

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford	McKenzie Close	01.01-1
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-01 P4-02 Aylesford - McKenzie Close	

### History

Residential parking in McKenzie Close has been an issue for some time, with residents choosing to park on-street close to their properties rather than use the nearby parking facilities. The area had a number of housing association garages 'en-bloc' that were unpopular with residents and were often not used for the storage of vehicles, but these have now been demolished in favour of open-air parking.

Residents are choosing to park on both sides of the entry road in to McKenzie Close, sometimes 'bumping-up' on to the footways. This has led to problems for large vehicles using the road as the parking on either side sometimes makes it impassable. This was demonstrated about a year ago when a Kent Fire & Rescue appliance was unable to attend a house fire in the road due to parked vehicles on the entry.

Some residents have claimed that the parking situation has worsened since the introduction of double yellow lines on Admiral Moore Drive a few years ago and that some of the patients to the nearby Doctor's Surgery are the main cause of the problems.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to address the access problems along the entrance road to McKenzie Close due to concerns about future emergency vehicle access.

The proposal that residents were consulted upon was for new double yellow lines along one side of the road and with double yellow lines on either side at the junction with Admiral Moore Drive and by the parking areas and sub-station.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 64 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	5	7.81%
In favour	4	80%
Against	1	20%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-1 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-1r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

The response to this consultation was low, but the majority of those who responded were in favour of the proposal. Though one objection was received, the objector did not give any indication as to the reasons for that objection.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Eccles)	Bull Lane / Cork Street	01.01-2
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-02A P4-02 Aylesford (Eccles) - Bull Lane & Cork Street	

### **History**

It had been reported that there were parking and access issues around the junction of Bull Lane and Cork Street in Eccles. Buses were finding problems accessing the bus stops and the re-development of a corner property has changed the road layout.

### **Statement of reasons**

The Borough Council has been asked to address the access problems and to reflect the change in road layout.

The proposal that residents were consulted upon was for new bus stop restrictions and yellow lines around the junction.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 27 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-2 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-2r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

Aylesford Parish Council responded, asking that the bus stop clearway on the west side of the road (that had been previously proposed, but deleted following comments from residents at the informal consultation stage) be added back in to the proposal. The Parish Council also asked for additional measures to be considered at other locations in Bull Lane.

### **Analysis of responses**

The consultation produced no response from residents. However, the comments from the Parish need to be considered.

The deletion of the proposal for a bus stop clearway from the western side of Bull Lane was done following concerns by an immediate resident about invasion of privacy by people waiting at the bus stop and looking in their windows.

The resident is understood to have also raised the issue with the bus companies and the Highway Authority, with a view to relocating the bus stop.

The Parish Council's requests for restrictions at other locations in Bull Lane are outside of this consultation and once investigated may form part of a later proposal.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no public objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Eccles)	Bull Lane / Mackenders Lane	01.01-3
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-02A P4-02 Aylesford (Eccles) - Bull Lane & Mackenders Lane	

### History

There had been reported problems with cars parking at the end of the existing double yellow lines around the junction of Bull Lane & Mackenders Lane and this was causing visibility problems for traffic emerging from Mackenders Lane.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to address the safety concerns and to extend the existing double yellow lines so that visibility is improved.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 17 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	11.76%
In favour	1	50%
Against	1	50%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-3 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-3r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The consultation produced a low response, however there was one objection, suggesting that the proposal may displace parking further up and down the road, and also that the existing yellow lines in the area get ignored.

The proposal is to introduce restrictions to move parking away from the junction to maintain visibility. This may well have the effect of moving vehicles further from the junction, but this is not in itself unusual or unsafe, though it may be inconvenient or unwanted by those who live in the area where parking displaces to.

**Recommendation**

As the proposals are intended to address junction safety concerns and improve visibility, the objection should be set aside and the proposals be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Eccles)	Mackenders Lane / Skinners Close	01.01-4
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-04 P4-02 Aylesford (Eccles) - Mackenders Lane & Skinners Close	

### History

There have been reported problems with cars parking at the end of the existing double yellow lines around the junction of Mackenders Lane and Skinners Close and this was causing visibility problems for traffic emerging from Skinners Close.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to address the safety concerns and to introduce double yellow lines so that visibility is improved.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 15 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	13.33%
In favour	0	0%
Against	2	100%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-4 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-4r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The low response suggests a level of ambivalence to the proposals, however, the two objections need to be considered.

Both objections suggest that the proposals are unnecessary, and that parking in the area does not seem to be a problem.

**Recommendation**

As the only responses received were against the proposal, suggesting that these restrictions are not required; it is recommended that the proposals be abandoned.



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Walderslade)	Papion Grove	01.01-5
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-07 P4-04 Aylesford (Walderslade) - Papion Grove	

### History

Residents of Papion Grove had reported issues of long-stay non-resident parking in the road, which has been causing problems for residents.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing new parking restrictions to prevent parking near to the junction and to prevent all day parking.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 37 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	6	16.21%
In favour	4	66.67%
Against	2	33.33%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-5 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-5r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The responses all suggest that residents agree there is a problem, but some residents have said that they little option other than to park some vehicles on the road. Though all the properties were originally intended ot have off-street parking, over time some of these parking facilities have changed use as houses have been extended.

The proposals are designed to deter commuter parking, and this is most prevalent in the first part of the road from Taddington Wood Lane.

