

Local Parking Plan – Phase 4a

Proposals for Waiting Restrictions

*Preliminary consultation letters – 3rd December 2008.
Representations requested by 19th January 2009.*

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
AYLESFORD		
<p>Thorne Close, Blue Bell Hill Village – 1 hour restriction to prevent commuter parking and extended DYL around corner to promote access for refuse and emergency vehicles</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed with proposals to next stage of TRO without amendments</p>	<p>1. Remove proposal for extended DYL and replace with some SYL and/or RPP scheme which would not interfere so much with local residents' parking.</p>	<p>1. Parking now sometimes restricts access to property - including rear gate access for a resident of Maidstone Rd;</p> <p>2. There is adequate off-street parking, & visitors may park elsewhere;</p> <p>3. Proposals would improve access for both vehicles and pedestrians.</p>
<p>Robin Hood Lane (Upper) Blue Bell Hill Village</p> <p>Recommendation - Extend corner protection at Crematorium Entrance Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>No representations</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
Pratling Street, south side, east of Old Mill Lane – extend DYL	No representations	No representations
Hermitage Lane/Spur Road N. of Barming Station Corner protection and preserving turning area Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO	1. Not a private road for residents; 2. Parking is off carriageway and therefore does not interfere with sight lines; 3. Clean the road, to get extra width before expense of DYL	1. Verges badly damaged by commuter parking 2. Access to property restricted, on occasions ‘near misses have occurred. 3. Commuters park here rather than pay to park at Barming Station, where there is spare capacity. (Photographic evidence of site & the spare capacity in Station Car Park)
Coldharbour Lane, S. of Junction 5 Interchange Corner and access protection to motorway lagoon Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO	No representations	1. Current parking practices can cause danger and obstruction; 2. Parking by commuters and dog-walkers causes considerable problems when manoeuvring large Highway Agency vehicles; 3. On occasions not able to gain access to maintain balancing pond because of parking (pond ensures pollutants from M20 do not discharge to watercourses) (Supporters: Gallagher & InterRoute)
Friars View/Mill Hall	No representations	1. Pavement parking at the junction forces

