

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There is limited parking spaces here now. If double yellows are put down where are residents going to park?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The car park within Howick Close isn't big enough to accommodate the vehicles for Howick close residents not to mention those who live on Clive House who would also have to use said car park.

There is also ample room for cars to park on both sides of the road and for larger vehicles to drive through.

I would however support double yellow lines being installed on the corners of the road where it is difficult for larger vehicles to turn and where there have already been accidents.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Parking is already an issue in this area due to the excessive cars on this close. I work from home daily and I can assure you these waste collections do not happen until after at least 10am, sometimes even the afternoon. Where these parking restrictions are proposed all the cars parked along here are gone by 8:30am Mon-Fri. There has never been an issue with collections or emergency services in the past accessing Howick Close in the 20+ years we have lived here. Please reconsider these restrictions as this will have a negative impact on a road with an already existing parking issue. Unless you are planning on creating a new parking area in replacement of removing these spaces? I can only assume not.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 05

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I strongly object to having the double yellow lines added to Howick Close. There are not enough parking space within the close for everyone to park As it is. I retire this month and I am unable to carry shopping. If these lines are added it will make my life extremely difficult. If all the spaces in the back car park are full, where do you propose I park my car, I do not have a garage. I have sent in previous photos of the road at 8am in the morning and the refuse lorry doesn't have a problem if they come after 8.00.am and they collect our rubbish at 10.30 anyway, why can't they do the other roads first like the Preston hall area, then collect from Howick when the road is empty. I can understand having yellow lines along Admiral Moore drive, but not Howick Close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the need for yellow lines to enable emergency services to get to the end of the close but before you take away parking spaces, please can you find other places to park.

We have all sorts of events here and there will be nowhere to park.

My mother is (REDACTED) and I am almost (REDACTED)., blue badge holders although we can park on yellow lines for a while.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object for the following reasons. 1 Howick Close already doesn't have enough parking for the amount of residents vehicles. 2 We also have 2 blocks of flats housing 12 flats each of which some residents also park in Howick Close. 3 We as residents haven't been made aware directly of any refuse truck access issues. 4 I have witnessed refuse trucks drive into Howick at speed when returning to collect a missed bin, therefore questioning the validity of them struggling to get access. 5 The largest area of parking isn't safely lit for safe passage to and from vehicles in the dark, half light or winter. 6 Many residents are elderly, ill or have babies and young children. Thereby needing to park close to there home for ease of access from home to car or visa versa. On Sunday I drove out of Howick Close behind an ambulance which had no problem entering or exiting with parked cars on both sides. 8 Currently cars speed along Admiral Moore drive as a cut threw to Culpepper estate and I feel that with the vehicles parked opposite Howick Close this helps slow them down. Should double yellows be put on Admiral moore drive then the speed will only increase for those using it as a rat run. 9 Should people have to park further from there current location they park, if their car alarm goes off, they may not hear it thus causing a noise nuisance to residents who would hear it, some of them being very elderly and in poor health.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 08

I support the proposals.

Comments

As a resident of 6 Howick Close on the side where double yellow lines are planned and being a blue badge holder I would like to know that with the already limited parking in the area not only due to private cars but also a number of business vehicles (large vans) which will be even more limited with the proposed double yellow lines what provision if any is being made for disabled parking and where will it be located, there are a number of residents on Howick Close who hold blue badges who would struggle without reasonable provision in place for localised disabled parking. A large number of garages on Howick Close are not used for car parking and are empty or sublet to small businesses for storing items such as carpets if these were demolished to make way for additional parking then this would create a larger area for off street parking than there is at present.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Howick Close

Response ref: DD-598-01 Aylesford - Howick Close - 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I would like to advise you that I do not think it is a good idea for the lines to be put down the street the reason for this is that due to my recent health issues I need my car to be near my home as I cannot walk far, and the issue of the street not being clear enough to get the bin lorry's down the road is not right as I have had to call the office on several occasions to report that they have not turned up, to be told that they could not make it then they leave it another week and put both lots of rubbish in the one lorry which makes no sense as we are told we must recycle but when it suits them they put it into the same lorry, also they have been known to turn up when the street is empty and still not emptied, the emergency services do get down the street without any problems as I have had 3 ambulances out for myself and they have had no issues, also if you do put these lines down where are we the residents going to park our cars. I would like a reply to this email please, as I did write a letter last Time about this matter but did not get a reply from anyone, as this is going to have a big impact on my physical health and mental health as well

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented, and to maintain access for large vehicles including refuse freighters and emergency vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

As long as it is only double yellow lines as per plans- as the parking on oneside of the road from outside The Bush Public House to Unwin Close, i feel actually reduces the speed of traffic into the Village and out of it. So should be maintained.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

I fully support all and any forms of parking restrictions being put in place along Rochester Rd and would hope that restrictions would go further and put in residents parking permit zones. The use of the local roads by non locals using the area to park up instead of the two currently free car parks along with Aylesford Football Club taking over the village is making it impossible to get around the local area at certain times of the day! Yellow lines whilst to some are a deterrent are seen merely as free parking zone to other non residents with little or no concern for actual local residents.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

Traffic backs up due to obstructive parking. My house is adjacent to the problem spot and suffers from excessive use of vehicle horns when motorists get impatient.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 05

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There is not enough available parking on Rochester Road. If for some reason myself, my family, friends etc can not park on our drive in many circumstances the only place to park is where the yellow lines aim to be. On 3 occasions vehicles have been keyed/scratched when parking in unwin close, so parking there is a no go. If the yellow lines are put in place where is going to be the nearest place to park? The nearest place I can think of are the 2 car parks by the river and along Forstal road. These options are not what I consider decent alternatives especially for elderly or disabled people. Plus they are quite far away and already get busy. If the new road to quarry was open to parking then I would say I don't object to the yellow lines

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 06

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

Also, if the yellow lines are put in place, people may park further up Rochester road in between the speed bumps which will cause traffic congestion. Traffic congestion is already a problem sometimes on Rochester road

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 07

I support the proposals.

Comments

To reduce congestion in this area. It will encourage more parking in Unwin Close where it is already difficult to gain access to or from Nos 2 and 11 Unwin Close.

Please consider this as a request to limit parking along Unwin Close as a later item for the Parking Action Plan

Response

Thank you for your response

We note the concerns about potential parking displacement in to Unwin Close, and will look to add Unwin Close to the holding list for consideration under a later Phase of the Parking Action Plan.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 08

I support the proposals.