In recognition of both concerns about commuter parking, and lack of resident parking, the proposals could be partly implemented – just the double yellow lines first, and if the commuter parking displaces further in to the road then the single yellow line restriction could be introduced.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and approve the proposed double yellow line restrictions for implementation, and for the single yellow line restrictions to be approved but not implemented and be held in abeyance, until residents and the local elected members agree their introduction.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Walderslade)	Fernbank Close	01.01-6
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-06 P4-04 Aylesford (Walderslade) - Fernbank Close	

### History

Residents of Fernbank Close have been reporting issues of long-stay non-resident parking in the road, which has been causing problems for residents

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing new parking restrictions to prevent parking near to the junction and to prevent all day parking.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 19 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	6	31.58%
In favour	3	50%
Against	3	50%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-6 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-6r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The responses from residents suggest that the commuter parking problem in the road may have reduced following the change in working arrangements of a resident.

Accordingly there were comments that the restrictions (particularly the single yellow lines) were unnecessary, though there may still be a need for double yellow line restrictions near the junction with Fostington Way.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and approve the proposed double yellow line restrictions for implementation, and for the single yellow line restrictions to be approved but not implemented and be held in abeyance, until residents and the local elected members agree their introduction.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford (Walderslade)	Catkin Close	01.01-7
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-05A P4-04 Aylesford (Walderslade) - Catkin Close	

### History

For some time there have been significant school-time parking problems in Catkin Close, where school parents park all around the junctions and cause considerable congestion.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to address the school-time parking problems so that congestion is eased.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 17 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	11.76%
In favour	2	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-7 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-7r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Ditton	Bell Lane / Fernleigh Rise	01.01-8
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-10A P4-08 Ditton - Bell Lane jct Fernleigh Rise	

### History

Residents have complained about parking around the junction of Bell Lane & Fernleigh Rise, mainly due to the lack of off-street parking for the nearby properties due to the age of those houses and the layout of the road.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to consider parking restrictions around the junction to prevent parking and to improve turning movements and visibility.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 16 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	12.5%
In favour	2	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-8 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-8r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Ditton	Kiln Barn Road & New Road	01.01-9
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-12 P4-08 Ditton - Kiln Barn leading to New Road	

### History

School-time parking in New Road has tended to ‘spill-over’ in to Kiln Barn Road and this is causing problems when parents park on the bend, affecting forward visibility.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to address the problems of parking on the bend that affects forward visibility.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 12 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	25%
In favour	3	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-9 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-9r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Ightham	The Street	01.01-10
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-19 P4-13 Ightham - The Street	

### History

Some time ago there were limited waiting parking bays in The Street, Ightham, but these proved unpopular with residents. The parking bays were removed from the roads, but the traffic regulation order was never amended.

### Statement of reasons

In light of the limited waiting parking bays in The Street having been removed some years ago, the parking bays are to be removed from the Order, so it better reflects the parking restrictions in Ightham.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 32 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	9.37%
In favour	2	66.67%
Against	1	33.33%
No view	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-10 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-10r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The level of response was low, but this is to be expected where there are no on-street changes. However, one objection was received, but on further inspection, it was not objecting to the proposed change to the Traffic Order, but requesting that



the existing double yellow lines be extended to improve visibility from a private access.

This request for alterations to existing restrictions will be investigated and may (if appropriate) form part of a later proposal.

**Recommendation**

As there were no relevant objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
East Malling & Larkfield	The Lakes	01.01-11
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-17A P4-09 Larkfield - The Lakes	

### History

There were reports of parking issues in The Lakes where visitors to the nearby country park try to avoid the parking charges by parking on-street. Whether this is the case or not, there are cars parked on the entrance road and this can impinge on access to properties and for buses using the area.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to introduce restrictions to prevent obstruction along the road, near the pedestrian crossing points and around the junction.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 31 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	3.22%
In favour	0	0%
Against	1	100%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-11 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-11r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The level of response was low, suggesting a reasonable level of acceptance for the proposals following the prior consultation. However, the one objector commented that they did not want to have double yellow lines outside their house.

The location of the objector's property is at the end of the advertised yellow lines – which were intended to prevent any issues of obstruction outside of their property. As the resident does not wish for the lines to be in front of their property they can be omitted, but this could lead to problems for the resident.

**Recommendation**

In light of the objection the proposals should be amended, with the yellow lines outside No.4 The Lakes and the neighbouring driveway to the north being deleted from the proposal. Accordingly, the Board should approve the reduced proposal for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
East Malling & Larkfield	Sheldon Way	01.01-12
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-15 P4-09 Larkfield - Sheldon Way	

### History

There have been a number of reports of parking issues associated with visitors to 'Tiny Town' children's play centre in Sheldon Way. This stems from the change of use of industrial premises to one that generates a large number of visitors on a daily basis. Parking is particularly an issue at pick-up and drop-off times (similar to schools) and this is affecting access to nearby businesses by large vehicles.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked to introduce restrictions to maintain access for large vehicles to the commercial premises in the road.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 11 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	18.18%
In favour	2	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-12 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-12r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
East Malling & Larkfield	Chaucer Way	01.01-13
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-13A P4-09 Larkfield - Chaucer Way	

## History

There have been requests for a number of differing restrictions on Chaucer Way from differing parts of the community;

- Restrictions close to the Gighill Road junction to prevent obstructive parking (from the Neighbourhood Watch Association)
- Restrictions opposite the bus stops and between junctions to improve traffic movements and prevent obstruction (from the Parish Council)
- Restrictions close to the play area to prevent parking near to the park (from the Police)

## Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has taken each of the differing requests for parking restrictions and has proposed restrictions to address all of the problems raised.

## Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

## Public Responses

We wrote directly to 61 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	7	11.47%
In favour	7	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-13 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-13r.

## Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
East Malling & Larkfield	Laburnum Drive & Maple Close	01.01-14
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-14A P4-09 Larkfield - Laburnum Drive, Briar Close Maple Close	

### History

Residents have reported problems of obstructive parking (sometimes half-on the footway) around the junctions of Laburnum Drive and Maple Close.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing parking restrictions to prevent obstruction and to ease congestion.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 27 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	9	33.33%
In favour	7	77.78%
Against	2	22.22%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-14 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-14r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with comments that the proposal for double yellow lines on Maple Close seemed to go further than was necessary for junction protection and could displace parking further along Maple Close.

### Analysis of responses

The proposals attracted 2 objections and comments from the Police.

With regard to the Police's comments; the original proposal was for shorter restrictions on Maple Close in line with the standard guidelines, but the responses from residents during the informal consultation process asked that the restrictions be extended to Pine Close.

Subsequent discussion with PC Paul Cave of Kent Police's Traffic Management Unit has clarified that the Police are not formally objecting to the proposal, but were commenting that the extended proposals may cause other issues further down the road.

On inspection the first objection actually related to parking issues on New Hythe Lane rather than in Laburnum Drive and Maple Close, and went on to suggest that the parking and other traffic issues on New Hythe Lane should be resolved. However this would be an issue for Kent Highways as the issues on New Hythe Lane are more complex than just parking, and that introducing parking restrictions may have a negative impact on vehicle speeds.

The second objection was from a resident on the periphery of the proposals who commented that they had not been aware of the proposals at the first consultation (but as already discussed, the proposals had been extended since the prior consultation). It went on to again comment on the issues on New Hythe Lane rather than the proposals in Laburnum Drive and Maple Close.

Given the views of the Police and of the residents on the periphery of the proposals, it may be that restrictions should be introduced to the previously circulated proposal, and if there are further issues in Maple Close and Pine Close then these could be looked at separately. The issues on New Hythe Lane are wider than just parking concerns; these have been forwarded to Kent Highways for their consideration.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposals on Maple Close be reduced to standard junction protection at the Laburnum Drive junction (as had been proposed at the informal consultation), and the Board set aside the objections and approve the amended restrictions for implementation.



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Ryarsh	Birling Road	01.01-15
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-21A P4-20 Ryarsh - Birling Road	

### History

There have been reports of parking close to the Duke of Wellington pub that causes problems for through traffic, and that parking for the pub can cause problems around residents' driveways.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing restrictions to prevent parking on the bends and at the junctions.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 35 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	2	5.71%
In favour	2	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-15 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-15r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Snodland	Cantium Place & High Street	01.01-16
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-23 P4-22 Snodland - Cantium Place	

### History

As part of the redevelopment of Cantium Place, the Highway Authority's requirements were for new parking restrictions around the junction of High Street and Cantium Place.

The Highway Authority asked that we only introduce parking restrictions on the High Street and at the junction, as it was not certain whether Cantium Place would be adopted as public highway.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council has been asked by Kent County Council to promote new restrictions and is proposing new 'junction protection' parking restrictions to prevent parking close to the junction.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 76 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	4	7.55%
In favour	3	75%
Against	1	25%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-16 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-16r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

There was a low level of response – much lower than that from the informal

consultation. This suggests a general level of acceptance of the proposal. The objection (and some of the comments) related to concerns that parking will displace to areas further in to Cantium Place, exacerbating the existing parking issues.

Additionally, the comments received indicated that Cantium Place had recently been adopted as public highway, though the Borough Council had not been informed of this, nor had we received an updated instruction from KCC.

One of the local members for Snodland, Miss Moloney commented that there had been a number of residents who asked for some form of 'KEEP CLEAR' marking across the exit from Cantium Place as the exit from the road is often blocked by traffic queuing back from the level crossing when the barriers were closed.

### **Recommendation**

The future of the proposal depends on the wishes of the Highway Authority –whether it wishes to implement the proposal as drawn, and then consider the displacement and obstruction issues within it's newly adopted road, or whether the parking issues at the junction and the obstruction issues should be dealt with at the same time.

If the issues are to be dealt with at the same time then the current proposal would need to be abandoned and a new proposal be advertised by the Highway Authority.

It is recommended that the current proposal is to be taken forward, with the objection set aside (on the advice of the Highway Authority). Any parking that displaces in to Cantium Place may need to be considered as part of a wider review of restrictions in the Snodland area, along with any measures that may be necessary for the effective management of the priority workings and traffic calming in the newly adopted Cantium Place.

The proposal from local residents for a new 'KEEP CLEAR' marking across the exit from Cantium Place should be taken forward for implementation as the lining work could be done at the same time.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Baltic Road	01.01-17
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-25 P4-24 Tonbridge - Baltic Road	

### History

Residents of Hilltop, Fairview Close and Silver Close have reported problems with all-day parking. This is associated with visitors to Tonbridge Grammar School. The parking occurs in these roads as they are the first convenient locations outside of the permit parking area.

