

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**18 June 2009**

**Report of the Director of Planning Transport and Leisure**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)**

**1 PARKING ACTION PLAN – PROGRESS REPORT**

**Summary**

**The report provides an update of current work of the Parking Action Plan and focuses on the following:-**

- **The Snodland Local Parking Plan – implementation.**
- **The general parking improvement programme, Phase 4a – implementation.**
- **The general parking improvement programme for 2009/10, Phase 5 – initial consultation.**
- **The parking review arising from the development of West Kent College – Initial assessment.**

**1.1 Introduction**

**1.1.1 The current work on the Parking Action Plan is focussed on the following schemes:**

- **Snodland Local Parking Plan –implementation stage**
- **Phase 4a of the Parking Action Plan - considering formal objections to the proposals**
- **Phase 5 of the Parking Action Plan - developing the next Phase at individual sites for 2009/10.**
- **Parking conditions on the streets around West Kent College - reviewing the resident consultation report issued by the developer.**

## 1.2 The Snodland Local Parking Plan

1.2.1 The Board approved the draft Snodland Local Parking Plan at the last meeting in March and this is now being implemented. This requires formal Traffic Regulation Order to formalise the parking arrangements and the procedure involves a 21 day period of statutory public advertising. This started on 11 May and ended on 1 June.

1.2.2 The results of the statutory consultation for the parking Order are reproduced at **Annex 1**. In summary there have been 11 representations of which there are 9 comments and letters of support with two formal objections. One in the form of a petition entitled:

**“ We the undersigned, object to the one-way traffic scheme proposed in Bramley Road. Our reasons”**

- **There is no need for this as there is not currently much of a delay caused by 2-way traffic**
- **One-way will cause people to drive faster**
- **One way traffic will not make parking easier**
- **The proposed one-way system will mean driving through other narrow/congested roads to reach/leave Bramley Road**
- **We will have less choice over our route in and out of the road**

1.2.3 The proposal for a one way system is something that has been requested for a number of years. The road is narrow and the majority of the properties are terraced houses where there is little provision off-street parking. Parking on both sides of the road means that two-way traffic is compromised. The suggestion of a one-way system with marked uncontrolled bays was proposed by local people to ease congestion and make the best use of available parking space in the road. The Member Steering Group felt that additional consultation with the residents of Bramley Road and Recreation Close was required to alert them to this specific proposal in the Parking Plan and was carried out with all residents of Bramley Road and Recreation Avenue during February. The results of this additional consultation were reported to Members of the Board in March as a supplementary report and the recommendation to introduce single way working in Bramley Road was endorsed

1.2.4 The petition that carried the Objection was not to the parking Order but to the proposed one-way traffic flow system in Bramley Road. A separate Order to introduce the one-way system in Bramley Road is required as this is a moving traffic Order and has to be processed separately to the parking Order. The one-way Order was programmed as a follow-on process once the parking Order was confirmed

- 1.2.5 There are 63 registered properties in Bramley Road and the Petition is signed by representatives of 27 households. Four properties are currently unoccupied so the petition represents 46% of the households. Although the petitioners state they were only able to speak to 40 households this still represents a significant number of residents who indicate they do not want a one-way system.
- 1.2.6 Closer inspection of the petition does reveal that some signatories also wrote in support of the one-way system during the extended consultation exercise carried out in February this year. This is in contrast to the previous rounds of consultation, casts doubt on local support or need for a one-way system and is contrary to the previous messages which demonstrated local support for the proposals.
- 1.2.7 The petition does not challenge the parking management proposals and there is no reason why they should not proceed as advertised. After careful consideration, the parking proposals should therefore be implemented and a further round of individual consultation carried out with residents of Bramley Road and Recreation Avenue to determine if there is a clear majority of support to proceed with one-way traffic flows and the petitioners advised accordingly.
- 1.2.8 The individual objection received relates to the introduction of double yellow lines for highway safety purposes to protect the junction at Roberts Road and Godden Road. I have considered the objection carefully against the original purpose of these proposed parking restrictions and do not find any justification to change the advice given and the view that the Steering Group came to. On this basis I recommend no change to the order in this respect