Comments

Parking has become a big safety issue on Rochester Road, I fully support the proposals.

St Peter's school pupils use this section of Rochester Road to cross over to Mount Pleasant, with the proposed restrictions in place, crossing the road will be much safer due to the non-obstructed view.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 09

I support the proposals.

Comments

We support to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Rochester Road, shown on plan DD/598/02

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 10

I support the proposals.

Comments

WE AGREE !!!!!

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 11

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I have again consulted with immediate neighbours regarding your proposal for double yellow lines and can confirm that they do not want double yellow line outside their house, therefore I again object to this going ahead outside my property too. I am a permanent resident at 92 Rochester Road and have never seen any vehicles parked in this area you intend to make unwanted changes with the implementation of double yellow lines. I am also the highest council tax band resident to Tonbridge & West Malling Borough Council within the village and do not want unsightly double yellow lines outside my property, thus potentially impacting its saleability or market value. Should this be the case that this goes ahead despite our objection, will Tonbridge & West Malling Borough Council be prepared to compensate in the circumstances of any losses? Please can you provide data of surveys conducted / carried out where it has been recorded that vehicles have parked within the area of your new proposal? I want to be provided with factual evidence, since it is quite plain that there are no vehicles that park here whatsoever, therefore, require an explanation into your motives. Only two properties directly occupy the position on the left-hand side of the road on your plan, that being 90 and 92 Rochester Road and do not want this. If, as you suggest Unwin Close want double yellow lines outside their properties then that is their choice and not a decision I should be allowed to influence.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 12

I support the proposals.

Comments

As previously commented the proximity of parked vehicles to our driveway makes it difficult & dangerous to exit onto Rochester Road due to restricted view of traffic, especially cyclists, however slowly you emerge.

It is also hazardous for pedestrians, especially walking children when vehicle park 2 wheels on narrow pavement. (Photos provided)

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, Rochester Road

Response ref: DD-598-02 Aylesford - Rochester Road - 13

I support the proposals.

Comments

I was disappointed to see that the new proposals do not take into account lengthening the already existing double yellow lines at the junction of Unwin Close and Rochester Road. There are existing double yellow lines going towards the village at this junction. However they cover only a very short distance down Rochester Road and make it extremely dangerous when trying to exit Unwin Close. Vision is very poor and there have already been many near misses at this junction. Hopefully your new plans will make leaving the close and turning right much safer. However turning left from the the close is very hazardous. Could the council reconsider extending the already existing double yellow lines down Rochester Road as a short extension is all that is needed to make it much safer for the residents.

Response

Thank you for your response

We note the concerns about potential parking displacement in to Unwin Close, and will look to add Unwin Close to the holding list for consideration under a later Phase of the Parking Action Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 02

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

Parking for access to the shops is good at present if you put double yellow lines in front it will push traffic down the side roads and cause an issue. It will also impact on the trade of the local shops which is not good for the local area or the business

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I live on a road adjacent to this proposal which will be severely impacted our road is not wide enough to accommodate parked cars which will happen if parking by the shops is stopped. The only viable

option if you want to stop parking is to turn the grass area into a car park as the existing parking bays are always all full being the reason people park in the road. Perhaps implement a way way system along the parade in addition the proposal you are suggesting will kill the traders in the shop premises and is a very poor recommendation

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

Changes to the road layout as described are outside of the Borough Council's remit, and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

The Bends at both ends of the Avenue road between premier Parade and towards Elm Walk are where people always park for the school drop off and pick ups and is very dangerous.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 05

I object to the proposals.

Comments

My parents lived there until recently and I still visit the road as my dentist is there. The parking is not easy for those visiting the shops. The small car park is always full.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 06

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I Object to the double yellow lines out the front of Premier Parade as I have family who live above the shops and when I go to collect my son from there house after work the car parking spaces are full in the car park and in The row across the front of the shops, if you put in double yellow lines my own family won't be able to park at there own address as all spaces will be full! It will also have an impact of the shops down there as people may not visit as there will be no where to park! There have not been double yellow lines there for years and it has never been a problem.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I have a concern that restricting parking outside Premier Parade will cause people to find places to park further along The Avenue, thus causing issues along the road. We already see heavy congestion from parking along the road at school time am and pm.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires

drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Residents of the flats already struggle with parking as the households of rowan close and the general public use the car park rather than their own driveways or the bays out the front of the shops. We will end up with no parking at all as the council have put a public carpark sign on the car park yet fail to maintain it and constantly argue that this is our own private carpark for the flats. The only way that this could work is if the carpark is made private for the flats and measures in place to prevent others from gaining entry to it.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As A Resident of the Flats we already struggle to park.

As residents from Rowan Close, The Ave And Genarel public Use the Car Park which adjoins the Flats, instead of parking on the own Driveways. I have spoke to T&M Council a few times about the Car park regarding Our Bins and have been told The Car park is Not the Responsibility of T&M and its up to the Tenants to look after this. If this is so Why have the Council Put A Public Car parking sign on the Entrance to this car park. The only way the Residents of the Flats are going to be able to safely park is if The Car Park is made a private car park for The Residents Only and Access is denied to the public. The Residents have young children, baby's, toddlers and have many times had to park on the road outside. Not in a bay outside the shop as they are also taken up by public. Could you please put this to your Committee as we as Resident are really Fed up with Not being able to Park.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 10

I object to the proposals.

Comments

You want to put double yellows all the way along in front of the local shops? Where will people park who use the shops when the parking spaces are full? If that happens then say goodbye to local businesses because revenue will drop. It'll just force people to park outside residential properties which will then obscure them leaving their property. What about elderly that can't perhaps walk to the dentist in the Avenue parade of shops, they need to park and can't because the spaces are all taken? How about double yellows both sides of Elm walk, it's a nightmare when the school kicks out, that won't harm local business and you can still use your allocation of yellow paint? Where would you park if you needed urgent treatment and all the spaces were taken and there were new double yellows Mr Councillor?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

Fully support yellow lines on the Avenue (Bends) not in front of the shops. Regarding service road at rear off premises of Premier Parade, that's what it is, just that.

The rear of shops are or where gardens for the flats above, Shops who owned the flats above concreted over rear of premises, sited containers turning it in to commercial even though it is residential not Commercial, all with out permission! There is still a covenant in place from 8am to 5pm for deliveries, as time has gone on, we except times have changed 7am to 7pm. The original covenant still exists!

