

*The Kent County Council (Various Roads, Tonbridge & Malling) (Waiting Restrictions and On-Street Parking)
(Amendment No 2) Order 2010*

Table of Representations to Parking Management Proposals – Phase 5

Date Notices Erected on site: 25th and 26th May 2010
Notice Published in Kent on Sunday 30th May 2010
End of Public Consultation Period 21st June 2010

General Responses from Statutory Consultees	
Kent Police	No site specific comments but expectations that all the proposals will meet the necessary criteria and regulations
Kent Fire & Rescue	“There are a number of locations where parked vehicles present a problem but where access for the Fire Appliances is severely restricted. Forward access can be maintained where the available road width remains at a minimum of 3.7 metres. It is necessary to allow additional road space/width to safely accommodate the length of vehicle when our drivers need to turn to negotiate staggered ranks of parked vehicles, sharp bends or junction access points”
Public Transport reps	No Response
Statutory Consultees – KCC County Councillors Borough Councillors Kent Ambulance Service Freight Transport Association/ Road Haulage Association	No Response No Response Site Specific Comments – See below No Response No Response No Response

Abbreviations:

DYL = double yellow lines (waiting prohibited at any time)

SYL = single yellow lines (various day time waiting restrictions)

SITE 1: Buckmore Park Main Entrance Road off Lord Lees Roundabout (West), and three subsequent entrances leading to Buckmore Park, Nil Desperandum Lorry Park and unnamed road south to Recreation Ground, Blue Bell Hill, Aylesford.

Problem: Extensive commuter parking on carriageway, footways and verges. This causes access and visibility problems, as well as verge erosion.

Proposal: DYL at main and three subsequent junctions, plus access road to Recreation Ground.

Proposal

- DYL on both sides of Main Entrance Road, from its junction with Lord Lees Roundabout in a westerly direction to private road leading to Nil Desperandum Lorry Park.
- DYL on both sides of access road leading to Buckmore Park, from its junction with the Main Entrance Road in a northerly direction for 20 metres.
- DYL on both sides of access road to Recreation Ground, from its junction with Main Entrance Road, in a southerly direction to gated access.

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 2: Church Street, Burham. Two locations:

- a. at its junction with Baker Street and**
- b. at the multiple access driveway to private parking area.**

Problem: Parking in these locations causes access and visibility difficulties.

Proposal

- DYL on south east side of Church Street, from a point 6 metres east of its junction with Baker Street in a westerly direction for 12 metres.
- DYL on south east side, from a point 10 metres north east of the south western boundary of No. 85 Church Street, in a south westerly direction for 20 metres.

Objections

Resident Objects to site b. of the proposal (*letter counter signed by three neighbours*).

Extracts of Comments Received

Certain properties have no designated parking areas, and they do not have front gardens which can be converted into hard standings.

Proposed DYL will increase speeds.

The public car park is inadequate and should be extended and also include CCTV.

Proposed DYL protect a private access to a private parking area (four properties).

Recommendation - Original proposal was adjusted to reflect representation made during informal consultation

Proceed with both sites as advertised in the interests of maintaining safety, access and visibility.

SITE 3: High Street, on east side, north of its junction with Knowle Road, Wouldham.

Problem: Parking makes turning corner difficult for large vehicles (especially buses) to negotiate. Boundary wall of nearby property damaged on a number of occasions.

Proposal Extend DYL on east side of High Street by 5 metres, to the boundary wall of 4/6 High Street. [see Annex 3]

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 4: High Street, at junction with Rectory Close, Wouldham.

Problem: Parking on and around junction causes visibility and access problems

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on west side of High Street, from a point 17 metres north of its junction with Rectory Close, in a southerly direction for 38 metres.
- DYL on both sides of Rectory Close, from its junction with the High Street, in a westerly direction for 10 metres.

Objections

One new Objection from a Resident.

Extracts of Comments Received

Parking in the area is already difficult, and this proposal will further increase inconvenience for residents.

**Recommendation - Original proposal was adjusted to reflect representation made during informal consultation
Proceed with proposal to protect the junction as advertised.**

SITE 5: Admiral Moore Drive, McKenzie Close, Bentley Close Aylesford.

Problem: Parking on Admiral Moore Drive by clients for chemist and doctors' surgery causes an obstruction, forcing overtaking traffic, onto the wrong side of road, into oncoming traffic turning in from Hall Road. There is a designated parking area, available nearby and disabled parking facilities are available in the Surgery Car Park.

