

## HIP Front Cover

HIP Version	Submitted by (Name)	HIP Date	Record Of Meeting Dates with KCC Virtual or Face to Face			Please list below the funding Opportunities/Sources for HIP initiatives/Measures
<b>3</b>	<b>Georgie Elliston</b>	<b>Approved by Planning Committee 31/07/2023</b>  <b>Submitted 31/08/2023</b>	<b>Demi Rodgers (DR), Nigel Rowe (NR), Linda Larter (LL) and Georgie Elliston (GE) – virtual meeting 17/11/2022</b>  <b>NR and GE virtual 13/03/2023</b>  <b>NR, Emma Tilbury, LL, GE, Cllr Streatfeild, Cllr Shea, Cllr Clayton, Cllr Wightman, Cllr Ancrum 06/09/2023</b>  <b>NR, Emma Tilbury, Georgina Jackson (GJ), GE 21/08/2024</b>			<b>County Member, Parish Precept Donation, CIL income</b>
<b>Are you an active member of the Speed Watch Scheme?</b>			<b>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></b> <b>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></b>	<b>Are you an active member of the Lorry Watch Scheme?</b>		<b>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></b> <b>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></b>
<b>Name of HIP Representative</b>	<b>Georgie Elliston</b>	<b>Contact Telephone Number</b>	<b>01732 459953</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>planning@sevenoakstown.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Name of Clerk</b>	<b>Linda Larter</b>	<b>Contact Telephone Number</b>	<b>01732 459953</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>townclerk@sevenoakstown.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Name of Chair</b>	<b>Cllr David Skinner (Movement &amp; Net Zero Working Group Chair)</b>	<b>Contact Telephone Number</b>	<b>01732 459953</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>cllr.skinner@sevenoakstown.gov.uk</b>	

KCC Project Manager Name	Nigel Rowe	Contact Telephone Number		Email Address	<a href="mailto:west.highwayimprovements@kent.gov.uk">west.highwayimprovements@kent.gov.uk</a>

- Please note the Priority column MUST be those issues which are regarded as the most important (No 1 being your highest priority, then filtering down ) KCC is unable to guarantee that all your requests will be deliverable, but Project Managers can investigate your top 1 or 2 priorities per year.

Priority	Location	Problem/Concern	What do you feel are the potential solutions?	Potential related costs and predicted benchmark – as indicated in KCC's HIP Pack 2024-2025*  *These have been extracted from KCC's Highway Improvement Plan pack – and do not constitute formal estimates from KCC Officers, nor may they encompass all related costs. Each estimate should be referred to for indicative purposes only, as they would likely form the <b>minimum starting</b> cost. Each item will be subject to investigation and costings by KCC. Prices can rise significantly depending on location and any additional engineering needed.	KCC Comments (This column is to be completed by Project Manager ONLY)
1.	Previous first priority of 20mph speed limits removed due to its forthcoming delivery, secured outside of the HIP process and to be completed by 1 <sup>st</sup> September.				Move to historical as being delivered by Active Travel by end of Aug with has made on 1 Sept 2024.
1.	Mount Harry Road, Hitchen Hatch Lane, St	Cars speeding and the fluctuation between 20mph,	Phase 2 of the 20mph speed limits project to	<u>For delivery of proposed new speed limits:</u>	NR to check with SB and AF and let STC know we'll pick up anything else after discussions with

	<p>Botolph's Road, St John's Hill/Dartford Road, Seal Hollow Road (30mph roads surrounded by 20mph roads)</p> <p>Tonbridge Road on approach to Sevenoaks School and Seal Hollow Road (60-40mph roads proposed for gradual reduction)</p>	<p>30mph and 40mph affecting the aforementioned roads in particular, making it difficult for motorists to adhere to speed limits due to now knowing what they are.</p> <p>Re Tonbridge Road: The 40mph speed limit ends just outside the Southern entrance to Sevenoaks School which caused the school to not be includable in the 20mph scheme – introduced primarily to increase student safety.</p> <p>High speeds on Tonbridge Road</p>	<p>include roads which couldn't be included in the previous scheme due to be delivered by September 2024. This includes Mount Harry, Hitchen Hatch, St Botolph's, St John's/Dartford Road, and the middle section of Seal Hollow Road due to potential compliancy issues, as well as the approach to Sevenoaks School from Tonbridge Road. The latter couldn't be included due to being too close to the 40mph speed limit and therefore not enforceable.</p> <p>STC proposes that the 30mph</p>	<p>Traffic and pedestrian survey: £85 x week for ATC tube £700 for manual pedestrian count (12 hours)</p> <p>Informal consultation exercise (required): ~£3,000 (if advertised via exclusive Town Crier, as previously)</p> <p>+</p> <p>Traffic Regulation Order: £3,000 + additional £685 for JTB report, if referred.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Zone entry treatment for proposed Tonbridge Road speed changes: £1,600 x 3 (for each speed change) Speed limit repeater signs – amount unknown: £320 each</p> <p>+</p>	<p>Active Travel (AT) – NR to meet with meet with AT and then arrange joint meeting with STC. NR – 13/9/24 Spoke with SB from Active Travel team who has commented 'the extent of the 20mph has been identified and will need to be installed and monitored for at least 18 months before we start looking at any expansion'. AT were looking at ways to reduce the speeds along the roads that don't currently qualify for a 20mph such as:</p> <p>Hitchen Hatch Road – moving parking bays to create a chicane effect.</p> <p>Installing of advisory cycle lanes to narrow the carriageway.</p> <p>Spilt out Tonbridge Road comments to new line:</p> <p>Tonbridge Road, approaching Sevenoaks School (40mph from Gracious Lane) – NR to look at average speeds on ATC outside of rush hour – more in depth analysis of the results.</p> <p>May be too high for a 30mph – could we engineer the environment to naturally lower speeds to qualify for a 30mph?</p> <p>Also check av. speeds on hill from Morleys roundabout to Sevenoaks – could this be reduced to 50mph or are speeds already below this?</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