34 ton trucks now are entering the service road for collection of waste bins! Damaging paths and residents driveways! You can not have parking at rear of shops, they tried it once and drove into properties opposite causing damage! Fence knocked down 5 times, Garage damaged 3 times! Kind regards from Ex Borough Councillor (REDACTED)

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I Support the double yellows to the bend on the Avenue. I object to those in front of the shops. I don't understand the reasoning!

There just isn't enough parking provision for all the cars that wish to park there, be they residents of the flats, clients and staff of the dentists, hairdressers and staff of the Care Company (plus their ever present company car) and even the shop. Back in the late 80s/early 90s the spaces by the trees were added to supplement the parking. Unfortunately with the number of cars now needing to park, these spaces are difficult to access or exit. Maybe they need to be moved into the trees further if feasible so widening the road? The cars will end up aggravating other residents on The Avenue and connecting roads. Can't the Parade businesses develop their rear yards for parking staff cars? Let's leave those lines out of the proposal!

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Changes to the road layout as described are outside of the Borough Council's remit, and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 13

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a resident I have 2 kids and if the parking spots outside the shops and such are filled then we'd have to park further away than is necessary.

It's hard enough getting a parking spot in our supposed private parking so it'll create too much hassle.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 14

I support the proposals.

Comments

I would support it if the council made the necessary arrangements for the car park next to the shops/flats to state it's a private car park as stated by the council when contacted previously. I have two young children (one two year old and one newborn), my two year old is deaf and does not hear/understand the traffic dangers. Many times we have to park on the road outside the shop as the car park is full due to other people parking there who do not live in the flats. If you added double yellow lines this would add to the volume of people trying to park there which is supposed to be a private car park. I do not want to have to park further down the road and walk my children all the way down to get them home, especially due to my two year olds needs. As a resident who pays my rent and taxes, I should be able to park comfortably outside my home. Please look into changing the signs outside the car park from a public parking sign to a private one like it should be.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 15

I support the proposals.

Comments

There is often cars parks directly outside the shops on the access road which makes it impossible to park or exit the dedicated parking bays. This is dangerous and disruptive.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 16

I support the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I support the double yellows to the bends but object to extending the double yellows in front of the shops

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 17

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the proposed lines on the bend in The Avenue immediately opposite the shops. I use the Dentist next to the shops and parking can be an issue sometimes so I do not support the extension of the yellow lines in front of the shops. I can't walk far so if I can't park where will I go?

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 18

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The double yellows outside the shops on Premier parade are unnecessary and will affect trade for those establishments. However, I wholeheartedly support the restrictions proposed for the yellow lines around the inside corner of the Avenue opposite the shops, as it is here that traffic is forced (dangerously) into the path of oncoming vehicles.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 19

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the proposal for double yellow lines. The only time we have any issue is at school times. The rest of the time is absolutely fine and there are no issues. Therefore the use of double yellow lines is unnecessary and will restrict residents.

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 20

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I object to the proposal for double yellow lines. The only time we have any issue is at school times. The rest of the time is absolutely fine and there are no issues. Therefore the use of double yellow lines is unnecessary and will restrict residents

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 21

I support the proposals.

Comments

I certainly support the action on The Avenue due to dangerous parking and pavement infringement. However there should be NO parking restrictions directly outside the premier Parade of shops as currently this does not cause any obstruction and no danger to the public. If restriction's were to be put there vital trade to the shop facilities would greatly suffer. I have been personally monitoring this for over 3 years as live opposite. Restrictions are certainly needed along the Avenue at that point as there has been many accident near misses and obstructional parking on pavements causing danger to pedestrians.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 22

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I OBJECT to the BoroughCouncil's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Avenue (near Premier parade) & The Lindens, shown on plan DD/598/03 My comments are as follows There are an inadequate number of parking spaces available at present to accommodate both the residential and trade properties of Premier Parade, putting double yellow lines across Premier Parade will push the vehicles that park in that area down The Avenue in addition to Rowan Close & The Lindens, neither of which are wide enough to have cars parked in the road and allow access for all vehicles, including emergency vehicles & refuse vehicles, to the properties in these roads. As a local resident I am aware that when cars are parked in the parade it is because all the parking spaces available are full. A much better practical approach would be to change the road

layout of the Parade to make it one way only with either entry or exit via The Lindens and vice versa in Rowan Close, the grassed area in front of the parade should also be converted to parking areas, especially if you proceed with the ridiculous proposal of putting yellow lines in. We as a community should be supporting local business and you as a council seem to be going out of your way to impede business to these traders. My recommendations above will cost more than a tin of paint which will be no doubt the reason why you will reject them, however, they are the better suggestion as they will improve all the situations you are trying to resolve without impacting the community.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

Changes to the road layout as described are outside of the Borough Council's remit, and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 23

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Your proposals are excessive, disproportionate and will cause more problems than they solve. Possible double yellow lines on just the bend in The Avenue where parking does cause an obstruction but this only occurs occasionally, not frequently; its not necessary to be extended up to the The Hawthorns or along The Lindens. The only 'parking' that occurs in The lindens is for the occasional essential deliveries. Parking restrictions along Premier Parade are NOT required, there isn't a problem. Any restrictions on Premier Parade will adversely affect trade for the shops. If it is a issue with deliveries to the shops then these should be made via the rear access which was specifically provided for this purpose when the shops were built living at 1 The Lindens and being at home most of the time we have a very good view of the area and there are only occasionally issues with parking which resolve themselves.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 24

I object to the proposals.

Comments

no comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 25

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The changes will highly affect my business.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 26

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Please consider the businesses on the Parade. The changes definitely will effect the businesses.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 27

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Our household strongly objects to the proposed double yellow lines outside our property. Our property is on a quiet residential part of The Avenue and is not affected by the problems at premier parade. We are far enough away from this parade of shops and have not experienced any problems. There are already double yellow lines opposite our property and these are sufficient in preventing any issues. We have just moved into the area (1st August 23) from central Dartford our main reason for moving to The Avenue was there were no parking restrictions. We were not made aware of any proposals for restrictions to be introduced at our time of purchase. If we had known this we would have reconsidered our purchase. We are very disappointed we were not made aware of these proposals. We feel that introducing parking restrictions outside our property would cause problems with our neighbours further along The Aveune if we have to find alternative parking. We would be grateful if you could reconsider your proposed parking restrictions to not extend the double yellow lines outside our property [REDACTED]

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 28

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

Our household strongly objects to the proposed double yellow lines outside our property. Our property is on a quiet residential part of The Avenue and is not affected by the problems at premier parade. We are far enough away from this parade of shops and have not experienced any problems. There are already double yellow lines opposite our property and these are sufficient in preventing any issues. We have just moved into the area (1st August 23) from central Dartford our main reason for moving to The Avenue was there were no parking restrictions. We were not made aware of any proposals for restrictions to be introduced at our time of purchase. If we had known this we would have reconsidered our purchase. We are very disappointed we were not made aware of these proposals. We feel that introducing parking restrictions outside our property would cause problems with our neighbours further along The Avenue if we have to find alternative parking. We would be grateful if you could reconsider your proposed parking restrictions to not extend the double yellow lines outside our property [REDACTED]

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

The introduction of double yellow lines does not prevent loading or unloading activities as these are still permitted, and our Civil Enforcement Officers have to give an observation period to check whether loading or unloading is taking place.

