

Joint Transportation Board 29 November 2010

Steering Group - 11 November 2010

East Malling Parking Review 2nd Consultation Responses (27 September – 18 October)

Attendance at Drop in Sessions

Tuesday 12 October - 63

Saturday 16 October - 104

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
Beech Road	DYL by school gate by side of 23 – these can be removed as cars can park there without problem – will need Access Protection Marking to protect driveway to No 23 Would like dog bone across drive as very close to school gate and DYL – No 21 and 19	Add request for APMs and review need to reduce existing DYL up to school gate

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
<p>Car Park Comments</p>	<p>What are the improvements to the car park – is it going to be better designed - is it going to be free for residents – are commuters going to be charged? Develop long stay pay and display car park to North of the village Institute for commuters. If it costs them as much to parking East Malling as it does to park in West Malling they will migrate to save on rail fare Good proposals regarding car park management Hardly any residents use the car park and would be inadvisable to push commuters onto the highway – Instead make better use of car park area itself and hardcore area to the rear – please consider cycle stores Should be free for all and used for commuters Proposals will move the commuters into The Grange Making resident only spaces will push more commuters onto roadside parking areas. The car park near the station is hardly used at all by non commuters vehicles – put covered cycle stands in car park – increase the capacity of car park with better lay out and use area at rear – install CCTV and better lighting Need for another car park when builders move in. The deal should include another car park About time this was all done Hand over control of car park to NCP or other private company as many rail car parks are managed this way Extend car park where the allotments are – the scrub behind the village hall and Beech Road would make ideal spot for village centre car park as not used for recreational activity Car Park presumed to be a station car park but intended for sole use of residents. This needs to be re assessed – Signage is incorrect There are usually 4 – 5 spaces available in car park midday and overnight only 7 -8 cars parked there Redesign Lay out – more spaces. Open up area at back land for more parking. Install CCTV. Upgrade lighting. Cycle rack area</p>	<p>Revise plan to show more accurate position of allotments in relation to car Park Include RPP in access road Consider cycle racks in Car Park Show provision of DPPB in access road and car park Explore viability of land use for extended car park to be considered within 5 year maintenance plan</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
	<p>Residents will suffer reduced or cancelled train services if you charge the same as other stations or remove free parking. Need to keep station viable for village – Commuters passing through village may well tell others or use the few businesses that remain</p> <p>Cost to the taxpayer of all this would be better spent on enlarging the car park and laying it out better to encourage commuters who park on roads to use it. If problem remain on roads these should be addressed with specific measures for those locations</p> <p>Charging residents £30 to park in car park may well make the scheme break even & be profitable for TMBC but not in the interests of residents</p> <p>If the car park was extended into wasteland would give more scope for reorganising on street parking</p> <p>Reserve and area of car park for villagers only by adding 4 hour limit</p> <p>Leave the remainder free for use by commuters</p> <p>Independent survey details submitted with opinion that not much need for change beyond extending the village car park into the spare land adjacent to the allotments, Redesign Car park spaces to get more cars spaces. With better CCTV, upgrade lighting, and cycle storage</p> <p>Access road to car park – resident parking bays need to be formalised</p> <p>Disabled persons parking bay provision in access road and in car park</p> <p>As long as residents needs are fully met in car park now and for the future</p>	
Chapel Street	<p>Provide shorter runs of unrestricted and resident parking in Chapel Street with more areas where traffic can pass</p> <p>Agree with recommendations for Chapel St</p> <p>Entrance to Maningham House needs some form of protection to have clear access for residents from footpath opposite</p> <p>Clear proposals in response to consultation</p> <p>Proposals fulfil the functions that I wished to see in Chapel Street i.e. maintaining</p>	<p>Revise and detail parking arrangements from Gillets Lane junction to show junction visibility and access arrangements</p> <p>Review extent of existing SYL in relation to width of road</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
	<p>parking to help reduce speed of traffic coming down hill and provide permit parking for residents. GOOD!</p> <p>Dismayed this parking is contemplated without first addressing the whole issue of traffic – suggestions will move the parking around and not relieve twin difficulties of parking + traffic</p> <p>Do not believe the commuter survey for Chapel Street is based on objective monitoring based on personal experiences... Busiest time is morning and evening rush hour so during the day there are plenty of spaces – so how is parking here impacting on businesses – Nothing in the proposals will change things for dust cart or buses – better to deter traffic and use by pass – what thought to traffic calming or reducing speeds – will increase speeds – need to control width restrictions – need to control car park first before reassessing residual problems – is it only residents of Chapel St who can apply for permits – is this to be for residents only – where are the signs going to go – will the lines be intrusive – who is going to enforce this?</p> <p>Would like to see measures put in place with the parking plan to limit volume and speed – often 50 mph+. Police requested to provide crash details – Recent Road closure on A228 increased volumes and gridlock.</p> <p>Proposals to prevent parking will increase speeds without traffic calming measures Villagers should have priority when parking to reduce speeds</p> <p>The parking arrangements are only a part of the overall strategy for traffic safety in the Village and cannot be dealt with as a separate issue. The overall plan must deal with all aspects. Full Consultation and historic detail has not been fully considered to provide fully detailed safety related areas. Will need much closer inspection see attached site plan for Chapel Street</p> <p>Available parking at top of Chapel St is not possible with the length of road, no of junctions/exits – needs further consideration</p> <p>Land near Manningham House – suggestions to Parish Council for options as privately run car park</p> <p>Various concerns over the speed of traffic and consequent damage to cars – Holistic approach required - flashing speed limit signs - speed bumps - and request</p>	