		causing safety concerns.	<p>speed limit be extended South, far enough that both entrances to Sevenoaks School can be included in the 20mph speed limits and its students afforded the same protection as other schools in Sevenoaks within the 20mph zone. This</p> <p>Re roads which were excluded due to potential for non-compliance: The following measures were discussed with KCC Officers Sebastian Bures and Annette Fletcher on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2024 as potential speed</p>	<p>Design fees: £1124 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £1,000-£10,000)</p> <p>=</p> <p><u>Minimum</u> benchmark for proposed speed changes: £13,394 + £320<sup>(x no. of repeaters required)</sup></p>	
--	--	--------------------------	---	---	--

			<p>interventions which would make compliancy with a 20mph speed limit on these roads feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory cycle lane added on the uphill side of Dartford Road from Hollybush to The Vine, as well as in St Botolph's Avenue</li> <li>• Moving car parking spaces on Hitchen Hatch Lane from the south to the north between Winchester Close and Mencap Hall</li> <li>• Further on-street parking spaces in Mount Harry Road</li> </ul>	<p><u>For delivery of advisory cycle lane:</u></p> <p>Traffic and pedestrian survey: £85 x week for ATC tube £700 for manual pedestrian count (12 hours)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>2x road safety audits (required for any physical changes to road layout): £995 each</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>TRO cost can be avoided if proposed via the same document as above. Potential costs of <i>delivery</i> not provided in HIP Pack.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			STC proposes that these be delivered, and potential for 20mph on these roads revisited on receipt of new traffic data following the interventions.	<p><u>For delivery of changes to car parking:</u></p> <p>Traffic and pedestrian survey: £85 x week for ATC tube £700 for manual pedestrian count (12 hours)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>2x road safety audits (required for any physical changes to road layout): £995 each</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>TRO cost can be avoided if proposed via the same document as above. Potential costs of <i>delivery</i> not provided in HIP Pack.</p>	
<b>2.</b>	HGV routes in town and narrow country lanes	HGV movement in town as through traffic inhibits active travel, increases burden on junctions, increases air	Introduce HGV weight/size restrictions to the “central” Sevenoaks area for <b>through traffic</b> .	<p><u>For delivery of HGV restrictions:</u></p> <p>Traffic survey: £85 x week for ATC tube</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p>	<p>NR – 13/2/24 ATC survey data shows Over 60,000 cars for High St and 50,000 cars for London Rd. Lorries and heavier traffic represents around 5% of these figures.</p> <p>Focus on positive lorry signage rather than weight restriction given strategic route?</p>

		<p>pollution in residential areas, and risks damage to Conservation Areas. <b>See Appendix for images of known damage caused by HGV movements.</b></p> <p>HGVs being directed via narrow country lanes such as Ashgrove Road as part of road closures – this road is considered unsuitable for such traffic due to blind corners.</p>	<p>Highways England to improve signage at motorway junctions to direct freight to use the M25 and the A21 bypass, rather than A25 through Sevenoaks and neighbouring villages.</p> <p>Opportunities for <b>positive signing</b> to be explored and installed, which directs HGVs towards more appropriate routes.</p> <p>This as supported by Aim M10 of the Sevenoaks Town Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Traffic Regulation Order: £3,000</p> <p>+</p> <p>Additional £685 for JTB report, if referred.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Restriction entry signs (2 pairs) £686 per sign for width restrictions, £915 per sign for weight limits. Advisory sign costs not indicated, but “new warning/information signs” are estimated to start from £635 each</p> <p>+</p> <p>Design fees: £1124 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £1,000-£10,000)</p> <p>=</p> <p><u>Minimum</u> benchmark for HGV restrictions: £7,683 width restriction</p>	<p>Need to look at the wider area – where are lorries travelling (to Dover and Marden) and where could we put signs to divert traffic away from the High Street/ where would they displace to?</p> <p>What about advisory signs at pinch points in upper High Street, between the church and fountain, as well as outside Market House and by The Stag? These sections are too narrow for HGVs to pass and it's a conservation area. Could this help justify a weight/ width restriction?</p> <p>Waitrose and M&amp;S etc have their own loading bays off the High Street so wouldn't necessarily need to be exempt for access via the High Street.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