Not all of the permit parking places in Baltic Road are used, with some areas significantly underused, particularly between Deakin Leas and Hilltop.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing changes to restrictions to deter parking in Hilltop and to relax parking restrictions in Baltic Road between Deakin Leas and Hilltop, so the spaces are better used and pressure in the surrounding roads is eased.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 53 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	4	7.55%
In favour	2	50%
Against	2	50%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-17 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-17r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The comments received are split between those who are currently experiencing a

problem and those who do not at present, but may have additional parking in their road.

However, the existing parking arrangements are skewed by the un-necessary over-restriction of Baltic Road. By spreading the parking to areas that are un-used, and that are closer to the commuting parker's destination, pressure can be relieved on the areas that are already experiencing problems.

The comments from properties further around Hilltop about parking at the other end of the road still remain, as parking at the other end of the road is occurring for other reasons. These issues may need to be resolved as part of other proposals at a later date, but this should not be a reason to prevent the reduction of issues in Silver Close, Treetops, Fairview Close and the eastern end of Hilltop.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection(s) and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Deakin Leas (Northern end)	01.01-18
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-41 P4-24 Tonbridge - Deakin Leas (North)	

### History

The redevelopment of part of the Tonbridge Grammar School site to a new housing scheme has changed the usage of the old school access, requiring the change of parking restrictions around the new junction.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing to remove parking bays in favour of new double yellow lines to improve visibility and access to the re-constructed junction.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 17 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	5.88%
In favour	0	0%
Against	0	0%
No view	1	100%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-18 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-18r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

There was only one response, and that was not clear in stating whether it was objecting to the proposal or not – it’s comments seemed to relate more to the issue of permits, the use of the existing parking bays by non-residents and the parking on double yellow lines by parents picking-up and dropping-off for the nearby school.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Springwell Road, White Oaks Close, Woodfield Road	01.01-19
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-36B P4-24 Tonbridge - Springwell Rd	

### History

The Borough Council introduced a parking scheme in to the area several year ago which established parking places for Area M.

Depending on the road (and the views of the residents at the time) the parking bay restrictions operate for either one hour in the morning or one hour in the morning and another hour in the afternoon.

Though the residents of Springwell Road, White Oaks Close and Woodfield Road originally opted for the single hour in the morning only, there have been problems with non-residents choosing to park in the area from lunchtime.

Residents have long been in discussion with the Council about changing the restriction to introduce an afternoon restriction.

Residents have also asked the Borough to look at the existing restrictions, to see if there are any other locations where parking bays could be provided.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing to extend the existing restrictions to cover an hour in the afternoon to deter long-stay parking, and to amend existing parking restrictions to create more on-street parking places.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

Proposed change	In favour	Against	No view
The change to parking bay operating times to include an hour in the afternoon	8 (66.6%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)
Additional 4 parking spaces in Springwell Road (alongside No.44 St Mary’s Road)	10 (83.3%)	2 (16.7%)	0

Additional 2 parking spaces in St Mary's Road	10 (83.3%)	1 (8.35%)	1 (8.35%)
Additional 2 parking spaces in Judd Road	11 (91.35%)	1 (8.35%)	0
Additional double yellow lines in Woodfield Road (outside No. 27)	7 (58.3%)	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)
Small gaps in restrictions in Weald View Road & St Mary's Road being filled in	7 (58.3%)	1 (8.35%)	4 (33.3%)

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-19 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-19r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

The responses show general support for each of the proposals, though one of the objectors (who objected to all of the proposals) did so on the grounds that these changes could cause displacement to neighbouring roads.

The choice of roads for these proposals was set by the comments received from residents at prior consultations – the roads that wanted the changes were included and the roads that did not were omitted. It may be that the roads that were omitted may want to have the restrictions at a later date.

The proposal for Woodfield Road produced a higher objection rate, as the proposal was for a new yellow line in a currently uncontrolled area that is used for parking.

However, this change was requested by the immediate resident, who says that parking in that area causes them access problems.

The overall proposals increase the capacity of the on-street parking, and 'weed-out' the non-resident long stay parking, so the loss of this small parking area should be offset against the other gains.



**Recommendation**

In light of the extensive consultations and the responses received, it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Truro Walk	01.01-20
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-38A P4-24 Tonbridge - Truro Walk	

### History

Residents of Truro Walk had reported a number of problems with parking in the road, which prevents access to and from the garage area. This is predominantly due to parents picking-up and dropping off at the end of the footpath from the nearby school.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing parking restrictions to prevent obstruction and to ease access.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 19 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	4	21.05%
In favour	2	50%
Against	2	50%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-20 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-20r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

Russett Homes (who manage the garages accessed from Truro Walk) have also commented that their tenants had reported problems with access to the garages due to cars parked on Truro Walk.

### Analysis of responses

The first objection was from a resident of Coventry Road and related to school

parking; that if restrictions were introduced on Truro Walk then the parents would park on Coventry Road instead. It also commented that the money used for new restrictions should be spent on repairing potholes.

The second objection was from a resident of Truro Walk, who did not want the single yellow line restriction, as this would prevent residents from parking there during the day, which would cause problems for their visitors, requiring them to park in Coventry Road.

The proposals are designed to prevent obstruction and to ease access, allowing better use of the garage areas, whilst having little impact on residents.

Unfortunately it is not possible to prevent parking by school pick-up and drop off-traffic whilst allowing residents as the road width is insufficient to set out appropriate parking bays and a permit parking scheme.