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
	<p>for 20 mph limit Too many bays – need more care for lines of sight as people don't give way Bays too long just need to top of hill</p>	
Chapman Way	<p>Request for extended corner protection opp No 30 Request that bend protected from parking towards St James Villas</p>	<p>Extend corner protection around bend and review the details of the proposed access protection arrangements for the School and Family Centre</p>
Cottenham Close	<p>What are the sanctions for anti-social parking on pavements in Cottenham Close?</p>	<p>No Changes to the draft recommendations</p>
Garner Drive	<p>Vehicles parked without consideration – lots of bends and junctions with no road markings on modern estates – would like to see DYL 10 m around junctions and bends and give way lines on junctions to improve safety</p>	<p>No changes to the recommendations for this area but need to monitor and adjust if a significant problem occurs</p>
General Comments	<p>Traffic and Parking in East Malling are hazardous – they are totally inter-related – a joint approach is required Parking restrictions in place in some areas need to be expanded avoiding the need for RPP Whole traffic situation needs full investigation before any proposals can be seen to be a working plan so no need for reassessment. Attached copy of last years consultation response – similar draft proposal needs full consideration This is a solution looking for a problem – focussed on preventing people using station by car than improving matters for residents and businesses - Problem is inconsiderate parking by residents who believe the public highway is their own parking space The proposed scheme is over complex unnecessary and not in the best interests of</p>	<p>Highway Services.</p> <p>Traffic, Highway and Transport comments to be followed up by Kent</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
	<p>residents and not proceeded with Think the proposals have some very good points Parking problem is something cannot be tackled in meaningful way because of growing population encouraged by TMBC and the demand for at least one vehicle per household Agree with all so far Fewer commuters would park in East Malling if the fast city services were reinstated from W.Malling – Previous pressure in West Malling has eased with new car park – WM car park is nowhere full Insufficient management of commuter parking Mostly agree with car park proposals and those for roadside parking What resources available to enforce restrictions – lived in EM for 8 years and never seen a traffic warden Review needs to go further Reduction to through traffic will help parking problems – limit building at Kings Hill/Wateringbury Road Recruit voluntary wardens to enforce Recommendations generally well received. A lot of work of what was already in the document to satisfy individual circumstances.</p>	
<p>Mill Street Eastern End Proposal – RPP with 4 hours nor return Monday to Friday Where road width, junctions and</p>	<p>Provide shorter runs of unrestricted and resident parking in Mill Street with more areas where traffic can pass.</p>	<p>No apparent changes required to the length of proposed and permitted roadside parking. Needs to be monitored and reviewed so any necessary adjustments can be made to keep parking and access as balanced as possible</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
<p>access points apply</p> <p>Western end with Middle Mill</p> <p>Proposal Unregulated bays to encourage considerate parking where road width, junctions and access points allow</p>		
<p>Rocks Close</p> <p>Proposal for main distributor road</p> <p>SYL Mon – Fri between 10 am and 10.30 am to deter all day parking by commuters</p>	<p>The current proposals should be for the whole of Rocks Close to deter commuter parking</p> <p>Would find the proposal for restrictions or the alternative of permits inconvenient and unnecessary – there is no problem on the hill either at present</p> <p>Permits to allow residents to park for the half hour restriction</p> <p>Double Yellow lines to stop parking on the junction nearest The Rocks Road</p> <p>Confirm preference to extend proposals to include whole of Rocks Close</p> <p>Need to extend restrictions throughout all Rocks Close or commuters will simply move further along</p> <p>Please extend the half hour restriction to beyond 30 Rocks Close</p> <p>Double yellow lines on corner of Rocks Road and Rocks Close should extend to corner on first cul de sac as parking on corner restricts drivers view</p> <p>The map at exhibition assumes Rocks close is private from the bump. This is incorrect as this is all public highway and adopted 20 years ago</p> <p>Extend restrictions along whole length of Rocks Close</p>	<p>Extend the initial SYL protected area to include the turning areas at the head of the Culs de sac with APM across dropped kerbs</p> <p>Extend corner protection of DYL up to first Cul de sac to preserve access and sight lines on approach to The Rocks Road junction</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
	<p>Reconsider in the light of removal of services stopping at EM as commuter parking has decreased</p> <p>Parked cars a significant safety issue in areas where Rocks Close has no footways</p> <p>Request DYL are continued up to 1st corner and enforcement is increased</p> <p>Having looked at the options I am in agreement with the other residents that SYL is extended to ALL Rocks Close and Access protection placed across all dropped kerb</p> <p>Query if the white access protection markings are enforceable</p> <p>Object as cars will park in areas where there are no paths and children play</p> <p>Do not believe the SYL are necessary as commuter parking is manageable on roads and cars can pass easily</p> <p>Concerned about parking in culs de sac if there are no restrictions – side roads will be blocked</p> <p>Preferred option is for the Close to remain unregulated but if it is applied it needs to be for the whole estate</p> <p>Single yellow lines should be extended into the whole of Rocks Close</p>	
