

Statement of Common Ground
between
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
and
National Highways

in respect of the
Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan
Transport Matters

[11 July 2022]



Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 | Overview | 3 |
| 3.0 | NPPF, Local Plan Approach and Evidence Base | 4 |
| 4.0 | Future working | 14 |
| 5.0 | Signatories..... | 15 |
| | Appendix 1: Evidence Base in relation to provision of transport infrastructure | 16 |

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This 'Statement of Common Ground' (SoCG) is a jointly agreed statement between National Highways (NH) and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) in relation to the preparation of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan: specifically and related to local highway and transportation matters.
- 1.2 It takes account of the development of the Local Plan including the Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) stage, together with the results of subsequent sensitivity testing which has been undertaken on behalf of the borough council, and at the request of NH and Kent County Council (KCC). As such, this SOCG provides an agreed position with respect to relevant strategic matters within the scope of the Local Plan as at 11 July 2022. This SoCG updates the SoCG dated October 2021, which is provided in Appendix H4 to the Duty to Cooperate Statement (November 2021) which forms Core Document [\[CD. 3.132c \(v\)\]](#) of the TWBC Local Plan Examination and starts on digital page 35.
- 1.3 The strategic matters covered by this SoCG relate to the provision of transport services and infrastructure to be provided/funded by developers to support the growth in the borough proposed within the Local Plan.
- 1.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹ states that planning policies should be prepared with the active involvement of local highways authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned. In relation to plan making, DfT Circular 02/20132 states that:
- The then Highways Agency, now NH, will work with the local authority to understand the transport implications of development options. This will include assessing the cumulative and individual impacts of the Local Plan proposals upon the ability of the road links and junctions affected to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in terms of capacity and safety. Such assessments should be carried out in line with current Department for Transport guidance or on a basis otherwise agreed with NH. (paragraph 15);

- NH will work with local authorities and developers to identify opportunities to introduce travel plan and demand management measures through their Local Plans. These will be based on existing and proposed patterns of development in a manner that will support sustainable transport choice and retain capacity within the transport network so as to provide for further development in future Plan periods. (paragraph 17);
- Capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage. NH will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements. (paragraph 18);
- Where a potential capacity need is identified, this will be considered and weighed alongside environmental and deliverability considerations. Additional capacity may be considered in the context of the NH's forward programme of works, balancing the needs of motorists and other road users with wider impact on the environment and the local/regional community (paragraph 19).

1.5 TWBC has worked with KCC and East Sussex County Council as the local highways authorities, and NH, formerly Highways England, Network Rail and the operators of public transport provision, for example local bus operators. SoCGs have been prepared and signed with East Sussex County Council, Network Rail and KCC.

1.6 Liaison in relation to the matters included in this SoCG is ongoing and will be subject to review. Moreover, this SoCG is not binding on any party and is agreed without prejudice to further matters of detail that either party may wish to raise subsequently through the examination into the Local Plan.

2.0 Overview

- 2.1. The parties agree that both TWBC and NH have been proactive in their approach to strategic matters in relation to strategic highways and transport matters in accordance with the requirements under the Duty to Cooperate (DtC).
- 2.2. Paragraph 1.28 of the Pre-submission Local Plan (PSLP) and paragraph 1.32 of the Submission Local Plan (SLP) refers to the extensive liaison between Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and NH in the preparation of the Local Plan, in terms of NH's role as the Strategic Highway Authority.
- 2.3. This SOCG also highlights a shared interest in considering the impact on the SRN and a recognition of TWBC's continuing commitment to this, as set out in Section 5, via ongoing liaison with NH.
- 2.4. The evidence base for transport and highways matters for the TWBC PSLP and SLP is that set out in **Appendix 1**.
- 2.5. In addition, addendum reports have been produced. Further details on these are provided below in Section 3.0.
- 2.6. Both TWBC and NH agree that the other authority has met the requirements under the Duty to Cooperate on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries, and through effective and on-going joint working.