Proposal

- DYL on both sides of Admiral Moore Drive, from its junction with Hall Road in an easterly direction to commencement of the designated car parking areas.
- DYL on both sides of Bentley Close, from its junction with Admiral Moore Drive in a northerly direction for 15 metres.
- DYL on both sides of McKenzie Close, from its junction with Admiral Moore Drive in a southerly direction for 10metres.

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 6: Bell Lane junction with Fernleigh Rise (north), Ditton.

Problem: Residents' parking causes visibility difficulties

Proposal DYL on west side of Bell Lane, from a point 15 metres north of its northern junction with Fernleigh Rise in a southerly direction for 30 metres. DYL of both sides of Fernleigh Rise, from its northern junction with Bell Lane, in a westerly direction for 10 metres.

No Objections.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 7: Beech Road, East Mallings.

Problem: Parking obstructs turning movements and causes access/exit difficulties to the school especially for essential service, delivery and emergency vehicles.

Proposal

- DYL on both sides of Western Arm of Beech Road, for its entire length, including turning head and northern exit road from school.
- DYL on west side of Eastern Arm to Beech Road, from southern entrance road to school, in a northerly direction to a point 15 metres north of its junction with the Western Arm of Beech Road.

Objections

Two Residents Continue to Object.

Extracts of Comments Received

Parking is at a premium, with 17 properties requiring parking, 12 of which do not have a Beech Road frontage, and therefore no off street parking facility.
Many of these residents own more than one vehicle.
There is a garage block, but not all are rented out because Russett Homes are too dear. Without providing alternative parking areas, these proposals will simply transfer parking to nearby roads.
There is no point in putting down DYL which will only be enforced intermittently – they won't be observed if they are not enforced.

Support

The Mallings School

The proposal will assist the school's on-site traffic management: so that the IN and OUT gates can be used at all times.

The Objectors have introduced no fresh issues from those that they raised at the informal consultation stage. The proposal was approved by the JTB in March in the knowledge that these objections were likely to be raised again during the formal stage. Hence the recommendation is to proceed with the scheme as proposed.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 8: Swallow Road, near junction with eastern junction with Kingfisher Road, Larkfield.

Problem: Persistent parking too close to this junction causes access obstruction, especially at each end of school day

Proposal

- DYL on western side of Swallow Road, from its junction with Kingfisher Road, in a northerly direction to a point opposite 29.8 metres south of 139/141 (to meet existing School Keep Clear markings),
- and on the eastern side, from its junction with Kingfisher Road, in a northerly direction for 20 metres.
-

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 9: High Street (A26), junction with private road to Surgery, Library, Primary School and Village Centre, Hadlow.

Problem: Parking on and around this junction in the High Street causes obstruction to access and visibility.

Proposal DYL on north west side of High Street, from a point 15 metres north east of its junction with the private road in a south easterly direction to Bus Stop Clearway.

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 10: Addlestead Road junction with Snoll Hatch Road, East Peckham.

Problem: Parking on and around the bend causes obstruction to sight lines. The Police have safety concerns about drivers forced to negotiate the bend on the 'wrong' side of road, where there is a danger of meeting oncoming traffic.

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on east side of Addlestead, from its junction with Snoll Hatch Road, in a northerly direction to the northern boundary of 10 Addlestead Road.
- DYL on the south side of Snoll Hatch Road, from a point at the boundary line of 125/127 in a westerly direction to the western boundary line of 127.
- DYL on the north side of Snoll Hatch Road, from the boundary line of 110/112 in a westerly direction to its junction with Snoll Hatch Road.

Objections

Objections from four residents

Extracts of Comments Received

Not needed. What little problems there are could be solved by existing powers.
The Council has no plans to find alternative parking for those displaced.
Parked cars are a form of traffic calming.
There are no safety benefits for traffic.
Proposals would be a huge inconvenience to residents as parking is at a premium.
Traffic speeds should be reduced and HGVs redirected.
There should be a police presence with speed camera to reduce speeds
'Re-active' speed limit signs should be introduced.
Buses should be re-routed via Chidley Cross Roads.
Proposals will cause more problems than they prevent.
DYL will be ignored.

Recommendation

The original proposal at the informal consultation stage was considerably reduced in scale to take on board representations from local residents.