				£8,529 weight restriction £7,434 advisory sign	
3.	Sevenoaks Rail-Way Station/London Road/Hitchen Hatch Lane	<p>Pedestrians take the “shortest route”, walking in the highway and avoiding pedestrian crossings; Long waits for vehicles at multiple lights causing delays, noise and pollution.</p>	<p>Redesign junction to create safe, direct pedestrian crossings and simplify vehicle controls.</p> <p>Proposal to replace the pedestrian guard rails with bollards, to stop pedestrians from walking in the road while still maintaining protections from cars.</p> <p><i>Note: STC is pursuing a Town Centre masterplan which will be looking at potential design solutions. <b>STC also notes that the Farmers site has submitted a</b></i></p>	<p><u>For delivery of junction improvements:</u></p> <p>£250,000+ (as indicated by Officer notes →)</p>	<p>Include wording from Traffic Operations email around jct. improvements here being £250k plus.</p> <p>Developer is the best route for major jct changes as this is a major project and not something we can fund or deliver. There may be developer contributions and/or CIL contributions but this is long-term.</p> <p>Short term - People are walking in the road rather than crossing at the signals – PGR is stopping people getting back on the footway which is why the TC wants bollards to allow people to cross. KCC noted that we'd be encouraging people to cross where they shouldn't be whereas at the moment pedestrians are choosing to cross where they shouldn't – but NR to check with P&amp;A to see if there is a short term solution.</p> <p>NR to speak to Traffic Operations to see if a ped crossing at the existing traffic lights on London Road, west of the station, could be installed?</p> <p>NR – 16/9/24 Update from TB Traffic Operations:</p> <p>We've had a look at the site and there is no easy solution and certainly no quick one either.</p>






			<b>new planning application, and recommends that junction improvements be secured via Section 106 agreements.</b>		<p>The first part regarding the crossing pedestrians and guard railing has been covered. Replacing the railings with bollards will make a free for all with pedestrians crossing wherever they like. The railings do direct pedestrians to the controlled crossings, if they choose not to use them, then there is not a lot we can do.</p> <p>As it is a large site, delay before the pedestrian green man appearing can be a while, though all the controlled crossings are walk with traffic to reduce the delays to pedestrians. The wait time could be reduced, but that will have a knock-on effect and would increase the delays to vehicles which would also likely increase the queues at the junction.</p> <p>Adding a pedestrian phase to the West side of the junction is possible, though this would require a reconfiguration of the controller and reduce efficiency, as some traffic would have to be held on red for the pedestrian demand to be served. There would also be works required to install the crossing and the lining would have to be adjusted to accommodate the new crossing.</p> <p>The road is over 11m wide at this point, so there is a possibility of installing a pedestrian island so walk with traffic could be utilised. However, this would require quite a bit of civils work and would need a controller reconfiguration.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

					It also needs to be mentioned that the controller and signal heads are over 12 years old, so well into their design life and the actual poles were not replaced at this time, so it may require significant works to make changes.
4.	Junction of A25/Hospital Road	Difficult for motorists to exit Hospital Road and Greatness Lane onto A25, contributing to the congestion at Bat and Ball junction. The Tarmac site development, accessed from Greatness Lane, will considerably increase this problem.	<p>KCC Highways Engineering advice welcomed.</p> <p>STC wishes to know if the lines were refreshed as claimed in the KCC Officer's notes from V1 of the HIP.</p> <p>STC would also request that a priority "Keep Clear" section be added marking the narrowest part of the junction at Hillingdon Avenue to reduce opportunity of vehicles straddling the footway and</p>	<p><u>For a Keep Clear section:</u></p> <p>Traffic and pedestrian survey: £85 x week for ATC tube £700 for manual pedestrian count (12 hours)</p> <p>2x road safety audits: (required for physical changes to roads) £995 each</p> <p>Installation: £172</p> <p>Design fee: £343 (based on anticipated construction cost being below £1,000)</p> <p><u>Minimum benchmark for Keep Clear markings:</u> £1,300 if traffic and pedestrian surveys are</p>	<p>Check how far this got – if they can have Keep Clear – NR to speak to AO (AT).</p> <p>Traffic backs up from Bat and Ball Lane, along Seal Hollow Road, as there is no facility for a right hand turn at the Bat and Ball lights into Otford Road so no one can get out of Hospital Road as traffic backs up.</p> <p>Also, the first 50yds of Hillingdon Avenue, off the A25, is less than 3.5m wide so traffic backs up.</p> <p>Traffic has increased due to the expansion of schools at the end of Hillingdon Avenue and traffic backs up onto the A25 with cars trying to turn into Hillingdon Avenue.</p> <p>Cars drive on the footway to pass which is used by school children.</p> <p>Request for Keep Clear outside Old Lodge House on the southern side of Hillingdon Avenue, near to the junction with Hospital Road.</p> <p>Having reviewed your comments regarding providing a priority workings system on Hillingdon</p>