Whilst there may be some inconvenience to some residents' visitors, in having to park in Coventry Road, this is not far away.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Dernier Road & Chiltern Way	01.01-21
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-26A P4-24 Tonbridge - Dernier Road	

### History

There have been several reports of large vehicles having problems accessing the Rowan Mews development off Dernier Road due to parked cars at the junction. There are also reports of problems for refuse collection vehicles and concerns about emergency access.

We carried out informal consultation on proposals for new restrictions around the Rowan Mews junction to prevent this occurring, but the response from residents of nearby Chiltern Way residents was a strong concern that this would displace parking in to Chiltern Way. The residents of Chiltern Way asked that the proposals be extended in to Chiltern Way so that obstructive parking did not occur.

To this end the proposals were amended with the restrictions extended in to Chiltern Way to prevent parking in front of the flats, near to the garages, in the turning area and on the bend.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing new restrictions to ease access and to prevent parking at the junction.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 48 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	11	22.91%
In favour	3	27.27%
Against	6	54.55%
No view	2	18.18%

Additionally, a petition was received from 19 properties in Chiltern Way (representing 34 residents), objecting to the proposal.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-21 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-21r.

## **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

## **Analysis of responses**

The responses again show the mixed views of residents. The residents of Rowan Mews are in favour of proposals to protect the access to their road, but the residents of Chiltern Way and Dernier Road are of a differing views.

A number of the signatories of the petition had taken the opportunity to comment on the proposals separately, but the petition echoed the points that have already been discussed.

A number of residents commented that the parking and access issues should have been the subject of more consideration when permission was given for the redevelopment of Rowan Mews, and that the parking standards that were applied have led to increased parking pressure on-street.

Residents of Chiltern Way expressed concerns that parking in their road would cause them problems when leaving their driveways as they park off-street. Whilst this is a concern for residents, it is not an unusual situation and the road width is sufficient to allow turning movements in to and out of properties, compared to the Dernier Road area where there is no off-street parking and the road is narrower.

A number of the signatories of the petition had taken the opportunity to comment on the proposals separately, but the petition echoed the points that have already been discussed.

Residents of the flats in Chiltern Way have made representations to Kent County Council about parking problems in the turning area of Chiltern Way, and to address their concerns the Highway Authority decided to introduce 2 new "KEEP CLEAR" worded markings in the turning areas, suggesting that the Highway Authority would be reluctant to allow parking in the turning area.

It is clear that there have been conflicting parking issues in Dernier Road and Chiltern Way for some time, where residents of one part of the road (or their visitors) park in front of other people's properties, or near to their access or in areas where the Highway Code states that parking should not occur (on bends and at junctions).

These issues are likely to remain whatever the treatment for protecting access to Rowan Mews, and are functions of the road widths, the limited availability of off-street parking and the level of car ownership. The parking capacity of the road has

been exceeded by the demand from residents and there is little that the Borough can do to resolve this.

### **Recommendation**

The access problems for Rowan Mews remain, whatever the views of residents and other parking issues. This needs to be taken in to consideration as a priority – there are legal rights of access that are being impinged by the on-street parking arrangements.

Our original proposal was for the minimum of restriction necessary to maintain access for emergency vehicles, so that the impact on the residents of Dernier Road and Chiltern Way was minimised. However, residents of Chiltern Way were not satisfied with this and asked that we introduce the further measures to prevent parking near the flats, the garage block entrance and the bend.

However, these extended proposals are also drawing objections that they will displace more parking further along the road – and it is likely to be an issue that cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of all residents.

Several of those who commented said that the extended proposals should be dropped, in favour of the original proposals as they had less of an impact on the area.

It is recommended that the proposal be reduced to that which was proposed at the informal consultation stage, as this would have the least impact on parking capacity on-street but would maintain the right of access to the Rowan Mews development. *(The original informal consultation proposal is shown as DD-562-26 P4-24 Tonbridge - Dernier Road in Annex 01.02-43).*



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Yardley Park Road	01.01-22
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-39 P4-24 Tonbridge - Yardley Park Road	

### History

Residents have commented that the parking bays on the south side of Yardley Park road cause problems when entering and exiting their driveways and that the parking bays are infrequently fully occupied.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing to remove the parking bay in favour of double yellow lines to improve access to properties

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 9 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	33.33%
In favour	3	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-22 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-22r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Market Quarter	01.01-23
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-31A P4-24 Tonbridge - Market Quarter	

### History

The recent adoption of the Market Quarter development was not accompanied by any parking controls and the area has been flooded with non-resident parking all day. Though this should have been addressed prior to the adoption, it has fallen to the Borough Council to address the issues of all-day parking by non-residents and obstruction to large vehicles such as refuse collection vehicles.

Out informal consultation produced a very strong response from residents, in favour of the proposals.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing new parking restrictions to prevent non-resident parking and to prevent parking where it would cause an obstruction.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 107 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	9	8.41%
In favour	7	77.78%
Against	1	11.11%
No view	1	11.11%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-23 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-23r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

## **Analysis of responses**

The strong level of support from residents has continued to the formal consultation stage, with a high majority being in favour of the proposals.

However there was one objection to the proposals, commenting mainly that the proposals would not reduce obstructive parking.

The objection seems to miss the main element of the proposal, that by removing the non-resident parking from the area, the incoming traffic (looking for a free parking place) in to the area would be significantly reduced, and the remaining parking (by residents) would be able to make better use of the freed-up road space.

The objector also commented that the proposals would not cover Sundays and that parking could then be a problem.