Additionally, blue badge holders can park on double yellow lines, provided they are not close to junctions and do so in accordance with the limitations of the Blue Badge scheme

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade
Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 29

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I emailed back in May when I received a letter on the same subject about the proposals for double yellow lines outside the shops at Premier Parade. I didn't receive any acknowledgement at the time. Please can I ask for a reply and confirmation of receipt. I am a resident in The Lindens of just over 10 years so am very local to the Premier Parade. Of course the parade of shops attracts a number of cars and on some occasions there are some drivers who don't park with much sense. However, I would say this is actually quite rare. You have proposed double yellow lines in a number of places that parking doesn't happen anyway. For instance, the entrance to The Lindens is too narrow for cars to park so there is no issue there. You have also proposed lines to be added directly outside the shops. There are often cars parked there but this doesn't cause a particular problem. Cars are only parking there when the car parking spaces are full anyway. If those spaces are full I suspect people will park on the lines anyway. Earlier today there were actually lots of spaces and yet still someone parked on the existing lines where the postbox is. This makes me think that unless you plan to enforce the area constantly there will be no difference. My biggest concern is what happens next. The proposed double yellow lines in my opinion are very unlikely to solve a problem and will only create a new issue by moving the problem further on and then that affects the residents on The Lindens and also The Rowans. These roads are narrow and don't really have the space for cars to park safely next to the kerb line. Is there a great deal of evidence of the issue, for example some time lapse photography that you can also share to prove the extent of this issue? If this evidence is there to support it then it would make a case for some investment in a better solution than painted lines. With regard to alternative solutions worth consideration. The businesses have a kind of garden space at the rear. The dentists employees must have at least 3 or 4 cars arriving daily. Those businesses could create parking for 2/3 staff cars at the rear. This will free up parking spaces for their customers. The existing parking spaces are generous in depth. The parking area could be redesigned so the spaces are slanted more. This would free some more space in the road way and along the kerb in front of the shops so additional parking at an angle in front of the shops could be put in place. This would provide more parking spaces compared to parking adjacent to the kerbs. I think it would be sad to lose any of the green space or trees but sympathetically toward The Rowans a few additional spaces could be added. In The Lindens there is a wide path that is often parked on anyway. The level could be reduced and the foot path reduced in width to allow for safer parking (again it is happening anyway!) A time limit for parking in the spaces outside the shops could be introduced. This will reduce the number of staff cars or residents using the parking spaces. Again freeing them up for the actual customers. Any of these ideas in my opinion would be more of a solution than the proposed lines that simply push the problem further on. To add another point which I think is related. There is very often drivers taking to the pavement to pass each other going up Teapot Lane while children and parents are walking toward the school is a much more desperate safety concern. The parking can't really be restricted

further but you could widen the road slightly or create parking lay bys where there are grass verges. Again to reiterate my point I think there needs to be more thought put into this than simply painting lines on the ground. On the 90degree corner going round The Avenue toward the Oaks this is really dangerous and I see the sense in the lines. However I still think they shouldn't actually be needed as the drivers should have enough sense (and a grasp of the highway code) to know that parking there or close to the junction of the road presents a huge hazard. I do really hope that my opinion is considered in this case before this action is taken and the consequences felt by the residents who will be affected.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement.

Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

The aim of the changes is to deter parking on the bends and in the narrow roads, prevent parking at the junctions, and to improve access to the off-carriageway parking places in Premier Parade

Changes to the road layout as described are outside of the Borough Council's remit, and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue/ Premier Parade

Response ref: DD-598-03 Aylesford - The Avenue (near Premier Parade)- 30

I object to the proposals.

Comments

DD/598/03 I OBJECT to the Borough Councils proposed restrictions in front of the shops at Central Parade. I believe the introduction of restrictions would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent businesses. The only place where restrictions may be necessary is in front of the dropped (pedestrian) access kerbs. The adjacent car park is usually occupied by residents and the parking bays opposite the shops are often occupied by employees of the businesses. It is stated that Aylesford Parish Council reported problems with obstructive parking. I have raised your Statement of Reason with Aylesford Parish Council as I could not find any mention of it in their minutes. They informed me that they have no recollection of it being discussed. Consequently TMBC were asked by APC on 10th October 2023 when this was reported by them.

At the time of writing, I have not received an update from them. I would be grateful of your comments.

Response

The proposed restrictions were requested by email by the Clerk of Parish Council on 20th September 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

The issue with the bend I have been trying to get yellow lines for years. So I support the proposal but doe the lines extend far enough. The area between 76 and 78 The Avenue still allows some parking though limited by the garage driveway to number 78 adjacent boundary to number 76. The issue I have is parking here means when driving towards the oaks you end up on wrong side of road. On many occasions over the years a car drives out from the Oaks, looks right and pulls out left. What can happen then is a head on collision as I have closely experienced.

Additionally on another issue, drivers go around the bends too fast. Times I being careful have had to stop quickly because some silly driver is cutting the corner at too fast a speed. Maybe we need Carriage way markings on the bends and also humps!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Speed management, the provision of centreline road markings and markings on road humps would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I dont see many issues with the access and parking around the avenue, I have never seen this blocked, it has always free flowed. This use of Yellow lines will be ignored, just like they are on The Parade in Ditton. The only issue I do see here is parking across the crossing in front of the shops.

This would hugely benefit from a zebra crossing. This way the use of the white zigzags would give the desired effect of no parking, with a clear sign that parking on zigzags is enforceable by 3 penalty points on your licence.