3.0 NPPF, Local Plan Approach and Evidence Base

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 3.1 TWBC and NH agree that the following (paras 20,104 – 106, 110 – 113) are the most pertinent paragraphs and parts of paragraphs of the NPPF (2021) in relation to the development of the TWBC Local Plan on highways, active travel and public transport matters, in addition to those set out at paras 24 – 27 of the NPPF in terms of the duty to cooperate.
- 3.2 Paragraph 20 of the NPPF requires that Strategic Policies within the Local Plan should set out the overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for;
- a) *'infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
- 3.3 Paragraphs 104 – 106 of the NPPF state:
- "104. Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:*
- a) *the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*
- b) *opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;*
- c) *opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;*
- d) *the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and*
- e) *patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places".*

“105. The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making”.

“106. Planning policies should:

a) support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities;

b) be prepared with the active involvement of local highways authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned;

c) identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development;

d) provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans).....”;

3.4 Paragraphs 110 - 113 of the NPPF state:

“110. In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;

c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and

d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree”.

“111. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”.

“112. Within this context, applications for development should:

a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use....”;

“113. All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.”

Iterative working

- 3.5 As detailed above, the process of producing the Local Plan has been an iterative one, with discussions and liaison with NH being undertaken at each stage.
- 3.6 The effective and on-going joint working between TWBC and NH is demonstrated by the changes between the TWBC Draft Local Plan and the PSLP. Regulation 18 consultation was undertaken on the Draft Local Plan in 2019. The Draft Local Plan was supported by various elements of the evidence base, including the Transport Assessment Report 2019 produced by SWECO.

Comments made by NH on the Draft Local Plan

- 3.7 The representations made by NH at Regulation 18 stage (i.e., on the Draft Local Plan) highlighted the Tunbridge Wells Draft Local Plan and its supporting documents contain policy, text and various means that should ensure that proposed developments effectively mitigate against any impacts upon the SRN. It further set out the need to

address the various technical and other matters and the implications for the wider Local Transport and Local Plan Evidence Base and the Local Plan policies and text.

Evidence supporting the PSLP

- 3.8 TWBC has prepared a transport evidence base to support the Local Plan strategy and site allocations. The relevant documents are listed below in **Appendix 1**.
- 3.9 The *Local Plan Evidence Base: Transport Assessment Report Update for the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Transport Modelling report)*, dated March 2021 provides details of the AM and PM SATURN model that supports the strategic modelling for the PSLP. This provides a core model simulation network centred around the key settlement areas of Royal Tunbridge Wells, Pembury, Tonbridge and Paddock Wood. The Base Case has been set out using surveys undertaken from 2018/2019 and includes projected growth up to the end of the Local Plan (2038).
- 3.10 The PSLP has an integrated and comprehensive transport strategy which offers choice and prioritises a) active travel and then b) public transport whilst ensuring that c) there are necessary improvements to the existing highway network and infrastructure to mitigate and address the impact of development to an acceptable degree and to ensure highway safety. This is set out in:
- Strategic Policy STR6 Transport and Parking;
 - Policy TP2 Transport Design and Accessibility;
 - Policy TP5 Safeguarding Railway Land, and;
 - Policy TP6 Safeguarding Roads.

Comments made by NH on the PSLP

- 3.11 NH made comments on the Regulation 19 Plan in respect of safety, reliability and operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network. It was further set out that at that stage, not untypically for local plans at this stage, NH needed to agree the modelling and mitigation as part of the transport evidence base supporting the Plan. However, it was further noted that there was no reason to believe this cannot be achieved ahead of the Examination into the soundness of the plan.

Discussions with NH

- 3.11 Detailed discussions took place with NH (and Kent County Council) ahead of and during the Regulation 19 consultation. As a result of these discussions (referred to in KCC's Regulation 19 consultation response), NH and KCC requested further sensitivity modelling be undertaken. This included a request that this sensitivity modelling is undertaken using the TRICS approach – whereby all sites are assessed individually.