### **1.3 Parking Action Plan – Phase 4a (Various Locations)**

- 1.3.1 The phased programme is a compilation of the many requests received for parking management interventions at various sites across the Borough and which are located outside those areas identified as ones where a more comprehensive local parking plan approach is required.
- 1.3.2 The schedule is being added to regularly as a result of requests from local members, residents and businesses. In these more recent stages, the nature of the parking problems is becoming progressively more intractable and, as a consequence, the informal consultation stage described at the last meeting has been introduced to test and refine the ideas being proposed to address the particular problems in a more flexible and responsive way than is possible during a formal statutory consultation stage.
- 1.3.3 This has proved to be a worthwhile exercise and it has helped shape and improve proposals to make them fit more closely to local expectations even, in some cases, where it resulted in a recommendation of ‘no action required’. At the last meeting of the Board, the results of the consultation at some 19 sites were considered and the recommended proposals at each of these sites were endorsed. Good though the informal consultation might be, there remains the

potential for those who disagree with what is proposed to submit an objection at the formal statutory stage of the process. Phase 4a has reached the formal advert stage and **Annex 2** illustrates the responses received during Statutory Consultation period between 5 April and 6 May.

- 1.3.4 Two sites have received unwithdrawn objections. One concerns the proposals for the junction of Elm Walk and Teapot Lane, Aylesford. The other relates to the single track spur road leading off Hermitage Lane near Barming Station. This short length of road was created after a section of the original road was improved and realigned in the late 1980s.
- 1.3.5 A commentary on each of these objections is contained in the annex. Effectively, the Board is being invited to reassess matters that it has already considered and on which it has already resolved its position. While this might be a little repetitive, as far as process is concerned, it is not of any consequence compared to the benefits of running a separate informal public consultation stage that is so valuable in refining proposals and ensuring general local support and it fits in well with the way that the Local Parking Plan projects have been implemented. It is worth noting also that a number of objections were not followed up when the purposes and details of the proposals were explained and these dropped out of the system as a result.
- 1.3.6 In the present case, the issue to be considered is whether anything materially new has been submitted in the two formal objections. After careful consideration, I do not believe that there has been and that the parking management measures proposed are an effective way of resolving the problems that the local residents brought to the Council's attention and sought remedy for. The proposals should therefore be implemented as advertised and the objectors informed accordingly.

#### **1.4 Phase 5 of the Parking Action Plan ( Various Locations)**

- 1.4.1 There are sufficient further requests to warrant further parking management work within a Phase 5 and this is reproduced at **Annex 3**. It is an unrefined schedule of requests from local people, County and Borough Members and Parish Councils that has only had the most preliminary of assessments. As such, it is not possible to provide any indication of whether what is requested has any merit or will lead to specific proposals. However, it provides an indication of the breadth and scope of the matters that continue to be forwarded to the Borough Council for attention and it parallels the programme of the more comprehensive approach to our local parking plans.
- 1.4.2 The sites will be monitored and assessed in the coming months to confirm what parking management solutions, if any, might be appropriate. If there are, these will be shared with the local community through an informal consultation exercise to assess what local support there is for action. Subject to how this proceeds, there will be reports to the Board when required.

## 1.5 West Kent College

- 1.5.1 A condition of the Planning Consent for the development of this site required the developer to carry out a programme of consultation with residents on the roads surrounding the campus. Parking surveys have been carried out and a questionnaire delivered to all properties to encourage feedback on parking conditions in the area. The exercise was carried out by consultants for the college in March and April. The initial working draft report with outline recommendations is expected very shortly. This will be discussed with local members as soon as it is received
- 1.5.2 The Board is reminded that there will be another round of consultation with the local community to see if there are any adjustments necessary or further comments on the development of their suggestions and ideas into a draft Parking Plan. I will provide the Board with an update on the response from residents at the next meeting of the Board

## 1.6 Legal Implications

- 1.6.1 The Borough Councils powers to carry out parking management derive from the existing contractual arrangement with Kent County Council

## 1.7 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.7.1 The cost of implementing the works on the Parking Action Plan are to be met within existing Borough Council capital and revenue budgets

## 1.8 Risk Assessment

- 1.8.1 A risk factor is the effect of displaced vehicles. There is alternative off-road parking at Barming Station Car Park and valid roadside parking opportunity near to the junction with Teapot Lane and Elm Walk so the proposed course of action is low risk.

## 1.9 Recommendations

- 1.9.1 Snodland Local Parking Plan **BE IMPLEMENTED** as advertised and proposals for one-way traffic flows in Bramley Road deferred to determine with a final round of consultation if there is a majority view and the Petitioners advised accordingly
- 1.9.2 The parking management measures proposed for Phase 4a of the Parking Action Plan **BE IMPLEMENTED** as advertised and that the Objectors be advised accordingly.

The Director of Planning, Transport and Leisure confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

contact: Karole Reynolds

Parking Action Plan – Phase 4a/Consultation  
Residents responses and Plan/Photographs of sites

Steve Humphrey  
Director of Planning Transport and Leisure