The Board endorsed these amended proposals at the March meeting. Proceed with the proposals as advertised in the interests of safety.

SITE 11: Orchard Road junction with The Freehold, East Peckham.

Problem: Parking on the bend causes difficulties for larger vehicles, particularly for emergency and essential services.

There is a long history of attempts to resolve the obstruction problem at this location. A previous request to restrict parking on both sides of the bend was investigated by Kent County Council at the request of the Parish Council in 1991 and 2000.

As part of these investigations, the County Council assessed whether a one-way traffic movement would deal with the problem. However, it considered that it would be unsafe as a result of potential non-compliance and the increase in speed that such proposals inevitably lead to.

On both occasions the County Council recommended restricting parking in this area on the grounds of safety and access but the proposal was not implemented.

In 2009, the problem came once more to the fore. East Peckham Parish Council, the Police and the Kent Fire and Rescue all separately raised concerns about access difficulties when cars are staggered or parked both sides of the bend where The Freehold meets Orchard Road. There is limited off road parking available within the adjacent properties so it is customary for residents and their visitors to park partially on the footway, sometimes on both sides of the road during most evenings and weekends. This practice allows for normal domestic and small delivery vehicles to drive past with care, but generates concerns for emergency response or larger service or delivery vehicles which need a greater width of unobstructed carriageway width to negotiate the bend.

Following the June meeting of the Board earlier this year, the parking team investigated the preferred option of the local Member to have restrictions on the one side of the road only. In practice, this does not resolve the problem because the required turning arc for the long base emergency vehicles would still be compromised.

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on both sides of Orchard Road , from its junction with The Freehold in a southerly direction to the southern boundary of No. 28 Orchard Road.
- DYL on both sides of The Freehold, from its junction with Orchard Road, in a westerly direction to the boundary line of 64/66 The Freehold.

<u>Objections</u>	Extracts of Comments Received
Objections from six residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals have the potential for making parking problems worse. • A one-way traffic system should be considered. • Will exacerbate existing parking problems. • Walking greater distances from my car to my property at night would be a worry. • The cleaning and valeting of vehicles outside ones own property would be prevented. • Removing parked cars would increase traffic speeds, and increase the likelihood of an accident. Parked cars reduce traffic speeds. • No problems for emergency services, as access can be gained from either end. • Complete and utter waste of tax-payers money in current economic climate. • DYL will push parked vehicles further down the road, possibly causing double parking. • Proposals would not be enforced, so they would be a waste of public funds.
Petition - 91 signatures.	<p>“We the undersigned are concerned residents who urge for the planned waiting restrictions and on street parking outside the houses from 28 Orchard Road round to the Freehold both sides to be abolished”</p>
Parish Council	<p>“The Parish Council concurs with the views expressed by the residents of The Freehold and Orchard Road and is supportive of the objections expressed by the residents. This together with the petition has led the Parish Council to reconsider its views on the proposed waiting restrictions and it no longer supports the proposal.”</p>
Borough Councillor	<p>Does not support proposal – would support DYL on one side only</p>
<u>Support</u>	
Kent Fire & Rescue	<p>Confirms that it does continue to have access concerns when cars parked evenings and weekends on bend as the fire tender needs additional road-width to accommodate whole length of vehicle when negotiating this bend</p>

Support for the proposal from one of the residents	
--	--

The recommendation in this case is very difficult to formulate. The correct technical solution, taking into account the risks to human safety of compromised access for the emergency services, particularly an ambulance or a fire tender is self evident. However, this is counter-balanced by objection and petition from local residents and no support for the proposal from the Parish Council or the local ward Member. Given these circumstances, I am reluctantly moved to suggest that the proposal be held in abeyance for the time being and only revisited if prompted by a request from one of the emergency services evidenced by details of a specific access incident.

Recommendation

Hold the proposal in abeyance pending specific prompting by the emergency services.

SITE 12: Pound Road, east of Fell Mead to Post Office, East Peckham.

Problem: Existing SYL do not protect the junction from obstructive parking at all times

Proposal in Detail: DYL on south west side, from a point opposite the north flank wall of the Post Office (No. 9) for a distance of 47 metres in a north westerly direction to the southern kerb line of Fell Mead (NB. This replaces existing single yellow lines).

No Objections.	
----------------	--

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 13: The Chase junctions with Severn Close and Derwent Road, Tonbridge.