Addendum Reports (September and October 2021) [PS_023]

- 3.12 Accordingly an *Addendum Report* (September 2021) was prepared and provided to NH (and KCC) that set out the results of the sensitivity tests that were undertaken (i.e. using the TRICS approach) and responds to the queries raised by both NH and KCC.
- 3.13 Following review of this Addendum Report, some further queries were raised, and sought further information.
- 3.14 Accordingly, a further *Local Plan – Transport Assessment Addendum 2 report* (October 2021) was produced which tests and is supplemental to the *Local Plan Transport Assessment Report* and supersedes the *Addendum Report* (September 2021). As such, the Addendum Report (September 2021) has not been included as an Examination document. This *Addendum 2 Report* (October 2021) includes further modelling that covers a scenario which KCC considers should be assessed (no reduction in trip rates from existing residents of Paddock Wood as a result of mitigation measures and inclusion of mitigation measures for consented schemes in the base case scenario). *The Local Plan – Transport Assessment Addendum 2 report* (October 2021) is accordingly provided at *Post Submission Document PS_023* of the TWBC Local Plan Examination.
- 3.15 As set out in the *Addendum 2 report*, the TRICS based trip rates were agreed with NH and KCC (paragraph 1.1.6), and the overall approach to the sensitivity testing modelling has been agreed with NH and KCC.

Local Junction Capacity Sensitivity Testing Technical Note (March 2022) [PS_024]

- 3.16 Following review of the *Addendum 2 report*, NH (in liaison with KCC) requested further detailed sensitivity testing of those junctions that are most likely to require capacity

improvements to accommodate Local Plan growth at the strategic level, based on the outputs of the strategic traffic modelling and sensitivity testing.

- 3.17 Accordingly a *Local Junction Capacity Sensitivity Testing Technical Note* (March 2022) has been produced. This forms *Post Submission Document PS_024* of the TWBC Local Plan Examination. This Technical Note demonstrates the results of ARCADY or LinSig modelling of these junctions and that these junction works can be undertaken on land under in highways ownership in accordance with relevant DMRB requirements.
- 3.18 In the case of the Kippings Cross roundabout it will be necessary to acquire additional land to provide the roundabout: the Borough Council has already committed to use its Compulsory Purchase Order powers (if necessary) to acquire relevant land, as it would, where necessary, for other land required (e.g. the A228 part off-line bypass and the “Five Oak Green” by-pass). Paragraphs 4.83 and 4.84 and (strategic) Policy STR4 of the Submission Local Plan confirms that the Borough Council will use these powers where necessary. TWBC and NH, together with KCC, agree to the principle of working cooperatively on Compulsory Purchase Orders, if considered necessary. The final position regarding the need for mitigation at Kippings Cross is contained in the *Kippings Cross Junction –Local Plan Mitigation Option Analysis Final Options Report (29/06/2022)*. It includes B2160 narrowing at Kippings Cross Roundabout. The Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated to reflect timing, delivery and funding of the agreed mitigation scheme.

Results of the sensitivity testing

- 3.19 Although of more relevance to the local highway network, the *Local Plan Evidence Base: Transport Assessment Report Update for the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Transport Modelling report)* identified a corridor study along the A26 in Tonbridge: the sensitivity testing has refined this to relate to active travel improvements in Tonbridge, and the extension of the Area Wide Travel Plan (£100,000) into Tonbridge, and a signalisation and an additional approach lane at the A26 and Three Elm Lane (£500,000). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (October 2021) [Core Document CD 3.142] reflects this.
- 3.20 NH and TWBC agree that the sensitivity testing, using TRICS combined with ARCADY and LinSig modelling of individual junctions, has confirmed that the original strategic

modelling undertaken and the mitigations identified in the *Local Plan Evidence Base: Transport Assessment Report Update for the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Transport Modelling report)* can effectively mitigate any significant impacts from the development on the transport network in terms of capacity and congestion, or on highway safety, to an acceptable degree. These mitigations are reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

- 3.21 NH, as at 11 July 2022, is satisfied that, in terms of the level of detail that is required at the Local Plan stage, the evidence is proportionate and demonstrates that the highway mitigations are deliverable. Both TWBC and NH recognise that the transport impacts of each of the Local Plan developments will still have to be assessed through the relevant transport assessments accompanying planning applications, in accordance with the NPPF.

