

Statement of Common Ground
between
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
and
Kent County Council

in respect of the
Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan
Transport Matters

[March 2022]



Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Overview	3
3.0	NPPF, Local Plan Approach and Evidence Base	5
4.0	Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Mitigation, Active Travel and Car Parking 14	
5.0	Future working	15
6.0	Signatories.....	16
	Appendix 1: Evidence Base in relation to provision of transport infrastructure	17

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This 'Statement of Common Ground' (SoCG) is a jointly agreed statement between Kent County Council (KCC) and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) in relation to the preparation of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan: specifically and solely related to local highway and transportation matters. Other matters relating to wider KCC interests (as referred to in paragraph 1.4 below) are dealt with in a separate SoCG.
- 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 KCC and National Highways (NH). As such, this SOCG provides an agreed position with respect to relevant strategic matters within the scope of the Local Plan as at March 2022. This SoCG updates the SoCG dated October 2021, which is provided in Appendix H8 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 96.
- 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. In broad terms this covers the following matters;
- Highways
 - Active Travel
 - Public Transport
- 1.4 This SoCG should be read in conjunction with the SoCG signed on 15 February 2022 [\[CD 3.155\]](#) which covers other services, infrastructure and matters for which KCC is the relevant body or authority.
- 1.5 Para 24 of the NPPF sets out that Local Planning Authorities and county councils (in two tier areas) are under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other

prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries. Para 26 states that:

“Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular plan area could be met elsewhere”.

- 1.6 Likewise, para 106 b) of the NPPF states: *“Planning policies should:....be prepared with the active involvement of local highway authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned”.*
- 1.7 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, and Network Rail. A SoCG has also been signed with National Highways (October 2021): this is in the process of being updated.
- 1.8 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 KCC 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 KCC in the preparation of the Local Plan, in terms of KCC's role as Local Highway Authority. Further to this, paragraphs 1.30 of the PSLP and 1.34 of the SLP confirms that regard has been had to other strategies and plans of key agencies, including those of the County Council in relation to all relevant transport matters.
- 2.3. Examples of the effective and on-going joint working between TWBC and KCC include:
- An iterative process of ongoing liaison with KCC , including both formally and informally through the preparation stages of the Local Plan, including through periodic meetings of officers and Members;
 - KCC provided a significant financial contribution to the costs of the highway modelling and evidence base for the TWBC Local Plan;
 - TWBC provides contributions from its staff budget to fund half of a Senior Transport Planner employed by KCC, whose focus is on sites and transport matters in the borough of Tunbridge Wells;
 - KCC officers attend the Strategic Sites Working Group which has met since July 2019 and is attended by stakeholders, infrastructure providers, land owners and elected Members in relation to the two strategic sites (Tudeley village and Paddock Wood and land in east Capel);
 - KCC were involved in the interviewing of consultants who have been appointed by and have undertaken key pieces of evidence in the preparation of the TWBC Local Plan. This includes the Tunbridge Wells Park and Ride Feasibility Study (June 2018) and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Phase 2;

- Liaison between TWBC and KCC officers occurred through workshops on access arrangements for various sites during assessment of their suitability for allocation, particularly those between Regulation 18 and 19 consultations – i.e. during the preparation of the PSLP;
- KCC and TWBC Members and relevant officers met to discuss the overall transport strategy for the Local Plan, and KCC and TWBC officers met on a number of occasions to investigate and develop potential bids for infrastructure, including the section of the safeguarded A228 Colts Hill bypass from Pembury to the Alders' Road junction - i.e. the section of safeguarded road beyond that to be delivered to mitigate the impact from the strategic sites, which will be funded from the development of the strategic sites.

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, three addendum reports have been produced. Further details on these are provided below in Section 3.0.

2.6 Both TWBC and KCC 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 KCC 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 and paras 107 and 108 in relation to parking.
- 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 KCC being undertaken at each stage.
- 3.6 The effective and on-going joint working between TWBC and KCC 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.
- 3.7 The representations made by KCC at Regulation 18 stage (i.e. on the Draft Local Plan) included concerns expressed about the impact of the scale of proposed development on the junction of the A268 and A229 at Hawkhurst village and proposals to locate housing in locations which KCC considered to not have appropriate facilities including in a number of the villages in the borough. Whilst there were a variety of factors which contributed to the allocation of considerably less houses in the

settlements of Hawkhurst (520 - 561 less), Cranbrook (303 – 374 less) and Sissinghurst (62-77 less) in the PSLP as compared to the Draft Local Plan, this is an example of how the iterative development of the Local Plan and joint working between TWBC and KCC has been effective.