			<p>compromising pedestrian safety. This solution was suggested by KCC Officer Alan Osuoha on 15-03-2023. STC did confirm its wish to pursue this after having taken the proposal to its Planning Committee on 03-04-2023, and requested information as to next steps on 14-04-2023, however this was not responded to either by the engineers copied into the email chain, or STC's HIP Officer Nigel Rowe.</p>	<p>sufficient and road safety audits aren't needed instead.</p> <p>£2,505 if road safety audits are sufficient and traffic and pedestrian surveys aren't needed.</p> <p>£3,290 if all of the above tests are needed.</p>	<p>Avenue, I can confirm this will not be a feasible option for a few reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is insufficient road space to install the physical build-out works required for a good priority working scheme. (The image below shows a good example where a physical build-out forces the traffic to have to give-way) - If only signs and marking are used as you have suggested, then vehicles will simply ignore them. The image below shows a good example in which the vehicle is forced to give-way.</li> <li>2. There is a very poor sight lines visibility of turning vehicles from the A25 into Hillingdon Avenue. The image below shows what the sightline is for a vehicle giving way to the proposed prioritised movement from the A25.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---	--	---



					<div data-bbox="1485 193 2119 533"></div> <div data-bbox="1534 533 2134 643"><p>3. The queue from the junction ahead will also backup into the priority working section.</p></div> <div data-bbox="1485 683 2188 866"><p>There is only one option which I believe will be supported which is to add a “KEEP CLEAR” marking at the narrowest point of the junction. It will be relatively easy to install and help to reduce the opportunity of vehicles straddling the footway.</p></div> <div data-bbox="1485 901 2011 1133"></div> <div data-bbox="1485 1173 2152 1396"><p>The gold standard option will be to make this section of Hillingdon Avenue one-way which I don't expect to be widely supported. This will remove the risk completely and at 3.65m is not really suitable for two-way traffic expected to increase in future.</p></div>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Hope the above is helpful in addressing your concerns.</p> <p>NR –16/9/24 Spoke with AO from Active Travel. He is aware of this junction and has been working on a design for 'Keep Clear' as above. Unfortunately, the Active Travel Budget will not cover as slightly outside of jurisdiction of their schemes. I have asked AO to send drawings to HIT and I will search and see if any funding available.</p>
5.	Seal Road/Greatness Park	Pedestrian crossing safety and lack of crossing facilities	Crossing facilities as well as signage to warn traffic on the A25 that people might cross here, or to protect the poor sightlines on the road.	<p><u>For a zebra crossing:</u></p> <p>Pedestrian count and speed survey: £800</p> <p>+</p> <p>2x road safety audits (required for any physical changes to road layout): £995 each</p> <p>+</p> <p>Basic zebra crossing: £24,000</p> <p>+</p>	<p>We do not believe, on initial look that the road environment near to Mill Lane is suitable for a crossing and there are no signs available to warn of pedestrians crossing a road where there is no formal crossing in place.</p> <p>NR to ask P&amp;A if there is an option to convert the existing tactile dropped kerb crossing with a zebra?</p> 