Emerging Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council (TMBC) Local Plan

- 3.22 In 2021, following the withdrawal of the TMBC Local Plan on 1st November 2021, TMBC has commenced work on a new Local Plan. This is still at the evidence gathering stage. It is unknown how many allocations will be made in Tonbridge.
- 3.23 Again, in relation to the local highway network (rather than that of the SRN), in order to model the impacts of growth from potential allocations in Tonbridge, consultants have been instructed to prepare a VISSIM model for Tonbridge. Reflecting the outcome of the strategic modelling work for the TWBC Local Plan, and the mitigations identified in Tonbridge, TWBC is working with KCC and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council on this, and has agreed to part fund this modelling work.

Provision of fast and frequent bus service on the local highway network

- 3.24 TWBC and KCC are actively working together in relation to the potential for a fast and frequent bus service from Paddock Wood, through Tudeley to Tonbridge. TMBC is involved in these proposals.
- 3.25 KCC and TWBC have commissioned the KCC Schemes Team to prepare feasibility designs providing options for active travel improvements and bus priority measures along the A264 Pembury Road corridor between the junction of A228/Tonbridge Road/High Street, Pembury (known as Woodsgate Corner) and the junction of A264 Pembury Road/Calverley Road/Bayhall Road/B2023 Prospect Road.

Viability

- 3.26 NH understands that the Local Plan is supported by a plan wide Viability Assessment. TWBC has advised that this includes a Stage 1 Viability Assessment, 2019 [CD 3.54a and appendices] that accompanied the Draft Local Plan and a Stage 2 Viability Assessment, 2021 [CD 3.65a and appendices], which informed the Pre-Submission Local Plan and subsequent Submission Local Plan. The Stage 2 assessment builds on that at Stage 1, adding a review of the strategic scale development proposals for Paddock Wood and Tudeley, as well as including a review of the viability of a sample of the 'mixed-use' allocation sites.
- 3.27 For the non-strategic sites, the Stage 1 Viability Assessment indicates that both residential and employment development are viable when meeting other policy requirements (including affordable housing) and the ability to provide considerable contributions towards the provision of infrastructure. Paragraph n of the Executive Summary on page viii) of CD 3.54a effectively identifies that (on the basis of the average house size being 90-100 sqm) that policy compliant (noting the difference in affordable housing requirements between previously developed and greenfield land) residential development should be able to provide a financial contribution of c.£12,000 - £18,000 per dwelling towards infrastructure provision.
- 3.28 This compares to the average contribution per dwelling on a variety of sites in the borough which have gained planning permission in recent years, with the vast majority of which (such as the three residential sites in Paddock Wood which provide contributions for significant transport infrastructure) being less than this range. NH recognises that this is positive in terms of the delivery of transport (including active travel and public transport) measures.
- 3.29 The Stage 2 Viability Assessment, 2021 identifies that the strategic sites, despite the significant infrastructure required for these to be delivered on garden settlement principles, are viable.
- 3.30 A comprehensive schedule of the infrastructure required to not only mitigate the growth across the Strategic Sites, but to deliver the growth against garden settlement criteria, is identified within through the Strategic Sites Masterplanning and Infrastructure Study. Costs have been assigned to each item of infrastructure, along with broad phasing assumptions. This information has been assessed within the Stage

2 Viability Assessment which confirms that the infrastructure can be delivered through the developments across both allocations without relying on external funding.

Conclusions

- 3.31 NH and TWBC agree that the (strategic policy) in the Submission Local Plan Policy STR6: Transport and Parking is appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF. It provides a comprehensive approach to transport provision, which offers choice and prioritises a) active travel and then b) public transport whilst ensuring that c) there are necessary improvements to the existing highway network and infrastructure to mitigate and address the impact of development.
- 3.32 NH and TWBC agree that the evidence base for the local plan has been subject to robust sensitivity testing, and the conclusions of this testing demonstrate that the approach taken and mitigation measures identified are – at the plan making stage – proportionate, appropriate, deliverable and accord with the NPPF. NH considers that the transport strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, and mitigation measures proposed, are acceptable.
- 3.33 NH and TWBC recognise and acknowledge that there will be a need to work very closely to deliver some elements of the mitigations, including some which relate to active travel, and commit to doing so, including with neighbouring authorities such as Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, where relevant.