The money would be better spent with yellow lines in Teapot Lane enforceable around school times only. Parking wardens would finally have the ability to issue tickets to allow the free flow of the road. Complete yellow lines down the even house numbered side of the road. Parking bays with yellow lines across peoples drives on the odd side of the road.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 05

I support the proposals.

Comments

Parking on the bends cause motorists a hazard. When I visited my daughter on several occasions I have come close to having an accident when a car comes out from the turning near the Dentist and finds me on the wrong side of the road as I pass parked vehicles in my immediate lane just around the bend!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

Drivers take the bend in the middle of the road and too fast. I would like to see lines at the top of the tee junctions as they are a favourite waiting spot for the school runs.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

The provision of centreline road markings and markings on road humps would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 07

I support the proposals.

Comments

To avoid Dangerous parking practices especially during school pickup and drop off times. This also includes the proposal in Premier Parade and the Avenue.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I have lived at [REDACTED] Oaks for 22 years. The road has minimal traffic other than that directly related to the residents themselves. Residents park considerably and within highway regulations and I dispute double yellow lines are necessary. The roads become busy on weekdays during term time in the morning at 8.45am and in the afternoon at 3pm as parents collect their children from school. This lasts for around 20 minutes and has been the case for decades. The flow of traffic continues without problems during this time. Placing double yellow lines in the selected area will only cause problems further up the road during these busy times and also for residents generally, as there will be less space for people to park safely in. Although the lines are not proposed for outside my property, we will certainly be affected by displacement - I therefore also find it infuriating that the council did not have the courtesy to alert my household about this consultation. This is the second time we have had to object to such proposals. I find it very frustrating that time including my own, is once again being wasted on this unnecessary idea. I also feel that this whole process is a waste of money to the public purse, particularly as the idea was abandoned some years ago when nothing in that time has changed. I hope common sense prevails in this matter once again. Thank you.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I change my initial response and object to the proposal for double yellow lines.

The only time we have any issue is at school times. The rest of the time is absolutely fine and there are no issues. Therefore the use of double yellow lines is unnecessary and will restrict residents. If anything, the use of single yellow no stopping between the hours of 8:30am-9:30am and 3:00pm-4:00pm would be much more appropriate.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 10

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I change my initial response and object to the proposal for double yellow lines.

The only time we have any issue is at school times. The rest of the time is absolutely fine and there are no issues. Therefore the use of double yellow lines is unnecessary and will restrict residents.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Avenue & The Oaks, shown on plan DD/598/04.

Comments; Go slow signs on the bends especially the Avenue, as people come round that corner fast at times.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

The provision of SLOW markings and warning signs would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to this as it will be reducing the available parking in the road, what with a dentist & a school, I already have issues with people parking outside my house and in some cases blocking my drive. I will now have a continuous stream of cars parking outside my property. It doesn't solve any issues, it just pushes the problem along the road, causing more congestion along The Avenue. Fair enough having yellow lines on the corners, but not the straight road paths.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 13

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Please accept this email as our strong objection to the New & Amended Parking Restrictions for Phase 14 The Avenue, & The Oaks. We are strongly against the Double Yellow Lines as they are very restrictive to the local residents who do not cause the parking problems. The parking problem is only there at school times in the morning and afternoon, for a total of approx. 40 minutes. Why should we suffer who live at the junction for other people's irresponsible parking. We have enjoyed living here for 33 years, and in all that time we have never witnessed an emergency vehicle being held up by this parking issue. Has anyone from the Borough Council or Parish been on site to actually see the situation, or ask the residents their views, before putting in this consultation?

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 14

I support the proposals.

Comments

Re the proposed plans for yellow lines in The Avenue & The Oaks in Aylesford. I agree that these are really necessary as parking in these areas causes very dangerous congestion for all traffic using this area and when school children are trying to cross the road with parked and moving cars obstructing their view with a great chance of a serious accident.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 15

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I am sending you my views on the recent application to appoint double yellow lines in The Oaks and The Avenue in Aylesford. I am against this proposal for the following reasons: We are a happy community in Aylesford and the only problem we have is with the school run at Teapot Lane and surrounding roads, Valley Invictar Primary School. There is a little upheaval with some parents parking. In the mornings and afternoons during term time. I admit some do park in the most shocking ways with no consideration for residents and other road users. However, as there is never anyone in authority to curb this problem they will continue to park in this manner. They only really cause a problem for other School drivers. Once the school madness has subsided, on average 30 min morning and afternoon, everything returns to normal. Normal is a quiet and fairly empty street environment. All residents seem to stick to the same parking spaces and there is no need for ugly double yellow lines, no obstructions and no holding or blocking traffic. If double yellow lines were added it would mess the residents parking spaces and cause unwanted hassle. Causing everyone to move up one, which would not work. Your submission is flawed also by what I can see, as it does not recognise number 15 The Oaks. So how can a proposal go through with a flaw to plans? I feel that Aylesford Parish Council has taken it upon themselves to justify parking restrictions without considering to seek the views of the residents that actually live here. I moved here from a street that was heavily impacted by speed humps, yellow lines and parking restrictions. It made a refreshing change not to see these horrible signs when I moved to The Oaks. These roads do not call for this intrusion. It's not justifiable. The area will just be defaced and that country feel will all be gone. Just as it is now with all these new houses being built on lovely open green land. If only someone from Aylesford Borough

Council could see how lovely and quiet it is here they would then see for themselves there is no need whatsoever for these restrictions.

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 16

I support the proposals.

Comments

I (REDACTED) confirm my support for the proposed changes to the on street parking arrangements for The Avenue and The Oaks shown on plan DD/598/04

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 17

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Good afternoon, I have noticed that you have now advertised the new parking restriction plan, on the street furniture around The Avenue and The Oaks, ME20. Can you please confirm by plan, what this will look like. Will this be applied as per original plan sent to me on the 19th May this year. If that is the case, as I previously stated in my response to the original letter, that our home, at ■ The Oaks was not shown on the plan and this the proposal would mean that I would have no parking outside my house. If this is the case then I would like to be consulted prior to the lines being laid as it seems to affect my ability to park and no one else's. I would expect a response as soon as possible.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires

drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

**Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 18**

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

We have received your notice for planned parking restrictions in The Avenue/The Oaks ME20. As per original response dated 24th May 2023, you have once again neglected to include our property, on your plans, at (REDACTED). Please see attached updated plan. our property was built circa 2012-13. so was not part of the original estate. We have noted that we have not received any responses to our request to update this, dated 10th June, 27th June and the 6th October. Our property is the only house that is directly affected by the implementation of the yellow lines, as these will prohibit our ability to park outside our property. This will cause us problems and of course drastically decrease the value of our property. We purchased this property two years ago with the understanding that parking was available outside the property. We have no issues with placing the yellow lines on the corners and junctions. as these will only be in the areas where parking is already illegal, i.e. within 10 mtrs of the junctions. However, yellow lines will stop some people from parking, but as we see everyday at the junction of Teapot Lane and Elm Walk, this is not the case and unless those restrictions are enforced then the yellow lines will be pointless. We would appreciate some form of direct communication, with you. to discuss this matter as it is causing us a great deal of stress. We know that some of the residents are against the yellow lines, but none of these are directly affected by you implementing them, this is probably why the response is low as most people do not see them being a problem. But as stated above we have the only house that will lose the capability to park in the road outside their property.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 19

I object to the proposals.