<p>The Rocks Road</p> <p>Extend DYL from Rocks Close to on eastern side of the road around blind bend with corner protection at Gillets Lane</p> <p>Extend existing SYL on western side with reduced times</p>	<p>Where are the residents of Rocks Road expected to park – will extended restrictions improve road safety – Rocks road is wide and can cater for parking down one side – Parking slows traffic down – what accidents support the rationale for this?</p> <p>Unwelcome prospect of extending DYL into The Rocks Road – create more difficulty for residents without off-road parking</p> <p>Additional restrictions will push commuters further up the road and the narrowest part of the road will become blocked – keep the widest part of the road near Gillets Lane relatively free of restrictions</p> <p>Unregulated parking up the hill will occur beyond the extension of the existing zone.</p> <p>Suggest Permit parking in this area</p>	<p>Need to carefully look at the extent of parking restrictions in relation to the width of the road. Monitor any displaced parking after implementation and if necessary adjust the extent of the DYL</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
<p>Mon – Fri 10 am to 10.30 am to deter all day commuter parking</p>		
<p>High Street</p> <p>Proposal – RPP with 4 hours nor return Monday to Friday</p> <p>Where road width, junctions and access points apply</p>	<p>Provide shorter runs of unrestricted and resident parking in High Street with more areas where traffic can pass</p> <p>Excellent that the blind spots will be no parking to help with gridlock situations when cars are parked there</p> <p>Good to see this.</p> <p>Not necessary to have more restrictions on road where currently unregulated – parking in High St is a problem and needs to be more vigorously enforced or further restrictions double and single yellow lines in place</p> <p>The main problem is residents and their visitors ignoring the current parking restrictions and parking outside the designated bays – it just takes one inconsiderate parked car to cause traffic chaos</p> <p>Commuter parking in High St not a problem resident cars present when commuters arrive – spaces available on most days</p> <p>Restricting parking in lower end of High St cited for purpose of road safety by improving visibility and reduce congestion – traffic speeds and volumes will increase which not benefit residents</p> <p>Parking o/s 43 should be single space not deleted as single space can be accommodated and still leave 10 m clear to car park entrance</p> <p>Permit parking from 27 High Street</p> <p>Does not seem there is a need for drastic changes on roads near the station – replace SYL with DYL in High St rather than impose restrictions on the other parts of the highway</p> <p>Have DYL where there are presently SYL</p>	<p>Review the extent of proposed permit parking o/s 23 and existing SYL in relation to width of road at this point.</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
<p>The Grange</p> <p>Proposal Extension of corner protection</p>	<p>Parking restrictions in Church Walk will push cars into The Grange - busy enough with Church users and residents</p> <p>Willing to give the proposal a go as long as it can be reviewed if needs be after 12 – 18 months</p> <p>Register agreement with suggestion to extend the DYL to opposite No 9. – In addition applying residents only parking Zone 11am – Noon, to prevent commuter parking</p> <p>Proposals for car park and Church Walk will transfer commuters up into The Grange</p> <p>Extend DYL Church side of The Grange and ensure they are policed</p> <p>Concerns about transfer of parking from Church Walk – driveways being blocked – DYL ignored or faded – vehicle damage – request residents have access points marked out (dog bones?)</p> <p>Impact on The Grange from commuters displaced from Church Walk and worn out yellow lines – increased obstruction to properties</p> <p>Yellow lines west side from Church to parking bays</p> <p>Parking Bay needs yellow box junction to stop parking in front of drive to No 1</p> <p>West Side DYL to No10</p> <p>Church Walk end extend by 10 metres</p> <p>(2nd letter) Now concerned that previous suggestion to extend the DYL on the east side will seriously impact on congregation for Church services and force them to use turning area for parking and residents' private driveway for turning purposes. Would like advice on protecting property from this.</p>	<p>Extend proposals on east side up to start of turning area and monitor</p>

Location and Description of Draft proposals	Extracts of Comments Received to Informal Consultation	Analysis and Recommendations
<p>Wateringbury Road</p> <p>Proposal Corner protection at junction with Gilletts Lane</p>	<p>Speeds Past Manningham house are dangerous</p> <p>Building Control Officer was shocked at speeds past our house – too scared to park vehicle – would like to see speeds reduced to 20 mph as in Leybourne and Aylesford</p> <p>Details of access and sight line arrangements Chapel St/ Gillets Lane/Wateringbury Road area</p>	<p>Incorporate more detail into this proposal in relation to access points, sight lines and road width for the junction area with Wateringbury Road/ Chapel Street and Gilletts Lane</p>