Safeguarding Land for A21 Kippings Cross to Lamberhurst

- 3.34 Policy TP6 of the Submission Local Plan (SLP) sets out the approach and areas set aside for safeguarding for future highway development. This includes an area from the Kippings Cross roundabout to the dualled section at the Lamberhurst roundabout along the A21. The Plan sets out that the delivery of this infrastructure is not required to deliver growth proposed in the Local Plan, although it remains a long-term cross-district transport priority in the Kent County Council Transport Plan 2016-2031 and is accordingly safeguarded on that basis.
- 3.35 Both NH and TWBC note that the current Government, makes decisions on a five-yearly cycle as to where and when road studies and/or projects will take place via its Roads Investment Programme and Roads Investment Strategy (RIS). The current cycle, RIS2, runs from 2020 to 2025; RIS3 is due to run from 2025 to 2030 and so on;

with each cycle the subject of comprehensive public engagement and assessment of national to local circumstances and priorities.

- 3.36 RIS2 includes the A21 Safety Scheme (details of which can be found at <https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-work/south-east/a21-safety-package/>). Therefore, while not a current National Highways requirement, should the safeguarding of the land referred to above be removed from the Plan, it could fetter safety led opportunities not otherwise normally available.
- 3.37 Both parties note that the SLP covers the period up to 2038; but, in accordance with national planning policy and best practice, will be reviewed several times during this period. Similarly, during this period, there will be several RIS cycles, each providing an opportunity for the future needs of the A21 to be considered.
- 3.38 In this context, both parties remain aware of, and committed to seeking to meet, long term and continuing needs/ aspirations for A21 improvements, including between Kippings Cross and Lamberhurst.
- 3.39 NH confirm that the impending Route Strategy for the South Coast Central area (covering the A21 and a key document supporting government RIS decision making) will refer to this on-going need and aspiration. It will then be a matter for Government to balance all competing needs and aspirations across all the England Route Strategies to publish lists of schemes for studies and/or or delivery as part of RIS3 or beyond. Government decisions are expected during 2023-2025, for RIS3 covering the 2025-2030 period.
- 3.40 NH have not specifically required TWBC to safeguard land but acknowledges that it remains the case that future government roads investment plans could include projects requiring land to be safeguarded between Kippings Cross and Lamberhurst either within or beyond the plan period. To delete the safeguarding notation from the plan at this stage could fetter the ability of the government to bring forward proposals and this could limit growth options beyond the plan period. Consequently, NH believe it would be helpful to retain the TWBC LP policy/ text safeguarding land in the vicinity of this section of the A21.

4.0 Future working

- 4.1 Both NH and TWBC agree to continue to work effectively and positively on transportation matters. This will, if necessary, include utilising a “monitor and manage” approach to the provision of infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development. NH and TWBC have previously agreed *‘monitor and manage’* approaches to mitigating the impact on the SRN in relation to planning permission (19/02267/OUT - an Outline application, access not reserved) for *‘Development of up to 74,000sqm GEA of floorspace within Use Classes B1 (Business) and B8 (Storage and Distribution), including creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian site access, cycle way, landscaping, ancillary café (A3) and associated works’* at Land East Of Kingstanding Way – granted in March 2021. It will also include working together on preparing submissions for pilots, or for funding opportunities, where relevant and identified.
- 4.2 Both parties are committed to continued collaborative working to plan and deliver sustainable growth and infrastructure within the borough.

5.0 Signatories

5.1 This statement has been prepared and agreed by the following organisations:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</p> <p>Signature</p>  <p>William Benson (Chief Executive) Date: 11 July 2022</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">National Highways</p> <p>Signature</p>  <p>Kevin Bown: Area 4 Spatial Planning Manager Date: 11 July 2022</p> |
|---|---|

Appendix 1: Evidence Base in relation to provision of transport infrastructure

Evidence in relation to general infrastructure provision

- [Tunbridge Wells Borough Council – Infrastructure Delivery Plan](#) (March 2021) – This IDP sets out the details of the infrastructure that is required to support existing and future needs and demands for the borough to support new development and a growing population as envisaged through the Council’s Local Plan. It covers a range of services and infrastructure.
- [Development Constraints Study](#) (October 2016) – this study analyses the high-level constraints set out in footnote 6 of the NPPF. This was the starting point for the overall strategy for development advocated within the Local Plan.
- [Tunbridge Wells Strategic Sites Masterplanning and Infrastructure Study](#) (February 2021) - This report sets out the key findings and recommendations about whether the study sites should be allocated in the Local Plan, by gathering evidence on whether specified scales of development at the locations identified in the DLP are deliverable from a masterplanning, infrastructure and viability perspective.