Problem: Parking on and around junctions and the inside of a sharp bend creates a danger to other road users.

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on both sides of The Chase, from its junction with Derwent Road in an easterly direction for 10 metres.
- DYL on both sides of The Chase, from a point 30 metres north of its junction with Severn Close, in a south westerly direction to a point in line with the boundary line of Nos. 54 and 54a.
- DYL on east side of Derwent Road, from a point 20 metres north of its junction with The Chase, in a southerly direction for 40 metres.
- DYL on both sides of Severn Close, from its junction with The Chase, in a south easterly direction for 10 metres.

Objections

One Resident maintains the Objection raised at the informal consultation stage.

Extracts of Comments Received

- DYL are unnecessary as parking can be accommodated on this wide road.
- Parking on the road does not present a hazard to other users.
- DYL should be considered on one side of road only.
- There have never been any accidents or problems generated by parked vehicles.

Notwithstanding the objection, there is a persistent safety problem at this location that fully warrants the proposed waiting restrictions.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised in the interests of safety.

SITE 14: River Walk, junction with High Street, Tonbridge.

Problem: Parking obstructs access to Car Park.

Proposal DYL on both sides of River Walk, from its junction with the High Street in an easterly direction for 15 metres to entrance of Car Park.

No Objections.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 15: Royal Rise, Tonbridge.

Problem: Parking by pupils during term time causes obstruction to essential service and delivery vehicles and inconvenience to residents.

Proposal

- DYL on east side, from its junction with Royal Avenue in a northerly direction for 55metres.
- DYL on west side, from its junction with Royal Avenue in a northerly direction for 25 metres.
- DYL on both sides, from the private road leading to Hill view School for Girls, in a north westerly direction for 20 metres.
- SYL on east side from a point 55 metres north of its junction with Royal Avenue to a point 20 metres north west of the private road leading to Hillview School for Girls. (no waiting Mon – Fri between 9.00am and 4.00pm)
- SYL on west side from a point 25 metres north of its junction with Royal Avenue to a point 20 metres north west of the private road leading to Hillview School for Girls. (no waiting Mon – Fri between 9.00am and 4.00pm)

No Objections.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 16: Mountfield Park junction with Kings Road, Tonbridge.

Problem: Persistent Parking on and around the junction causes obstruction and compromises visibility and safety

Proposal DYL on north side of Kings Road, from a point 15 metres east of its junction with Mountfield Park in a westerly direction for 35 metres. DYL on both sides of Mountfield Park, from its junction with Kings Road, in a northerly direction for 10 metres.

	<u>Extracts of Comments Received</u>
Objection Objection from one resident	Proposal doesn't go far enough to alleviate the traffic problems - will exacerbate them. There are already problems because train users and workers at Tonbridge Police Station using the road, and this situation will not be improved by this proposal. Non residents should be discouraged by introducing a resident's preferential parking scheme.

Recommendation

Proceed as advertised and monitor to establish if further action required.

SITE 17: Upper Hayesden Lane junction with Masefield Way, Brook Street, and Lower Haysden Lane, Tonbridge.

Problem: Persistent Parking in these locations causes obstruction for emergency services, increase in student parking obstructs shuttle bus drop-off area.

Proposal

- DYL on both sides of Brook Street from a point 15 metres west of its junction with Scott Road in a westerly direction to its junction with Upper Hayesden Lane NB. This extends existing
- DYL. Upper Hayesden Lane from its junction with Brook Street in a westerly direction to a point 30 metres west of its junction with Masefield Way.
- DYL on both sides of Lower Haysden Lane 'access' road.
- DYL on south side of Lower Haysden Lane (including all of exit road) in a north westerly direction to a point 45 metres west of the access road from Upper Hayesden Lane.
- DYL on north side of Lower Haysden Lane exit road, from its junction with Lower Hayesden Lane in a north-westerly direction for 15 metres and from a point 68 metres north east of its junction with Upper Hayesden Lane, in a north westerly direction to a

point 45 metres west of the access road from Upper Hayesden Lane.

- SYL (waiting restriction Mon – Fri 10.30am– 11.00am) on north side of Lower Haysden Lane (exit slip road to Upper Hayesden Lane) from a point 15 metres north west of its junction with Upper Hayesden Lane in a north-westerly direction for 53 metres.
- DYL on both sides of Masefield Way, from its junction with Upper Hayesden Lane in a southerly direction for 10 metres.