Comments

It is busy here at school times but only for less than an hour, 8-8:45 and 2:45-3:30. Double yellow lines would be very inconvenient for those living in the street.

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks
Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 20

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

I am writing to you about this parking consultation on behalf of (REDACTED) who lives at (REDACTED). We are against the proposals. (REDACTED) is elderly and requires quite a bit of health provision. Keeping her living at home is in everyone's interests, both ours and the NHS's, and being able to park near the house is important for health care workers and family members returning when her condition requires extra help. Although the house does have a drive there is frequently the need for more than one car and my mother is also unable to get into a car parked in the drive. Putting double yellow lines outside will make the organisation of her care more difficult. In addition, other

than for the start and end of the school day, the street is very quiet and double yellow lines feels completely unnecessary. All it will do is deflect parked traffic to somewhere else nearby on the estate or, unless regularly monitored by you, parents will ignore the double yellow lines to drop off and pick up their children. It may be that the extra urgency of doing this while parked on double yellow lines will have some safety implications for the children.

Response

In your response you confirm that there are parking problems at the junctions.

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

The only restriction that we can introduce is "no waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) as any restriction to prevent parking at certain times condones parking at the other times.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parki

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Formal Consultation response – Aylesford, The Avenue / The Oaks

Response ref: DD-598-04 Aylesford - The Avenue (near The Oaks)- 21

I object to the proposals.

Comments

DD/598/04 I OBJECT to the Borough Councils proposed parking restrictions at the junction of The Avenue and The Oaks, Aylesford. It is stated that Aylesford Parish Council reported problems with obstructive parking. I have raised your Statement of Reason with Aylesford Parish Council as I could not find any mention of it in their minutes. They informed me that they have no recollection of it being discussed. Consequently TMBC were asked by APC on 10th October 2023 when this was reported by them.

At the time of writing, I have not received an update from them. I would be grateful of your comments.

Response

The proposed restrictions were requested by email by the Clerk of Parish Council on 20th September 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Blue Bell Hill, Common Road

Response ref: DD-598-05 Blue Bell Hill - Common Road - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

Vehicles do not slow down when turning into common road from Maidstone road, just treated as a bend in the road. Double yellow lines also need to be extended at the entrance to mill lane all the way up the slope and past the first few houses as this is very narrow and easily obstructed

Response

Thank you for your response.

We note the concerns about additional parking issues in Mill Lane, and will look to add Mill Lane to the holding list for consideration under a later Phase of the Parking Action Plan.

Formal Consultation response – Blue Bell Hill, Common Road

Response ref: DD-598-05 Blue Bell Hill - Common Road - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

This will only force drivers to park further down Common road which will be dangerous due to the width of the existing lane past the viewing point.

The parking on the highlighted area is never an issue. I would like to know the reasoning and thoughts regarding this.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

Current trends of parking on the corner, especially on the odd numbered houses side of the road, causes safety issues for those vehicles approaching each other round the bend, with some instances of having to mount the kerb to avoid the oncoming vehicle. This in turn endangers pedestrians that may be walking by at the same time. There have also been instances of failed deliveries by lorries coming into the Close caused by the parking on the corner.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I agree that lines are needed around the bend but they are unnecessary on the straight section. In fact I believe adding them to the straight section would cause more harm than good as cars would be able to speed and cars would be displaced to further into the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

By putting in double yellow lines will stop residents from parking outside their house, which they have been able to do for 30yrs! Why can the double lines go just on the bend?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 05

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Contrary to the opinion of Councillor Roud, the cars which park in the first 100yards of the close act as a natural traffic calming arrangement. The cars which travel from the end of the close frequently travel above the 30mph speed limit, but slow at the bend because of the single lane arrangement caused by parked cars at the end. My pregnant daughter lives where the yellow lines are proposed and by necessity her car parks on the road. Both for her and for me visiting to support her, installing yellow lines will only push the cars which need to park to further down the close, causing inconvenience because of the distance to the house. Cars also park in the proposed area to take advantage of the footpath through to the orchards. Most importantly my view is that the benefit of yellow lines has been completely misunderstood. Cars will travel at a greater speed down the close without the parked cars, creating more risk of accidents, not less to pedestrians and residents exiting their drives with cars. I recommend engaging a traffic specialist to comment rather than acting on the opinion of an individual or a small group of poorly informed individuals. Review the instances of accidents in the area caused by parked cars. The residents are not aware of any. The residents

actually living on the spot have the best informed opinions and are unanimously opposed to the proposal.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 06

I object to the proposals.

Comments

will shunt proposed cars to our end of the close causing obstructions as road is already to narrow for service vehicles to enter without added cars from outside the close we have a drive which has just allowed more cars to park already without the added double yellow lines

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There is little parking in the village, homes have extended and increase in cars per household, and this is needed space for the local residents

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We understand that the purpose of the changes is to ensure full access round the bend in Cottenham Close for the larger vehicles. Therefore, why not simply put double yellow line round the bend. It should be noted that most of the cars parking in the first part of Cottenham Close are not residents (nor their visitors) of Cottenham Close. Why not make restrictions on parking similar to Mill Street. Allowing residents only to park on Cottenham Close. Surely that is fair to the residents of Cottenham Close.

It does appear that due to covenant restrictions by Developers on Vigo Close that their residents use Cottenham Close as their parking.

Is this not partly due to Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council giving Planning permission for Vigo Close to be developed with such covenant restrictions in place ?