This could be an issue, but this is less likely to occur as parking within the town centre car parks is also free on a Sunday, and there is also a considerable stock of single yellow line on-street restrictions that do not apply on Sundays.

A comment was received, asking if there was any financial assistance for residents to buy parking permits. Unfortunately this is not something that the Council can do, as it would effectively subsidise individual residents, whilst providing a higher level of monitoring and enforcement than others receive.

However, the cost of on-street parking permits is currently £35 per year, and as such represents a significant discount over the cost of buying off-street parking on a daily basis.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	River Walk	01.01-24
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-42 P4-24 Tonbridge - River Walk	

### **History**

There are proposals to redevelop an empty office building to residential housing in River Walk and as part of the proposal the access arrangements to the site are being changed. The existing restrictions would be unsuitable to the new usage.

### **Statement of reasons**

The Borough Council is proposing changes to the existing parking restrictions to reflect the change of use and to improve access.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 2 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-24 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-24r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	The Crescent	01.01-25
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-37A P4-24 Tonbridge - The Crescent	

### **History**

Residents have reported problems with parking opposite garages in The Crescent, preventing access to the rear of properties.

### **Statement of reasons**

The Borough Council is proposing parking restrictions to prevent obstruction and ease access.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 40 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-25 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-25r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Greenfrith Drive	01.01-26
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-28A P4-24 Tonbridge - Greenfrith Drive	

### History

There have been reports that school-time traffic causes significant congestion and problems for buses.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing restrictions to prevent obstruction and to ease traffic flow.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 21 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	4.76%
In favour	1	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-26 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-26r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Hunt Road, Whistler Road & Lawrence Road	01.01-27
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-30A P4-24 Tonbridge - Hunt Road	

### History

There have been reports of parking close to junctions that cause visibility problems, and problems for buses travelling along Hunt Road, caused by unregulated parking.

We carried out informal consultation on initial proposals that were more extensive, covering Hunt Road down to the junction with Knight Road, aimed at managing parking to ease large vehicle access. However, this informal consultation produced a large response from residents of that part of Hunt Road, asking that we abandon that element of the proposals, and asking that the verges be converted to allocated parking areas for them.

The conversion of public highway to private allocated parking is outside the remit of the Borough Council (and goes against the principle of “public” highway). Even if this were of merit and within the Council’s remit, there would be significant physical constraints on doing this as there are considerable changes in level between the houses on either side and the roads, which would require significant civil engineering works to address.

In light of the comments relating to the parking in Hunt Road, and the desire of residents at the Whistler Road and Lawrence Road junctions, the proposals were reduced from the original, with the proposed restrictions on Hunt Road towards Knight Road being dropped.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing restrictions to prevent obstruction and to ease traffic flow.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 48 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	6.25%
In favour	2	66.67%
Against	1	33.33%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-27 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-27r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

The level of response received to this consultation was much lower than to the informal consultation, suggestive of general acceptance of the proposal.

However, one objection was received, commenting that they did not want parking restrictions outside of their gate as the proposed double yellow lines would prevent them from stopping to open or close their gates.

This is not the case, as parking front of accesses to allow the operation of gates is permitted. This has been discussed with the resident who raised the objection and he has withdrawn his objection

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board note that the objection has been withdrawn and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Masefield Road & Shakespeare Road	01.01-28
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-32 P4-24 Tonbridge - Masefield Road & Shakespeare Road	

### **History**

At a previous consultation on other issues the Fire & Rescue service commented that there had been problems with their vehicles turning in to Shakespeare Road.

### **Statement of reasons**

The Borough Council is proposing parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking and also to prevent parking at the bus stop.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 8 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-28 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-28r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Mountfield Park & Kings Road	01.01-29
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-33 P4-24 Tonbridge - Mountfield Park	

### History

Residents have reported problems with parking between the end of the existing parking restrictions and their driveways, causing visibility and access issues.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing extended junction protection restrictions to prevent access to the driveways from being compromised.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 10 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	30%
In favour	1	33.33%
Against	2	66.67%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-29 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-29r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The responses received suggested that the problems related to one particular resident who had issues with parking near to their access, and that other residents would not like to lose the opportunity to park.

However, the presence of existing ‘access protection’ markings, provided by Kent County Council suggests that there has been a history of comments and complaints of obstructive parking.

**Recommendation**

The comments received suggest that this is an issue that affects only a small number of residents, and that there is no consensus to the validity of the problem.

However, the presence of the existing access protection markings gives some credibility to the problem. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Pembury Road	01.01-30
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-34 P4-24 Tonbridge - Pembury Road	

### History

There have been reports that parking on Pembury Road (east of Tudeley Lane) causes problems, particularly around the central traffic island. There were also concerns that parking could displace towards the Vauxhall roundabout.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing parking restrictions to limit parking to one side of the road and to protect the area around the traffic island and close to the roundabout.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 6 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	16.67%
In favour	1	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-30 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-30r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Gorham Drive	01.01-31
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-27 P4-24 Tonbridge - Gorham Drive	

### History

Residents have reported problems of cars parking on the footway and at the narrow point of the road near to the junction of Gorham Drive and Lodge Oak Lane.

### Statement of reasons

The Borough Council is proposing new parking restrictions to prevent obstruction and ease congestion.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 8 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	12.5%
In favour	1	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-31 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-31r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Recommendation

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Tonbridge	Kings Road	01.01-32
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-43 P4-24 Tonbridge - Kings Road	

### **History**

The existing single yellow line parking restrictions on-street do not coincide with the definitions in the on-street Traffic Regulation Order, as the markings were changed when Kent Highways installed traffic calming on Kings Road.