				<p>Design fees: £2,083 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £10,000-£30,000)</p> <p><u>Minimum benchmark for zebra crossing:</u> £28,873</p>	<p>School children have to cross the A25 to access the footway just east of Mill Lane to get to school however there is also repressed demand as school children are being driven to school due to the perceived safety of the road and there is significant development coming that will increase demand/ justification for a crossing at this location.</p>
6.	Hillingdon Avenue	Lack of safe access or crossing points for students	<p>A public consultation was done by KCC on safe crossing points at Hillingdon Avenue and Seal Hollow Road, however nothing was followed through afterwards. Please could this be investigated, and also both feasibility and deliverability studies of safe crossing points produced.</p>		<p>Believe this was carried out by a developer/ KCC Education?</p> <p>AT (AO) said this was going to be implemented as part of the east-west cycle path but this has since been moved so seems to have been dropped – NR to speak to AO and D&amp;TP to ascertain where this has got to.</p> <p>NR – 16/9/24 Spoke with AO from Active Travel . The crossing point at Seal Hollow Road was looked into but the desire line and visibility is poor at the end of the path from Hillingdon. The most direct cycle route was deemed to be The Crescent where we are placing raised tables to facilitate.</p>
7.	Hospital Road outside Hospital	The Hospital has informed Cllr Richard Streatfeild	Add crossing points on Hospital Road.	<p><u>For a frail people warning sign:</u></p>	<p>It is not possible to install a formal crossing here due to physical limitations and it is a quiet road.</p>

		that it fails its safety test every year due to not having any safe crossing points to access it.		New warning/information signs: £635 each	NR to find out if they can have a frail people warning sign? – find out if possible before 16 September so that STC can see if this would be acceptable to the Hospital.
8.	Bradbourne Vale Road/Betenson Avenue where it meets Shoreham Lane	Pedestrian crossing safety, lack of crossing facilities and poor sightlines for drivers going up the hill	Crossing facilities as well as signage to warn traffic approaching the hill from either side that people might cross here.	<p><u>For a dropped kerb crossing with tactiles:</u></p> <p>Dropped kerb pair: £1,260</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Tactile paving: Cost not indicated.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Design fees: £1124 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £1,000-£10,000)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">=</p> <p><u>Minimum</u> benchmark for dropped kerb and tactile paving: £2,384 + cost of tactile paving.</p>	<p>The road environment is not suitable for a crossing and there are no signs available to warn of pedestrians crossing a road where there is no formal crossing in place.</p> <p>NR to find out if they could have a dropped kerb crossing with tactiles just northeast of Betenson Avenue instead.</p>



9.	<p>The Crescent, St Johns Road, St Johns Hill, Bradbourne Road, Bradbourne Vale Road, Littlewood, Hillingdon Avenue, corner of Bethel Road and Cedar Terrace Road</p> <p>Ash Platt Road</p>	<p>Cars parking on both sides of the road and on pavement, causing school children to walk in the road and blocking access for pushchairs and wheelchairs. Lack of parking for residents.</p>	<p>Review of parking arrangements e.g. resident parking schemes, 2 hour visitor parking and/or introduction of yellow lines.</p> <p>Consider corner protections: STC will prepare a map of locations for a TRO.</p> <p>Some of these roads may be covered by the Parking study which STC has recently commissioned for St John's area – this will therefore be received following that.</p>	<p><u>For corner protections:</u></p> <p>Traffic Regulation Order £3,000</p> <p>+</p> <p>Additional £685 for JTB report, if referred.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Lines and associated signage: £800 per location</p> <p>+</p> <p>Design fees: £1124 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £1,000-£10,000)</p> <p>=</p> <p><u>Minimum benchmark for corner protections:</u></p>	<p>NR re Ash Platt Road – 2/11/23 Meeting with P&amp;A to discuss options. Any intervention is likely to require pre-consultation engagement with all stakeholders including the school.</p> <p>TC to come up with list of locations so that we can sense check locations then STC can do an engagement exercise before doing a bulk TRO.</p>
10.	<p>St Johns Hill/Dartford Road</p>	<p>Pedestrian crossing safety</p>	<p>This location is no longer “on hold” due to having been removed</p>	<p><u>For a zebra crossing:</u></p> <p>Pedestrian count and speed survey: £800</p>	<p>NR to speak to AF and SB for an update – if they are looking at delivering this then it can be removed from the HIP as it would be an AT scheme. Otherwise we could look into the scheme. STC has funding for this.</p>



			<p>from the 20mph scheme by KCC.</p> <p>STC has agreed to fund a zebra crossing on Dartford Road, as consulted on by KCC in 2022. This was a “high level” design by Alan Osuoha which requires further design work and costing. At a site meeting between STC and KCC Officers Annette Fletches and Sebastian Bures, they expressed doubt as to the deliverability of a zebra crossing at this exact location, and may need to move along road.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>2x road safety audits (required for any physical changes to road layout): £995 each</p> <p>+</p> <p>Basic zebra crossing: £24,000</p> <p>+</p> <p>Design fees: £2,083 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £10,000-£30,000)</p> <p><u>Minimum</u> benchmark for zebra crossing: £28,873</p>	<p>STC noted that the crossing needs to go as close to ‘Five Ways jct’ – A225/ Hitchen Hatch Lane etc. as possible.</p> <p>NR – 13/9/24 Per SB – Active Travel ‘We do still need to look at the zebra crossing on Dartford road. Need to draw up a design and put it through stage 1’</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---