Now because of non Cottenham Close cars, being parked on Cottenham Close. The issues of access are being resolved by punishing the residents of Cottenham Close, by putting forward such an unfair proposal. Surely Tonbridge & Malling should address the real issues effectively created by them. Please rethink the proposals. Yours sincerely, (REDACTED)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a visitor it has not caused issues and would further limit available parking

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 10

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We regularly visit friends who live in the area proposed for double yellow lines. If such a parking restriction was imposed we would have to park a long way from their house. I see no reason that yellow lines are needed for such an long stretch.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 11

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a frequent visitor to cottenham close, assisting a friend during a difficult pregnancy, there is already limited parking in the road. The proposed will prevent me from helping, and in all likelihood will cause greater problems with other friends and family attempting to visit.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Proposed extension of double yellow lines will result in significantly reduced on street parking in the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 13

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Parking is already a problem when we visit our son and daughter-in-law. We agree that parking should not be allowed on the bend itself, but see no reason for stopping residents and visitors from parking outside their own properties on the straight near the entrance to Cottenham Close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 14

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to putting double yellow lines on the straight entrance to Cottenham Close, as this is unnecessary and not in my view a safety concern. If this proposal was just for double yellow lines around the bend I would understand, but it is not. I visit this area regularly to visit my sister for child care purposes and need to park on the road outside their home. There is no where else within 100m safe for me to park most days. I cannot see the purpose of restricting parking on the straight as this will offer little benefit but cause huge inconvenience to residents and visitors.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 15

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I find it amazing that you are proposing to limit parking even more in Cottenham Close. Residents and visitors should have the right to park outside their properties except where it would be dangerous to do so. There is a case for double yellow lines actually on the bend but to extend them any further is unnecessary.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 16

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I strongly object to this grossly restrictive proposal. Parking space is already very limited in the village. Where are residents supposed to park?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 17

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a regular visitor to the close to see friends, we have never had an issue with poor or dangerous parking within the close. By extending the double yellow lines along the straight part of the close up to the bend you are will be seriously reducing the amount of available parking for friends and family. This will mean that we would have to park further up the road causing more issue for local residences further along the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 18

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We object to the proposed extension of double yellow lines on Cottenham Close for the following reasons: Safety Risks Amplified: The current double yellow lines on Cottenham Close effectively prevent access blockages to and from Mill St. Extending them may encourage faster driving around the blind bend leading into Cottenham Close, putting at risk children playing, dog walkers, and elderly and disabled individuals using the public footpath where it crosses the road. Natural Traffic Calming: The parked vehicles currently serve as an effective traffic calming measure, ensuring drivers navigate cautiously. Their removal in favour of double yellow lines might necessitate future council expenditure on additional traffic calming measures, such as chicanes or speed bumps, which would be a waste of council money and resources as this issue is not currently present. Essential Access for Vulnerable Residents: A number of elderly and infirm individuals reside on this road. Maintaining clear access for delivery vehicles, like shopping deliveries, is vital to their independence and well-being. Problem Displacement, Not Solution: The proposed yellow lines will merely displace parking further into the road, leading to a more congested parking situation in the heart of Cottenham Close.

Emergency Vehicle Access: The potential clustering of parked cars deeper into Cottenham Close could obstruct rapid access for emergency vehicles, which could be life-threatening in an emergency.

Environmental Concerns: Prolonged searching for parking due to increased density may lead to increased idling and emissions, adversely affecting local air quality. Decrease in Property Value: The perceived inconvenience of parking restrictions and denser than expected on-street parking may deter potential home buyers or renters, resulting in a decline in property values. Community Disruption: Tighter parking restrictions could lead to increased competition for limited spaces, causing stress and potential disputes among neighbours. Visitor Inconvenience: Extended yellow lines can hinder visitors, friends, carers or family from easily parking when they visit, hampering social interactions. Increased On-street Parking Density: This proposal could result in a congested parking situation deeper into the close, challenging the navigation and parking of all vehicles, as well as decreasing road visibility for those who are using driveways. Potential for More Vehicle Movements: The restriction might increase vehicle movements as residents reposition their cars or move them for others, increasing potential accident risks. Considering these substantial concerns, we wish to object to these proposals as we believe this is the best option to prioritise the safety, well-being, and harmony of the residents of Cottenham Close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close
Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 19

I support the proposals.

Comments

I have seen many near miss accidents waiting to happen on the bend where the parking has reduced the road to single track. On occasion I had to wait whilst a food delivery was unloaded as I could not pass, which gives concern to anyone needing an ambulance or fire service.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close
Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 20

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Cars are not often parked on the bend. I do not want yellow lines any further up than they are at the moment. We don't need double yellow lines.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 21

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

No double yellow lines. This is not needed. I as a resident do not want double yellow lines.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 22

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The recent proposal to apply double yellow lines to the entrance to Cottenham Close should be abandoned. Double yellows, if deemed really necessary could be included to the corner bend of the Close for a short distance. However, it is the case that because it IS a bend nobody parks cars there anyway. At this present time with cars parked at the beginning of Cottenham providing a restriction in traffic flow and a natural reduction in any possible excessive speed. Remove these cars with double Yellow lines and this will become a pedestrian hazard as many walkers to the area beyond Cottenham cross the road somewhere between Mill Street and the footpath entrance to the right by the bend. Please stop interfering with our roads.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 23

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Placing parking restrictions from Mill St junction to the outside of No.14 & No.3 will push vehicles that currently park outside No.1 further up into Cottenham Close whilst there is a need to restrict parking on the bend, maintaining the existing parking outside 1a/2 would make more sense!

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 24

I support the proposals.

Comments

Strong support

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 25

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I don't think there is a significant issue at the moment and the vehicles that do park on this section of road will just cause a parking problem elsewhere.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 26

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We already have residents from Vigor Close parking here. They will therefore park further up the cul-de-sac. Nothing will be achieved by this restriction but to increase congestion in the Close. This is probably a hidden pre-cursor to residents parking permits!

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 27

I support the proposals.

Comments

I do not own a car, but I can see that sometimes traffic is forced on the wrong side of the road on the bend. The proposal will cause parking problems further along the road but safety must come first.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 28

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We have 2 cars, which we need. When planning permission was given for this development the Council allowed builders to put smaller than average garages in. If we put our smaller car in the garage we cannot get out of the car!!! We have 1 provided parking space. Originally we were able to have a permit to park on Mill St (our property faces on to Mill St) That is no longer the case so now we park opposite our house on Cottenham Close, along with several others from this development and any guests we may have. Where are people to park if these yellow lines are placed on a perfectly safe, straight piece of road????