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
<p>Corner and bend protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>		<p>pedestrians onto carriageway especially when pushing a push chair.</p> <p>2. This is especially hazardous, when parked vehicles restrict pedestrian visibility.</p> <p>3. Three ‘parked’ cherry pickers can cause ‘gridlock’ especially when HGV lorries use route – and there are implications for level crossing.</p>
<p>Teapot Lane/ A20London Road</p> <p>Corner protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>No representations</p>
<p>Teapot Lane/Elm Walk junction</p> <p>Corner Protection to preserve sight lines for school crossing patrol</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>1. No benefit in putting these in place – the real problem lies with cars parking both sides of the road at school times, Suggests parking bans between 8 - 9.30 am and 2.30 – 4 pm to clear the road for school buses</p> <p>2. Would like single yellow lines so residents can park on corner during evening and weekends. Parking problems caused by school employees parking in the road</p>	<p>No representations</p>
<p>Quarry Wood Industrial Estate</p>	<p>Letter neither supports nor objects to proposals,</p>	<p>1. RBS has no objection providing work was undertaken at a convenient time (for</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
<p>Corner and access protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed with proposals to next stage of TRO and monitor parking patterns</p>	<p>1. Lack of parking spaces no where for parking to transfer.</p> <p>2. HGVs park on pavements and DYL,</p> <p>3. Pavements too wide in Wealden Way (not many pedestrians) narrow f/w to allow more parking.</p>	<p>them).</p> <p>2. A request for proposed DYL to be extended a further 25 yards in Lake Road, north of access road to BHS Stores.</p>
DITTON		
<p>Orchard Grove/Cobdown Close</p> <p>Corner protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO – monitor the adjoining areas for evidence of obstructive parking and if justified add onto list Phase 5</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>Three letters with conditional support, including P.C. asking for DYL proposals to be extended:</p> <p>a. on west side of Orchard Grove;</p> <p>b. on south side of Cobdown Close</p> <p>c. Up to and around bend in Cobdown Close</p>
<p>LondonRoad/Bradbourne Lane</p> <p>Corner protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>1. Ditton P.C. generally support proposal.</p>
EAST MALLING		
<p>Cottenham Close/Mill Street</p> <p>Corner Protection</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>1. Hazardous for drivers trying to exit Cottenham Close, especially when forced onto 'wrong' side of road.</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
<p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>		<p>2. Request advice when this will be put in place.</p> <p>3. Access to Cottenham Close difficult for large vehicles, and in the past this has resulted in garden wall being knocked down.</p>
<p>WATERINGBURY</p>		
<p>Glebe Meadows leading to Allington Gardens</p> <p>a)Corner protection</p> <p>b)Prevention of parking on a bend</p> <p>c)Protection of turning area</p> <p>Analysis - There are no representations about difficulties with access from the Ambulance, Police or KF&R.</p> <p>The refuse vehicles operators state that the turning area is difficult to manoeuvre at any time - with or without cars in place</p> <p>Local responses indicate that there remain a few concerns about occasional safety issues. The main problem is seen as inconsiderate or opportunist parking by</p>	<p>1. Residents of Bow Terrace will now start parking outside my house;</p> <p>2. Only solution is ‘residents only ‘parking.</p> <p>3. Protest about proposals, but asks for DYL in turning area opp. house;</p> <p>4. Difficulty gaining access to property because of parked cars opposite so needs DYL in this location;</p> <p>5. Predicts operational difficulties for staff on call if cannot park on bend;</p> <p>6. Parking situation does not justify DYL;</p> <p>7. DYL means a loss of much valued parking spaces without gain in terms of safety or access;</p>	<p>1. Should assist traffic movements;</p> <p>2. Proposals are the only way to resolve parking problems;</p> <p>3. Support of proposals generally, but asking for ‘Residents only’ parking.</p> <p>4. Support DYL in Scout Hut Access Road.</p> <p>5. The situation has improved significantly since the property on Tonbridge Road is restored for family use</p> <p>Parish Council suggest ‘Keep Clear’ markings are used in the first instance to assist with emergency vehicles and defer other proposals subject to review after further monitoring</p> <p>PETITION</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
<p>residents from adjoining roads. There is insufficient evidence or support from residents to indicate the need to install enforceable parking restrictions</p> <p>Recommendation – Install ‘Keep Clear’ markings in turning head and continue to monitor the parking patterns in remainder of the road. Defer proposals subject to further monitoring to assess evidence to support the need for restrictions at these and other suggested sites</p> <p>Advise residents of this action</p>	<p>8. Proposals won't solve problems, but suggests DYL outside 14/34 Glebe Meadows would help;</p> <p>9. Will not resolve parking problems – only transfer them to other locations;</p> <p>10. Parking by Tonbridge Road residents exacerbate problems – only solution is ‘residents only’ parking;</p> <p>11. Parking ‘calms’ traffic speeds;</p> <p>12. Parking will transfer to outside my property</p> <p>13. Creates enforcement issues</p> <p>14. DYL will not alleviate parking problems;</p> <p>15. Never a serious problem with parking or obstruction;</p> <p>16. Never heard of any problems for environmental & emergency services, or furniture removal vans (pantechicons);</p> <p>17. Proposals would only move the problems on, but suggest DYL on bend opposite the layby where the post box is, and also extend existing DYL (by one car length) at Bow Road junction in Glebe Meadow.