

TONBRIDGE LOCAL PARKING PLAN – REVIEW OF ZONE N

Comment/Suggestion	Action
<p>Request to re-establish the revoked permission by owners of Cape House to use its private access to enable residents to use parking to rear of their properties in Rose Street.</p>	<p>This is a private road so permission or agreement over the use of the area for residents to gain access to the rear of their properties is at the discretion of the landowner. Officers have written to the owner of Cape House to establish contact and to ascertain whether use of the access in the way requested is possible and, if so, under what terms and conditions.</p>
<p>Issues with security lights from Cape House into residents windows including noise and pollution from cars visiting the business.</p>	<p>Response awaited on request for Environmental Health asked to investigate.</p>
<p>Concern that too many business permits have been issued to Cape House employees who use Rose Street to park their cars during the working day.</p>	<p>The competing needs of different groups of drivers will continue to be carefully balanced, consistent with the overall parking capacity within Zone N. Local businesses contribute significantly to the economic vitality of the area and their parking needs will continue to be met through the Business Permit scheme in a way that does not compromise the needs of local residents. Consequently, we will monitor to ensure that take up of valid on-street parking opportunities is as evenly spread as possible throughout the zone and not overly concentrated on a few streets. Currently, there appears to be some on street capacity during the daytime hours.</p>
<p>Extend scheme to cover the period 9 am to 6 pm for permit holders only - to reduce parking after the end of the current afternoon restriction.</p>	<p>We are happy to consider these suggestions for extended restrictions if a majority of residents support the proposals. Residents need to be aware this will impact on daytime visitors by increasing the time period they will need to use visitors' vouchers. We will re-consult residents on this matter in due course and report on the results.</p>
<p>Request for more enforcement.</p>	<p>Patrols beats are regularly assessed. The frequency and route is partially intelligence led to identify sites where there are regular problems reported with obstruction to traffic by parking on DYL.</p>
<p>Dissatisfaction expressed about enforcement and tickets issued to</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are installed for safety reasons to reinforce the rules of the Highway</p>

<b>Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p>permit holders who cannot find bays in their street and park on double yellow lines.</p> <p>Suggestion that not more than 2 visitors should be allowed at any one time to a house.</p> <p>Objection to the inclusion into the permit scheme of residents from new developments in the area.</p> <p>Limit permits to 2 per household.</p> <p>Loss of parking bays owing to new development in the area.</p> <p>More cars in Rose Street than there are available parking spaces.</p>	<p>Code to prevent parking in unsuitable places and obstruction of the highway. There are no exemptions for permit holders.</p> <p>Visitors' permits are not usually linked to individual permits and it would not be possible to identify which ones related to which property/ permit holder. Even if that were possible the implied restriction on visitors is not likely to be acceptable to many residents.</p> <p>The parking impacts of new developments will continue to be given very careful consideration in the context of existing parking pressures in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Through analysis of current parking pressures, is not yet considered to be necessary to introduce a rationing policy on resident preferential parking permits. The permit scheme is fundamentally aimed at discouraging commuter parking and freeing up parking opportunities during the day for local residents and businesses within the zone. While there are a few parking 'hot-spots', all the town centre parking schemes are broadly managing to achieve this aim. If the pressure on day time parking were to deteriorate, then rationing the number of permits for each household would be a valid option to be considered in consultation with the local community.</p> <p>This is something over which we have no control. The Department for Transport guidelines on Parking Schemes states that 'Parking schemes should not inhibit the real solution and prevent proper off-highway parking'. So there is little we can do to prevent loss of on-street parking whether it is through residents creating parking space in their front gardens or from approved development.</p> <p>Although the permit scheme has helped to relieve this pressure, the parking pressure remains when there are more cars than available road space. No scheme can guarantee to residents or their visitors that a parking space will always be available in the preferred location or at the required time.</p>

Comment/Suggestion	Action
<p>There is a particular need to park outside own home because of vandalism in the area</p>	<p>The problems reported of vandalism will be referred to the Beat/Community Police Officer for the area. Since the temporary CCTV camera was installed earlier this summer reports the incidents of vandalism have diminished.</p>
<p>Reinstate pavement parking in Rose Street and Pembury Grove as there is another footway opposite for pedestrians to use.</p>	<p>The Police, Fire Service and the refuse collection contractors Veolia were asked if they would support this suggestion.</p> <p>The Fire Service do not support this proposal for Rose Street or Pembury Grove mainly on safety grounds that removal of the double yellow lines would encourage persons to park in inappropriate positions and render fire tender access impossible. In the past there have been several incidents which have been difficult to resolve owing to this factor. The Police will not support any proposal for Rose Street or Pembury Grove that will lead to offences being committed. Veolia do not support the proposal for access and safety reasons.</p>
<p>Reduce DYL in Priory Road for more parking spaces.</p>	<p>Kent Police will not support the reduction in double yellow lines opposite the junction with Pembury</p> <p>There is potential to include a small increase in the length of parking bays in Priory Road from Goldsmid Road junction and towards the distribution depot - The Police and emergency services are happy that additional parking in this location does not compromise the flow of traffic or turning movements in and out of Pembury Grove and this will be progressed as part of phase 4.</p>
<p>Request for permission to use Russet Homes car park in Bridge Close and a suggestion to convert part of the Green in Pembury Grove for residents parking.</p>	<p>Both these locations are owned and maintained by Russet Homes. The car park is private and for tenants only. The use of the Green is under consideration by Russet Homes Development Department but not for creating car parking space</p>
<p>Dog Fouling on the Green (Russet Homes Land at Pembury Grove).</p>	<p>The information was passed to the dog warden following evidence from CCTV footage in June this year.</p>

<b>Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>Action</b>
Request for Double yellow lines in the alleyway between Pembury Grove and Rose Street to prevent parking causing obstruction	The status of this alleyway is being investigated and, if it is found to be public highway, further consideration can be given to ways of dealing with the obstruction.