11.	Town Centre triangle	Reports of pedestrians nearly being hit when crossing the zebra crossings, also zebra crossings not linking to key destinations where people are more likely to cross e.g. The Stag	Review of crossing facilities.  <i>Note: STC is pursuing a Town Centre masterplan which may identify potential design solutions</i>	<p><u>For a zebra crossing:</u></p> <p>Pedestrian count and speed survey: £800</p> <p>+</p> <p>2x road safety audits (required for any physical changes to road layout): £995 each</p> <p>+</p> <p>Basic zebra crossing: £24,000</p> <p>+</p> <p>Design fees: £2,083 (based on anticipated construction cost being between £10,000-£30,000)</p> <p><u>Minimum benchmark for zebra crossing:</u> £28,873</p>	This is on hold with no current action for HIT. Need more info as to which crossings, and will await the outcome of the masterplan.
-----	----------------------	---	---	---	---

12.	London Road, including zebra crossing and by Lidl and Fire Station	Reports of near misses from pedestrians using the zebra crossing, speeding cars not adhering to the speed limit.	<p>STC asked for a 30mph repeater sign to be installed as part of the signage being installed for the 20mph speed limits, to reinforce the speed limit. This due to having received a report of a near miss, but having been found unviable by KCC lighting team due to the area being acceptably lit.</p> <p>STC believes this road is not suitably safe for pedestrians and would request that alternative solutions be investigated.</p>	N/A – move to historic.	<p>Annette Fletcher:</p> <p>“My street lighting colleagues have come back to confirm that the existing street lighting on London Road and that all columns on London road have been upgraded to LEDs and are communicating on their CMS system.</p> <p>In terms of lighting in that section of London Road, the levels are adequate.</p> <p>To confirm that within a street lit area (more than 3 LCs within 186m) and speed limit is 30mph we do not provide 30mph repeater signs.</p> <p>As mentioned previously please request enforcement by the Kent Safety Camera Partnership .”</p> <p>There is little we can add to what has been said above and the zebra already has modustar beacons</p> <p>Checked speeds and 85% is below 30mph – STC will log that the lines are refreshed – move to historical.</p>
-----	--	--	---	-------------------------	--

13.	Brittains Lane/Burntwood Road/Ashgrove Road/Oak Lane	Poor sight lines as well as concealed entrance resulting in at least 2 known accidents within the last year	<p>Convex mirrors at: The junction where Brittains Lane meets Oak Lane Where Burntwood Road meets Ashgrove Road On Brittains Lane where Ashgrove Road meets Oak Lane</p> <p>Concealed entrance sign on Oak Lane, past Dibden Lane where it approaches Brittains Lane and Ashgrove Road.</p> <p>Request forwarded to Nigel Rowe on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2024, following agreement for him to review the request on</p>	Prices not indicated.	<p><b>NEED TO AMEND TO BE RELEVANT TO Brittains Lane/Burntwood Road/Ashgrove Road/Oak Lane:</b> Whilst the widespread use of mirrors is not encouraged, there are sites when their use may be a benefit to road safety.</p> <p>As the Department for Transport (DfT) allow them in certain circumstances and are themselves proposing new legislation to remove the need for special authorisation, we have adopted a new proactive policy that allows their limited use.</p> <p>Each site would need to meet with the DfT criteria and would require an independent safety assessment to ensure that existing hazards are not increased by inducing drivers to rely on a mirror and take less care than they normally would. The assessment process would include a review of the safety record and consultation with the police.</p> <p>Kent County Council (KCC) will only consider traffic mirrors on the public highway where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a crash history relating to a lack of visibility.</li> <li>• Visibility for vehicles emerging from the side road is severely restricted.</li> <li>• A visibility improvement scheme is not feasible.</li> <li>• Visibility cannot be improved by removing hedges, walls, trees or other obstacles.</li> </ul>
-----	--	---	---	-----------------------	---

			receipt of updated crash data.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speed limit on the major road is above 30mph, the introduction thereby being aimed at higher speed roads.</li> <li>• There are no other reasonable standard highway improvements possible.</li> </ul> <p>I have checked the crash history for Forstal Road and there is no recorded crash pattern in the past three years. In addition, average speeds past the recreation ground do not exceed 30mph. As such, we are unable to install a mirror at this site.</p> <p>However, I note that there are some sections of private verge on the opposite side of Forstal Road which may be of use to you, depending on where you are looking to install the mirror.</p> <p>Mirrors may be sited off the highway on private land but that is a matter for the landowner and the person who places the mirror. Planning permission may also be required, which would involve contacting the local Planning Authority, and, should the private mirror overhang a highway maintainable at public expense, then a licence would be required from KCC as the Highway Authority (KCC).</p> <p>It is not possible to advise whether placing a mirror on private property would compromise road safety as it would come down to experiencing the mirror in operation however it should be noted that if KCC ascertains that road safety is being</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