</p>	<p>Signed by 21 households (out of 31 properties) the petition calls for ‘residents only’ parking and contains supporting statement for the current proposals.</p> <p>(However a number of signatories supporting the proposals also have made separate representations <u>against</u> the proposals. The Organiser of the petition is advised of this has since written to withdraw the petition</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
	<p>18. Existing parking already makes it difficult to negotiate private accesses – proposals would exacerbate this.</p> <p>19. Consider restricting parking by commercial vehicles.</p>	
<p>Love Lane/Tonbridge Road, Wateringbury</p> <p>Corner Protection</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>Support from Parish Council</p>
<p>HADLOW</p>		
<p>Tonbridge Road/Carpenters Lane</p> <p>Corner and Bend protection of sight lines</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>1. Does not consider that existing parking justifies introducing DYL. If they have to be introduced they should go no further than Kenwood Court.</p> <p>2. Costs not justified, money could be better spent elsewhere in Hadlow (potholes)</p> <p>3. Support proposals to Kenward Court, but extending further will exacerbate problems.</p>	<p>1. Near miss, when parked vehicles in Carpenters Lane, obstructed sightlines out of The Maltings.</p> <p>2. Arriva support proposals</p> <p>3. Parish Council – Support.</p> <p>4. Supports DYL on junctions only with Carpenters Lane and the Maltings. Does not support the proposal to protect the bend on the grounds that the DYL will</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
		urbanise the area.
TONBRIDGE		
<p>Yardley Park Road/Chiltern Way</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>1. Proposals do not go far enough, and will only transfer parking further into Chiltern Way.</p> <p>2. Consider extending restricted waiting (e.g. no waiting before 10.00am), which would stop long-time parking so that roads could be swept etc.</p>	<p>Proposal should prevent inconsiderate parking (possibly with dog bone).</p>
<p>Waterloo Road/Douglas Road</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>No representations</p>
WROTHAM		
<p>White Hill (slip road to London Road)</p> <p>Recommendation – Proceed to next stage of TRO</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>1. Wrotham PC fully support proposal, and say that they have had many representations from residents asking for DYL at this location.</p>
HILDENBOROUGH		
<p>Nizels Lane/Philpots Lane</p> <p>Extended corner protection to prevent obstruction to through traffic (commuter parking)</p> <p>Recommendations - Proceed to next</p>	<p>No representations</p>	<p>1. Resident, who first raised the issue, supports proposals alleging that parked commuter cars are hazardous, and restricts access for farming vehicles.</p> <p>Hildenborough Parish Council ‘No</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
stage of TRO		comments to make'
BURHAM		
<p>Rochester Road</p> <p>1. Outside Frosts Garage Obstruction of footway and sight lines</p> <p>2. Old School Close – corner protection</p> <p>Assessment - Although the Borough Council does not condone the practice of obstructive parking on footways, across sight lines or around junctions, there has been little supporting evidence during the monitoring period to maintain the continuing local claims that these are persistent problems and not just occasional opportunist parking.</p> <p>Recommendation - The proposals for both sites to be deferred. Should further complaints about obstructive parking be received the Borough Council may need to revisit this proposal at some time in the future. The local Police are to be asked to take a more positive role in assisting to deter parking on footways and unprotected junctions and the complainants and objectors be</p>	<p>1. Parking assists traffic calming;</p> <p>2. Poorly served by public transport and so people need their cars and there is Inadequate off-street parking facilities at north end of village;</p> <p>3. Windmill PH will be adversely affected by proposal, and proposals should be opposed if they attach village amenities.</p> <p>4. Proposals would not serve any purpose.</p> <p>5. Unnecessary;</p> <p>6. No consistent parking on pavement, and anyway few pedestrians use the facility.</p> <p>7. Never received any complaints about parking obscuring visibility.</p> <p>8. DYL will urbanise village, which was voted Kent Village of the Year</p> <p>Parish Council Comments:</p> <p>1) The PC identifies parking on footway by cars owned by residents in Downsview and</p>	<p>No representations in support of proposals</p>

Location	Comments - Objections	Comments in Support
<p>advised accordingly. The marking of an advisory 'KEEP CLEAR' across the access point to Old School Lane may deter future problems</p>	<p>has requested residents to refrain from this practice and residents have agreed. Therefore DYL are not necessary</p> <p>2) Object overall to DYL cluttering streets with unnecessary DYL and does not support the request from residents of School Lane. The PC has visited the site and viewed the areas and there is not a problem</p>	