### **Statement of reasons**

The proposal is to alter the Traffic Regulation Order to reflect the on-street restriction.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 10 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-32 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-32r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Bush Row	01.01-33
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/7A Bush Row	

### **History**

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### **Statement of reasons**

The existing parking arrangements in Bush Row include a disabled persons parking place, but residents have told us that this is no longer required and should be returned to general parking.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 14 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-33 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-33r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Forstal Road	01.01-34
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/1A Forstal Road	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

The parking issues on Forstal Road relate to parking overspill from the nearby industrial units (during the week) and parking by visitors to the playing fields at weekends.

Parked cars currently form a continuous line, with no passing places and this can lead to congestion. Additionally, parking occurs close to the field entrances that can cause issues for traffic turning in and out.

Cars also park close to the bus stops on Forstal Road.

### Statement of reasons

The proposals are to manage parking to allow passing places, improve visibility and to reduce congestion. The proposals are also to improve bus services by protecting the bus stop areas.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 18 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	5.56%
In favour	1	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-34 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-34r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.



Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	High Street	01.01-35
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/6A High Street	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### Statement of reasons

The existing limited waiting parking bays in the High Street are subject to differing time limits. Some of the bays have a 20 minute maximum stay, to enable pop-in visits to the Post Office and other similar establishments. However, the commercial premises near the 20 minute bays have changed usage, to businesses that are normally associated with longer duration visits.

Accordingly we are proposing to extend the maximum stay duration to better serve the local businesses.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 12 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	8.33%
In favour	1	100%
Against	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-35 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-35r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	High Street (West)	01.01-36
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/8 High Street (West)	

### **History**

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### **Statement of reasons**

The area at the bottom of the steps at the western end of the High Street has cars that park there overnight with no apparent problem. A fault in the signing of the restriction has led to enforcement being withdrawn for this restriction, and parking has extended in to the daytime period. This has caused no problems and has been popular with residents. To this end the restriction is being removed to allow parking.

### **Formal consultation**

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### **Public Responses**

We wrote directly to 10 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue, however we received no response.

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-36 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-36r.

### **Statutory Consultees**

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Powell Close	01.01-37
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/4A Powell Close	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### Statement of reasons

Residents of Powell Close have raised concerns that vehicles park at the junction of Powell Close and Rochester Road, which affects visibility for vehicles using the junction and obstructs pedestrians.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 20 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	4	20%
In favour	3	75.00%
Against	0	0%
No view	1	25.00%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-37 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-37r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The responses from the residents of Powell Close support the proposal, but there were comments that the proposed restrictions should be extended further in to Powell Close, around the back of the old Police Office.

The legal process for introducing parking restrictions does not allow us to extend proposals from those advertised – merely to agree their introduction, reduce the scope of proposals or abandon them. Extending proposals would require the restrictions to be re-advertised.

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should now be implemented. If there is a need to extend the restrictions further, this could be considered at a later date.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Rochester Road	01.01-38
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/5 Rochester Road	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### Statement of reasons

For a number of years there have been concerns about parking in Rochester Road. These relate to the extensive parking along one side of the road which creates a long stretch where opposing traffic flows have nowhere to pull in.

The proposals are to break up the continuous length of parking and to provide passing places by introducing new double yellow lines.

The new double yellow lines also protect areas outside of The Village Club and the offices in the old church, and prevent obstruction of their car park areas.

The restriction outside The Village Club also protects the area for delivery vehicles.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 27 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	11.11%
In favour	2	66.67%
Against	1	33.33%
No view	0	0%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-38 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-38r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

The response to the proposals was quite low, suggesting that the issues were reasonably well received. However there was one objection to the proposal, on the grounds that parking is already a problem in Rochester Road and that the introduction of yellow lines would make parking harder.

However, the purpose of the public highway has to be considered – it is not intended for the parking of vehicles – it is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but it is not a right to expect parking close to a residential property. There is uncontrolled long-stay parking available in the car parks in the village, but some residents choose to park on-street.

The Village Club also raised concerns that the proposed parking restrictions would prevent deliveries, but the meaning of the double yellow line restriction has been clarified, and their objection has been withdrawn.

A resident also asked that new double yellow lines be introduced along the length of the northwestern side of the road to prevent parking occurring on both sides. However, due to the road width and the regular opposing traffic flows this is thought to be an unusual occurrence.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Station Road	01.01-39
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/2 Station Road	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### Statement of reasons

The Council has been asked to look at introducing parking restrictions at the entrance to the Station Road cul-de-sac to prevent parking from causing an obstruction and also to deter parking on the footway.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 19 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	3	15.78%
In favour	1	33.33%
Against	2	66.67%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-39 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-39r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

Parking in a small cul-de-sac where there are more properties than road space is always going to be an issue, but it is not the responsibility of the Council to provide a parking facility to residents who have made no private arrangements for parking.



Whilst we try to accommodate parking where possible we must be aware of the requirements of the police and the advice within the Highway Code.

The lack of space in the road and the desire for parking does not provide justification for the desire to park on the footway and at the junction.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Aylesford Village	Unwin Close	01.01-40
Formal plan ref:	DD/559/3 Unwin Close	

### History

Parking issues in Aylesford village have been an issue for some time. Residents and the Parish Council have asked that the Borough Council look at the parking problems as a whole, reviewing on and off-street parking provision in the village.