					<p>compromised as a result of a private mirror being placed near to the public highway, we can use our powers to remove the mirror.</p> <p>No DfT approved sign for concealed entrances.</p> <p>Is there any signage we can look at instead of mirrors - what's the opportunity for jct warning signs or similar instead?</p> <p>There are already some signs but is this correct (should it be staggered crossroads?) or as visible as can be?</p> <p>There is no pedestrians in road sign on one approach and the crossroads warning sign is not grey backed on that same approach.</p>
<p><b>14.</b> (Pending finalised designs from Tarmac regarding the proposed roundabout at this junction)</p>	<p>Bat and Ball Junction, A25/A225</p>	<p>STC wants to be confident that the design which Tarmac are going to deliver as part of their Outline planning application (which has now been conditioned as first part of the delivery plan), delivers the best possible solution and safe usage to pedestrians,</p>	<p>In STC's previous iteration of its HIP, the redesign of the Bat and Ball Junction to ensure safe pedestrian crossing was the first priority. It has since been removed from the priority list, due to the Sevenoaks Quarry (Tarmac site) having since received Outline</p>		<p>NR to discuss with D&amp;TP re who can meet with TC to discuss further. – see email re roundtable meeting</p> <p>Wait for more info from STC re Pedestrian crossing indicators – NR can check with DA and Toby Butler – but need to know what exactly is meant by indicators??</p>

		<p>cyclists and motorist.</p>	<p>planning permission to develop the site, with conditions set in place ensuring delivery of a revised traffic and pedestrian scheme to be delivered after the first stage of development.</p> <p>This therefore is unlikely to be delivered via the HIP, and STC anticipates being included in discussions, stakeholder sessions and public consultations on the design with Tarmac, in order to ensure that the design can best serve Sevenoaks Town residents' needs.</p>		
--	--	-------------------------------	---	--	--

			<p>What STC would like to retain on the HIP however, is the channel of communication to ensure that the resulting design is to the best quality and use of pedestrians.</p> <p><b>In the meantime, STC would however like to receive copy of the Speed Survey ordered by Nigel Rowe to replace the one referred to by the Project Manager in the first iteration of the HIP.</b></p> <p><b>STC also wishes to know why the pedestrian crossing indicators at Bat &amp; Ball were removed when KCC</b></p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--



			<b>reconfigured and added lines at this location.</b>		
<b>15.</b> (ON HOLD)	Hillingdon Avenue	Pedestrian crossing safety	This location, which STC had flagged in its previous HIP for similar issues have been <b>temporarily</b> put on hold and moved to the bottom of STC's priority list due to it being inside the soon-to-be-delivered 20mph zone. <b>It may be revisited or permanently removed once impact of the 20mph scheme can be reviewed, depending on whether it has addressed concerns.</b>		Noted – no action for HIT at this time
<b>16.</b> (ON HOLD)	A225 Seal Hollow	Pedestrian crossing safety	This location, which STC had flagged in its		Noted – no action for HIT at this time

Road/"Hole in the Wall"

previous HIP for similar issues have been **temporarily** put on hold and moved to the bottom of STC's priority list due to it being inside the soon-to-be-delivered 20mph zone. **It may be revisited or permanently removed once impact of the 20mph scheme can be reviewed, depending on whether it has addressed concerns.**

Feasibility and deliverability studies of safe crossing points requested.

## Historical Priorities Record

**Note from Sevenoaks Town Council that despite there being numerous items on the below Historical Priorities Record, none of them have been delivered via the Highway Improvement Plan, which continues to be unsuccessful and have delivered 0 priorities since**

No	Location	Problem/Concern	What do you feel are the potential solutions?	KCC Comments
1	<i>EXAMPLE: Church Lane</i>	<i>Speeding off peak.</i>	Speed Reduction	After traffic surveys obtained, data showed that vehicle speeds were within the current speed limit, therefore no further action proposed.
1.	Bat and Ball Junction, A25/A225	Inadequate, poorly designed crossing points for pedestrian safety. Considerable congestion and delays during the four daily rush hour periods and throughout the day, with particular traffic queues forming on Otford Road and Seal Road towards the junction; Very high levels of air pollution.	<b>In STC's previous iteration of its HIP, the redesign of the Bat and Ball Junction to ensure safe pedestrian crossing was the first priority. The reduction of air pollution and congestion in this area, as well as unsafe crossing facilities remain a top priority for STC, and removing it from STC's HIP priority list has not altered that.</b>  <b>Rather, it has been removed from the priority list, due to the Sevenoaks Quarry (Tarmac site) having since received Outline planning permission to develop the site, with conditions set in place ensuring delivery of a revised traffic and pedestrian scheme to be delivered after</b>	

