on behalf of Platt Church of England School.

A period of formal public consultation had not identified any safety or operational issues with the proposed single yellow line waiting restrictions. This would be in force between 0800 and 1600 hours.

**RESOLVED:** That the Traffic Regulation Order for Single Yellow Lines be implemented as shown in the plan provided at Appendix D to the report.

**JTB 22/8 A26 TONBRIDGE ROAD, WATERINGBURY, PROPOSED 40MPH SPEED LIMIT**

The report of the Head of Transportation at Kent County Council gave details of a proposed 40 mph speed limit. The changes proposed on the A26 were located to the west of the village from Pizien Well Road.

The formal public consultation had not identified any safety or operational issues with the proposed 40 mph speed limit on the section on the A26 Tonbridge Road. In addition, there was clear local support from the community of Wateringbury, the village school, the parish council and the local Borough and County Member.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposed 40 mph speed limit order be accepted and the Traffic Regulation Order made.

**JTB 22/9 NEPICAR LAY-BY, A20 LONDON ROAD, WROTHAM - PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

The report of the Head of Transportation at Kent County Council summarised the consultation outcomes in respect of the proposed permanent prohibition of motor vehicles in the Nepicar Lay-by, off the A20 London Road. Details of the temporary arrangements in place since 2020 to prohibit traffic in the lay-by were also provided.

Reference was made to the concerns of local residents, the parish council and the local County Member who had expressed a preference for the lay-by to be closed permanently on the grounds of highway safety and anti-social behaviour. It was also indicated that Wrotham Parish Council would offer to meet reasonable costs incurred by the County Council if the lay-by was permanently closed.

It was, therefore, proposed by County Councillor H Rayner, seconded by Borough Councillor R Betts that the lay-by be permanently closed to vehicular traffic upon cessation of the temporary Traffic Regulation Order on the grounds of highway safety, anti-social behaviour, lack of appropriate facilities and the offer from Wrotham Parish Council to pay reasonable costs associated with the permanent closure.

**RESOLVED:** That the Nepicar lay-by on the A20 London Road, Wrotham be permanently closed to vehicular traffic for the reasons set out above.

**MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION****JTB 22/10 HIGHWAYS FORWARD WORKS PROGRAMME: 2021/22 AND 2022/23**

The report provided an update and summarised schemes that had been programmed for delivery in 2021/22 and 2022/23.

Members made particular reference to Appendix B and expressed concern in respect of drainage and flooding along the A20 London Road and Brookfield Avenue in Larkfield and Pembury Road in Tonbridge.

**JTB 22/11 ATTACHMENTS TO STREET LIGHTING ASSETS**

The process for applying to place attachments on street lighting columns and the associated fees for administering permits was outlined in the report. It was reported that the fee did not include any load testing that might be required.

There was in-depth discussion around the process for granting permissions in respect of Christmas lights and hanging baskets. In addition, significant concern was expressed about the financial implications for Parish Councils, especially as these charges were incurred annually. It was felt that the County Council should be asked to consider how the financial burden to Parish Councils could be reduced.

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIVATE****JTB 22/12 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 8.51 pm