No Objections

Support
Kent Fire & Rescue

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 18: Lower Haysden Lane at junction with Entrance to Haysden Country Park, Tonbridge.

Problem: Visitors to Country Park use nearby road rather than pay to park in the designated car park Country Park Car Park. Parking too near the access and around the bend creates access, visibility and safety problems

Proposal DYL on both sides of Lower Haysden Lane, from a point 30 metres south west of the Entrance Road to Haysden Country Park (including return into Haysden Country Park) in a north easterly direction for 100 metres.

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 19: Audley Avenue and Audley Rise, Tonbridge.

Problem: Parking on both sides of the road causes obstruction to through traffic

Proposal DYL on north side of Audley Avenue, from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Alders Meadow, in a westerly direction to a point opposite the boundary line with 71/73 Audley Avenue (this joins up the gap in existing DYL). South side of Audley Avenue, from its junction with Pembroke Road to a point 15 metres east of its junction with Ives Road (joins up with existing DYL). West side of Audley Rise, from a point 15 metres south of its junction with Audley Avenue in a southerly direction for a distance of 10 metres (NB. This extends existing DYL to a point that matches the terminal point of DYL on the opposite side of road).

Objections

Three residents have maintained the objections raised during the informal consultation stage related to the proposed DYL in Audley Rise.

Extracts of Comments Received

There will be no room for residents to park.
Fishermen, dog walkers, cyclists, who will not pay to use the Car Park, already cause problems in Audley Avenue and Audley Rise even though the Car Park is usually empty.
It will make a bad situation worse.
The proposal to make DYL begin/end at the same point on both sides of Audley Rise will encourage parking up to that point which will cause problems for larger vehicles.
No consideration has been given to requests for free parking in the Car Park, or to a residents parking scheme.
Too many visitors to the Country Park are using our roads to park in order to avoid parking charges, often when the Car Park is empty.
It is reasonable that we should be able to park near to our house
Loss of two parking spaces which at the moment are always full and this will have a knock on effect on all residents.

Recommendation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 20: Leigh Road and Stocks Green Road, Hildenborough.

Problem: Parking at each end of the school day on and around the junction and both sides of the road outside Stocks Green Primary School, causes obstruction and increases safety risks at times when there is a high number of vulnerable pedestrians in the area.

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on both sides of Stocks Green Road, from its junction with Leigh Road in a westerly direction for 20 metres.
- DYL on west side of Leigh Road, from a point 20 metres south of its junction with Stocks Green Road in a northerly direction for 40 metres.
- SYL on west side of Leigh Road, from a point 20 metres north of its junction with Stocks Green Road in a northerly direction to the northern side of Streamside Close (waiting prohibited between 8.00am and 9.00am and between 3.00pm and 4.00pm).
- SYL on the east side of Leigh Road, from a point 20 metres north of its junction with Stocks Green Road (opposite) in a southerly direction for 32 metres (waiting prohibited between 8.00am and 9.00am and between 3.00pm and 4.00pm).

Objection

Objection received from Hildenborough Parish Council.

Extracts of Comments Received

The waiting restrictions are unnecessary: they will restrict adjacent residents parking. However, the corner protection at Stocks Green Road is supported.

At the informal consultation stage, the Parish Council objected to the proposal to manage parking generated by school traffic with weekday daytime parking restrictions along short lengths of Leigh Road. The original proposal was adjusted to meet to a degree some of the concerns by the Parish Council and this involved reducing the restricted times to match the parking restrictions times operating on the adjacent "School Keep Clear" markings.

There have been persistent parking problems around the school entrance and the Borough Council has been working for a number of years with the Police, Kent Highways, and the Primary School to incrementally introduce a series of small but effective traffic and safety enhancements. The proposal is the latest phase of this incremental approach.

The identified need for residents to park on the road during peak school dropping off and pick up times is low as most have off road parking facilities. Moreover, residents report that they are regularly inconvenienced by obstruction of driveways and sight lines where kerbside parking is unregulated at peak times.

The primary reason for this proposal is the need to manage the roadside parking area near the school to minimise conflict with normal traffic movements and to address concerns about child pedestrian safety at each end of the school day. This makes it imperative that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

Recommendation - Original proposal was adjusted to reflect representation made during informal consultation

Proceed with proposal as advertised

SITE 21: Brookmead junction with Meadway, Hildenborough.