			<p>the first stage of development at this location.</p> <p>This is therefore unlikely for the scheme to be delivered via the HIP, and STC remains dedicated to ensuring that the resulting design best serves the needs of Sevenoaks Town residents. STC anticipates being included in discussions, stakeholder sessions and public consultations on the design with Tarmac, and will be actively engaged in the process to make sure that the design proposed achieves <u>all</u> of the following: improve pedestrian safety, reconnect the neighbourhood and reduce air pollution and traffic jams.</p>	
2	Wickenden Avenue	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p> <p>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as “carriageway and footpaths require improvements” were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC’s operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the “Historical Priorities Record”, however STC has requested that it be sent an</p>	

			update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC's flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b>	
3	Broomfield Road	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p> <p>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as "carriageway and footpaths require improvements" were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC's operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the "Historical Priorities Record", however STC has requested that it be sent an update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC's flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b></p>	
4	Mill Lane	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p> <p>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as "carriageway and footpaths require improvements" were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on</p>	

			<p>surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC's operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the "Historical Priorities Record", however STC has requested that it be sent an update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC's flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b></p>	
5	Wickenden and Swaffield Roads	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p> <p><b>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as "carriageway and footpaths require improvements" were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC's operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the "Historical Priorities Record", however STC has requested that it be sent an update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC's flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b></b></p>	
6	Clare Way, Lea Road, Hurst Way and Stafford Way	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p>	

			<p>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as “carriageway and footpaths require improvements” were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC’s operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the “Historical Priorities Record”, however STC has requested that it be sent an update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC’s flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b></p>	
7	Beaconfields	Carriageway and footpaths require improvements	<p>Surfacing improvements and repairs required</p> <p>On 5th January 2022, Stuart Taylor advised STC that its priorities labelled in the previous iteration of its HIP as “carriageway and footpaths require improvements” were not able to be considered under the HIP. This is because a separate team deals with issues on surfacing improvement and repairs, and he had therefore passed the items onto KCC’s operations team to have a look into. The items have therefore been moved to the “Historical Priorities Record”, however STC has requested that it be sent an</p>	

			<p>update for each site, regarding whether anything was found or actioned as a result of STC's flagging the locations. <b>STC awaits this update.</b></p>	
7.	Clare Way	<p>Residents have been reported as parking in the "Keep Clear" section on this road dead-end road, which was introduced in order to allow emergency vehicles to turn around.</p>	<p>STC has requested that a further deterrent of yellow lined be painted at this location.</p> <p>*Note: this was formally requested by STC in a letter to SDC and KCC departments, dated 17-07-2023.</p> <p>*Further Note 08-09-2023 STC has prepared a consultation which should commence shortly.</p> <p><b>06/11/2023: Due to strong and mixed resident consultation responses, the Planning Committee resolved to keep the situation under review in hopes that the informal consultation and potential for subsequent TRO would act as a satisfactory deterrent.</b></p>	
	Letter Box Lane	<p>Poor sight lines on entering Letter Box Lane making motorists unaware that traffic is displaced onto the wrong side of the road by the new corner protections, whereby these do</p>	<p>Extending the double yellow lines further into Letter Box Lane to allow cars exiting the Lane to correct onto the left side of the road before nearing the exit – in order to avoid potential collisions with those entering the Lane.</p> <p>Request sent to KCC previously, but the existing TRO could not be extended without new TRO. <b>STC resolved to monitor the effectiveness of the corner protections as</b></p>	



		not extend far enough into the Lane to allow cars to move onto the correct side of the road before nearing the exit.	<b>originally designed by KCC and to consider funding extension in future, should monitoring efforts find that the safety of motorists is indeed negatively impacted.</b>	
	20 mph limit ( <u>not</u> zone as this requires engineering)	Speeding cars and the need to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety, especially near schools. Sevenoaks Town Neighbourhood Plan (STNP) also emphasises the importance of pedestrian and cycle travel and supports 20mph in residential areas and near schools.	<p>20mph speed limit reductions as per KCC designs, which were consulted on by STC at the end of 2023.</p> <p>The intention is for it to be signage only as per the current design, so as to protect potential for future cycling paths to be incorporated into road designs, as identified in the LCWIP.</p> <p>Delivered 12<sup>th</sup> August – 1<sup>st</sup> September 2024, paid for by STC.</p>	

Appendix:

Known damage caused within the Sevenoaks High Street Conservation Area by HGV vehicles moving within the Town:

Image 1: bent sign