### Statement of reasons

Residents of Unwin Close have raised concerns that vehicles park at the junction of Unwin Close and Rochester Road, which affects visibility for vehicles using the junction and obstructs pedestrians. There have also been concerns that parking measures introduced elsewhere could exacerbate parking issues in the Close.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 19 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	9	47.36%
In favour	8	88.89%
Against	1	11.11%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-40 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-40r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### Analysis of responses

The responses received are all broadly in favour of the proposals, but there is an underlying theme that the proposals should be extended further up and down Rochester Road, and in to Unwin Close.

The extension of restrictions along Rochester Road related to concerns about visibility if vehicles were parked there. However, the proposals extend for the normal distance used for junction protection and the area has traffic calming and is subject to a 20mph speed limit

The objection is actually in support of the proposals, but again asks that the yellow lines be extended further southwards.

The legal process for introducing parking restrictions does not allow us to extend proposals from those advertised – merely to agree their introduction, reduce the scope of proposals or abandon them. Extending proposals would require the restrictions to be re-advertised.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objection(s) and approve the restrictions for implementation. If there is a need to extend the restrictions further, then this could be considered at a later date.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
East Malling & Larkfield	751-755 London Road	01.01-41
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-44 P4-09 Larkfield - 751-757 London Road	

### History

The Borough Council were asked to assist Jacobs Consultancy in preparing the Traffic Regulation Order associated with the private re-development of 751-755 London Road, Larkfield.

The redevelopment of the property has been subject to all the normal planning processes and the alteration of the parking restrictions on London Road was part of the requirements of the Highway Authority and the planning permission.

### Statement of reasons

The proposed new parking restrictions are intended to prevent parking in the area so that visibility is maintained for traffic using the re-developed access.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information "on deposit" at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council's offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 21 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	1	4.76%
In favour	0	0%
Against	1	100%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-41 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-41r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

As the request for changes to the parking arrangements was being dealt with by Jacobs, they have dealt with the objection. Their comments are as follows;

*“An objection has been received from a nearby resident. The objection is based on not agreeing with the provision of the development, a Planning application for which was considered by the Council some time ago, and was granted approval. The alteration to the parking arrangements outside 751 – 755 London Road was a condition of the planning approval.*

*Visibility for vehicles leaving the site is limited and the site is located close to a very frequently used bus stop. It is recommended that the objection be over-ruled and that the short section of restricted parking proposed should be installed on safety grounds.”*

### **Recommendation**

As this is a requirement of the planning permission, and the objection related to the re-development rather than to the change to the parking arrangements, it is recommended that the Board set aside the objection(s) and approve the restrictions for implementation.

Parish or Ward	Location	Annex
Leybourne	Rectory Lane North	01.01-42
Formal plan ref:	DD-562-45 P4-15 Leybourne - Rectory Lane North	

### History

At the request of residents of Rectory Lane North and Leybourne Parish Council, the Borough Council introduced parking restrictions along the road to prevent parking and the associated obstruction for emergency vehicles.

The Parish Council have subsequently asked that the existing “School Keep Clear” restrictions be altered, so that parking is prevented at all times (currently parking and stopping on the zig-zag markings is only precluded between 8.30am and 3.30pm, Mondays to Fridays).

### Statement of reasons

The Council is proposing to extend the times of operation of the “School Keep Clear” restriction to “at all times” to help allay concerns over obstructive parking and restricted emergency vehicle access.

### Formal consultation

We carried out formal consultation on the proposals by placing advertisements on-street, in the local press and by placing information “on deposit” at the Borough Council offices in Kings Hill and Tonbridge, as well as at Kent County Council’s offices in Maidstone.

### Public Responses

We wrote directly to 39 residents whose properties front the proposed parking changes or who had commented at prior consultations on this issue.

	Number	Percentage
Responses	6	15.38%
In favour	2	33.33%
Against	2	33.33%
No view	2	33.33%

Copies of any consultation responses are available in Annex 01.03-42 (available to Members at the meeting) and redacted versions will be made available online as Annex 01.03-42r.

### Statutory Consultees

We wrote directly to the local emergency services, bus companies that operate in the area, haulage associations and other motoring bodies, as well as the respective Parish Councils and County Councillors for each area.

Kent Police responded with no specific objections and their standard comments and observations on new parking restrictions.

### **Analysis of responses**

Prior consultations over parking issues in Rectory Lane North have been divided in to two opposing views – those with concerns over emergency vehicle access, who tend to be residents of the road and are generally in favour of restrictions, and those who are not resident in the road wish to visit the area – either for the Cricket Club, the school or the nearby church.

The consultation responses received during this process are no different, with the views being expressed on exactly these lines.

The comments about limited parking for the church actually say that some of their visitors have to park in Oxley Shaw. Whilst this is not directly outside their frontage, the parking in Oxley Shaw is not far away, with good footway access and a controlled pedestrian crossing – it is not unreasonable to expect visitors to park in this road for the Church, and the same applies for visitors to the Cricket Club.

### **Recommendation**

The concerns of residents and the Parish Council over emergency vehicle access need to be considered. There are 24 residential properties in Rectory Lane North, along with the school and the Cricket Club pavilion.

The need to maintain emergency access needs to be considered against the convenience of parking for leisure activities, or where there are alternative parking arrangements. Accordingly it is recommended that the Board set aside the objection(s) and approve the restrictions for implementation.