Evidence in relation to Highways

- [Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Parking Strategy 2016 – 2026](#) (2016) – The strategy considers car parking in the borough by reviewing consultation responses on the provision of parking of town and responding to these along with initiatives for tackling congestion.
- [Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Transport Strategy 2015 – 2026](#) (July 2015) – The strategy, prepared jointly by TWBC and KCC, sets out the vision for transport in the borough between 2015 and 2026.

- [**Tunbridge Wells Park and Ride Feasibility Study**](#) (June 2018) – A commissioned study to investigate the feasibility of introducing Park and Ride in the town, with particular consideration of the effects and necessary actions related to town centre parking.
- [**Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Transport Strategy Review: Context and Way Forward**](#) (September 2019) – The paper sets out the contextual framework for the review of the Transport Strategy, including key challenges, from which proposed aims for the review are put forward. It sets out how the aims are relevant with the objectives and policies in the new Local Plan.
- [**Transport Assessment Report Update for the Pre-Submission Local Plan**](#) (March 2021) – This report sets out the modelling and analysis undertaken to support the Local Plan, with particular focus on the core model simulation networked centred around the key settlement centres, including Royal Tunbridge Wells, Pembury, and Paddock Wood. Mitigation measures are identified to offset the effects of additional trips from the Local Plan developments on the local transport network.
- [**Local Capacity Modelling Appraisal Technical Note - Transport Assessment Addendum 2 \(October 2021\)**](#) - This report is an Addendum to the Transport Assessment that formed an evidence base document to the Pre-Submission Local Plan at Regulation 19 stage. As a result of ongoing consultation with the highways authorities Kent County Council (KCC) and National Highways (NH, formally Highways England), further Sensitivity Tests have been agreed so that all parties have confidence that highly robust traffic modelling have been undertaken.
- [**Local Junction Capacity Sensitivity Testing Technical Note \(March 2022\)**](#) – This report provides details of the AM and PM SATURN model that supports the strategic modelling for the Tunbridge Wells Borough Pre-Submission Local Plan. Kent County Council (KCC) and National Highways (NH – formerly Highways England) requested that sensitivity testing of the Report Update be undertaken using the TRICS rather than TEMPRO approach.
- [**Kippings Cross Junction – Local Plan Mitigation Option Analysis: Final Options \(29 June 2022\)**](#) - This report sets out that the narrowing of the B2160 approach to a single lane represented the most viable option to mitigate Local Plan related highway congestion issues at Kippings Cross.

Evidence in relation to Active travel as well as Public Rights of Way

- [**Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Cycling Strategy 2016-2020**](#) (2016) – The Cycling Strategy includes actions and principles which support the promotion of cycling and the delivery of related infrastructure in the borough. The document acts as a tool to assist in the delivery of the vision and objectives of the Transport Strategy.

- [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan \(LCWIP\) Phase 1](#) (November 2019) – Phase 1 of the LCWIP focuses on key routes into Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre where there is a significant opportunity to convert many shorter journeys to more active and sustainable modes of travel.
- [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan \(LCWIP\) Phase 2](#) (March 2021) – Phase 2 of the LCWIP was commissioned to expand upon Phase 1 LCWIP by developing complementary measures for Low-Traffic Neighbourhoods and Inter-Urban routes which further support the Borough’s ambition for mode shift to sustainable modes.

Evidence in relation to Parking

- [Residential Parking Standards Topic Paper for Pre-Submission Local Plan](#) (February 2021) – This paper sets out recommendations based on the analysis for new residential parking standards to take forward into the new Local Plan in the parking standards development management policy.