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.

Discussions with KCC H&T

- 3.11 Detailed discussions took place with KCC (and National Highways (NH)) 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 (and NH) 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) [CD 3.166]

- 3.12 Accordingly an *Addendum Report* (September 2021) was prepared and provided to KCC (and NH) 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 KCC and NH.
- 3.13 Following review of this Addendum Report, KCC raised some further queries, 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). This *Addendum 2 Report* 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 Core Document CD 3.166 of the TWBC Local Plan Examination.
- 3.15 As set out in the *Addendum 2 report*, the TRICS based trip rates were agreed with KCC and NH (paragraph 1.1.6), and the overall approach to the sensitivity testing modelling has been agreed with KCC and NH.

Local Junction Capacity Sensitivity Testing Technical Note (March 2022) [CD 3.167]

- 3.16 Following KCC's review of the *Addendum 2 report*, KCC (in liaison with NH) 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 Core Document CD 3.167 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 Blackhurst Lane/A264 Pembury Road/Hall's Hole Road junction 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 KCC agree to the principle of working cooperatively on Compulsory Purchase Orders, if considered necessary.

Results of the sensitivity testing

- 3.19 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 KCC 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 KCC 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 KCC 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, 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 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

- 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 A further example of how mitigation measures are already being taken forward, KCC and TWBC have recently commissioned the KCC Schemes Team and has instructed others 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 KCC 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. KCC 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 KCC 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 KCC 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. KCC considers that the transport strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, and mitigation measures proposed, are acceptable.

- 3.33 KCC 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.

4.0 Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Mitigation, Active Travel and Car Parking

4.1 The following reflects the comments made by KCC in its partial representation to the Regulation 19 consultation on the TWBC PSLP.

Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Mitigation

4.2 KCC considers the approach to Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Mitigation (as set out in paras 6.546 – 6.549 and Policy TP1 in the PSLP) to be acceptable.

4.3 Active Travel:

- KCC supports Policy TP2, however has suggested alterations to the policy supporting text as follows; *'paragraph 6.550 should say 'Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan', rather than 'Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Fund'. TWBC agrees that this wording amendment should be made to correct the reference and has advised the Inspector that this can be made as an additional (minor) modification;*
- KCC has also suggested that an amendment should be made to the final paragraph of policy TP2, where it refers to *'shared space schemes'* – KCC does not consider that this reference is necessary as any proposed shared space schemes should be assessed by the County Council as Highway Authority, as part of the Transport Assessment and so this reference should be removed. It has been agreed that this be addressed by a minor amendment to this final paragraph to clarify the approach, which is *"Shared space schemes which are regarded as suitable by Kent County Council, as the Local Highway Authority, will be considered as part of new residential schemes or within existing residential streets with very low levels of traffic"*.

Car Parking and safeguarding Policies




4.4 KCC has stated its support for the development management policies which relate to parking, including Policies TP3 – Parking Standards and TP4 – Public Car Parks. Additionally, they consider the safeguarding policies – TP5 – Safeguarding Railway Land and TP6 – Safeguarding Road to be acceptable.

5.0 Future working

- 5.1 Both KCC 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. It will also include working together on preparing submissions for pilots, or for funding opportunities, where relevant and identified.
- 5.2 Both parties are committed to continued collaborative working to plan and deliver sustainable growth and infrastructure within the borough.

6.0 Signatories

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

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	Kent County Council
<p>Signature</p>  <p>Alan McDermott (Portfolio Holder for Planning & Transportation)</p> <p>Date: 28 March 2022</p>	 <p>Signature</p> <p>Simon Jones, Corporate Director, Growth, Environment & Transport</p> <p>Date: 25 March 2022</p>
<p>Signature</p>  <p>William Benson (Chief Executive)</p> <p>Date: 28 March 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.

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.