Problem: Parking on and around the junction causes obstruction

Proposal :

- DYL on west side of Brookmead, from a point 15 metres north of its junction with Meadway in southerly direction for 30 metres.
- DYL on both sides of Meadway, from its junction with Brookmead in a westerly direction for 15 metres

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 22: Brookmead junction with Greenview Crescent, Hildenborough.

Problem: Persistent parking on and around junction creates safety and access problems

Proposal:

- DYL on south side of Brookmead, from a point 15 metres east of its western junction with Greenview Crescent in a westerly direction for 30 metres.
- DYL on both sides of Greenview Crescent, from its western junction with Brookmead, in a southerly direction for 10 metres.

No Objections

Recommendation

Proceed with proposals as advertised

SITE 23: Foxbush, Hildenborough.

Problem: Parking on and around the junction and outside St John's Community Centre causes obstruction and access difficulties.

Proposal DYL on both sides of Foxbush, from its junction with Tonbridge Road (B245) in a north westerly direction to a point at the east boundary of No. 20 Foxbush.

Objections

Objection received from Hildenborough Parish Council

Extracts of Comments Received

PC considers that the entrance area (to Church Hall) should not be restricted and a dropping off area with parking for the disabled should be provided.

The Parish Council raised no objection at the informal consultation stage. The proposal was prompted by police concerns about regular problems of obstruction caused by inconsiderate parking too close to the junction, access to the hall and car park entrance.

The Parish Council prefers that a 'drop off' area in front of the Church be installed to assist with elderly and disabled parking and access.

The reasons behind this request are fully supported and it has been explained to the Parish Council that drop-off areas that operate outside normal working days and times, are notoriously difficult to effectively manage or enforce. Drop-off areas are largely disregarded when organisations have regular functions late into the evening or at weekends. Double yellow lines do already support access needs for less able bodied drivers as they contain exemptions which allow stopping for passengers to board or alight and for blue badge holders to park for up to 3 hours. Consequently, the recommended approach is to confirm the proposals as advertised.

Recommendation

Original proposal was adjusted to reflect representation made during informal consultation. Proceed with proposal as advertised.

SITE 24: Lower Street, Hildenborough.

Problem: Increase in commuter parking causes visibility and access problems for through traffic including agricultural vehicles and equipment.

Proposal [see Annex 3]

- DYL on north side, from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Rings Hill in a westerly direction to a point 20 metres west of Little Lucy's Farmhouse entrance (this extends existing DYL).
- DYL on south-side, from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Rings Hill in a westerly direction for 20 metres (this extends existing DYL).
- DYL on the south side, from a point 70 metres west of Rings Hill in a westerly direction for 25 metres.
- DYL on the south side, from a point 135 metres west of Rings Hill in a westerly direction for 90 metres.
-

Objections

Extracts of Comments Received

Objection from two commuters.

Where will commuters park if they don't want to pay the huge fee of £5 a day at the Station Car Park? I already pay £4k a year to commute to London, and can't afford to pay an extra £1300 a year in Car Park fees.

This is just a money making exercise for force drivers into the Car Park.

It is perfectly safe for traffic to park and there are no problems for cars passing each other.

It is a very quiet, wide road, with little development surrounded by fields and little traffic.

There is no street lighting so female commuters are being put a risk having to walk further to find their car.

There is no need to install DYL on this unclassified route, which has more than enough width for its operation.

Even with parked cars on this stretch of road there is in excess of 4.00 metres of carriageway available for moving traffic

Support

Two Residents Support.

Lower Street is a narrow country lane which in most places is only passable by one vehicle at a time. Cars are parked there by commuters using the nearby Hildenborough Railway Station, but who do not wish to pay to use the extensive facilities at that location.

There are safety issues for pedestrians who are forced to walk on the road with no footway. At night, this problem is made worse by the absence of street lighting which renders such people almost invisible.

The nose to tail parking, with no passing spaces, results in traffic having to reverse for up to 100 yards to either a blind bend or back to the junction at Rings Hill.

Larger vehicles such as delivery trucks and agricultural machinery are particularly difficult to accommodate with these parked vehicles

Farm vehicles use the road several times a day, especially during silage and harvest times, and as they tend to be wider than the average car meeting a vehicle approaching from the opposite direction is very dangerous.

Recommendation - Original proposal was adjusted to reflect representation made during informal consultation

Proceed with amended proposal as advertised.