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 29

I support the proposals.

Comments

I've today been made aware of the plans to extend the double yellow lines into Cottenham Close. Whilst I agree with the proposal to introduce double yellow lines on the bend, a spot where parking can be dangerous, I object to the proposal to then extend these double yellow lines to the intersection with Mill Street. Double yellow lines on the straight between the corner and Mill Street is unnecessary from a safety perspective and will cause parking problems for residents along the entire road and could lead to customers speeding down the start of the Close.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 30

I object to the proposals.

Comments

- 1. It will add more parked cars & congestion furthre up the close.*
- 2. It will be harder for residents to park near own home.*
- 3. It will increase speeding at the entrance of close and round the bend.*
- 4. From a personal point of view, yellow lines go beyond No.14, we are unable to increase off-street parking due to lamp post on the corner of our drive and water hydrant 1/2 way along front. As we are elderly and as time progresses will probably need help to manage it would make it more difficult for this help to park in order to assist us.*

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 31

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for Cottenham Close East Malling, shown on plan DD/598/07.

COMMENTS As a long time resident of Cottenham Close I feel there is no need for further parking restrictions on the entrance to the close. What I would prefer to see are the existing double yellow lines, marked in red on the plan, to be rigorously enforced by regular visits of a traffic warden or police officer.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 32

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the councils proposal for changes to the on street parking

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 33

I support the proposals.

Comments

100% agree with the new proposals = stop people parking on the bend as very hazardous - many near misses have witnessed as cars moving fast passing bend. Also pulling off from drive can be hazardous too. Blind bend for pedestrians who step into road as cars parking on the bend!!!

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 34

I object to the proposals.

Comments

People coming into the close drive far to fast and with no cars parked at the beginning of the close they would drive even faster!!! P.S. Maybe a speed camera?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 35

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I do not support this plan, it's a small residential street which is already busy with cars. This plan will increase the congestion further up the road which isn't necessary.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 36

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We do not need or want double yellow lines where shown on the above drawing. At the moment vehicles do not park on this corner.

The problem is the 5 cars from Vigor Close who have no parking outside their premises. Who decreed this planning? I am given to understand that this can now be reversed allowing the residents to park in their own road. The yellow lines will create a rat run, vehicles already drive too fast around this bend.

My suggestion would be to create three bays 'resident parking only' out side No1b Cottenham Close, suitably marked. This will create a chicane and slow traffic substantially. If double yellow lines are installed where shown on TMBC Drawing No DD/598/07 where will Vigor Close residents park then? Not further up Cottenham Close we hope, which is already full with Cottenham Close residents cars, some parking on the pavement.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 37

I support the proposals.

Comments

Many residents seem to park their vehicles in the road instead of their drive. As to why, is one of life's mysteries. This is nowt so strange as folk.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 38

I support the proposals.

Comments

I would have preferred a 20mph limit to have applied to the whole area shown on plan DD/598/07

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 39

I support the proposals.

Comments

As per my previous comments (not supplied)

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 40

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 41

I support the proposals.

Comments

Of course, parking restrictions are only effective if they are enforced occasionally!

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 42

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Our view on the proposed yellow lines are still the same as our original response. Lines on the bend are required as it is dangerous, but we still feel it is not necessary to have the lines continued from the existing lines at the entrance up to the bend. (your letter dated 19th May 23 state that Councillor Roud reported obstructive parking only on the bend not from the entrance of the close. This will cause many problems for us, visitors, or tradespeople if we need them in our home. We've had this problem with double yellow lines many years ago and had them evoked to where they are now. The 18 in favour of this proposal is because its not going to effect them anyway. (Plan enclosed)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 43

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Yellow lines only around bend. Allow residents to park outside own homes.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 44

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I agree yellow lines on bend might be needed but a section between existing yellow lines (red on plan) at entrance to close, past 1A should remain for parking. Cars need to be parked somewhere! And in my experience this slows traffic.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 45

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I just don't understand why! Where do visitors park?? We only have one parking space to if we have a visitor they park in the close. No other parking around!!! Make it residents only, Mon-Fi. What do we do for parking?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 46

I support the proposals.

Comments

The problem is motorists that mainly park on the road are non-residents to the station to go to work making it dangerous and difficult to get out of our drives.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 47

I support the proposals.

Comments

Reference DD/598/07 Cottenham Close I support the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Cottenham Close, East Malling shown on Plan DD/598/07. I fully agree your proposal for double yellow lines as per Parking Action Plan Phase 14. The proposed plan features/shows a very dangerous spot to have vehicles parking on road or partly on the pavement. I should like see the lines extended as all residents of Cottenham Close have a driveway to park on or a frontage area on which to park a vehicle so as to keep pavements & road clear. My wife who is registered disabled sometimes has to drive her electric buggy into the road to avoid a pavement parked vehicle. Not only private cars are parked on the road / pavement but also commercial vehicles. There have been instances when Ambulances, Fire Brigade & Refuse Collection vehicles have had problems getting through. My proposal being that if you have a driveway or frontage then it should be used for parking vehicles on.. Hope that this note will help in solving our Cottenham Close problem.

Response

Thank you for your comments

This page is intentionally left blank

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 01**

I support the proposals.

Comments

I do agree with the placement of the double yellow lines. But I must add that, that spot is useful for truck driver to stop at, I would suggest that there not to be double yellow lines on one side of the cul-de-sac but the exit and the entrance of the roundabout I do agree with

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 02**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I've never witnessed an obstruction at this part of the highway.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 03**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I work in this area. I have never seen a parking problem here. The only thing double yellows here will do is prevent people from using the burger van which has been installed in this area for many years.

We need to support small businesses not obstruct them

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 04**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Regularly drive past there, lived here for over 10 years, never ever seen an issue at this spot. Looks like a total waste of time and resources. I cannot believe it's got this far. Several other places in East Peckham that need attention but defiantly not this one.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 05**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

no comments supplied

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 06**

I support the proposals.

Comments

no comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 07**

I support the proposals.

Comments

I work at one of the businesses at the end of branbridges. Most people won't understand the difficulty for the lorries entering and leaving the site. Also the obstruction of vehicles when leaving work makes it very difficult to turn left when multiple people are trying to go home.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 08**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

This is totally pointless. Lived here 21 years and never been an issue there. Hardly any cars park there during the day. Only come the evening to pick up kebab from the van. A waste of money

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 09**

I support the proposals.

Comments

Parking related to the Kebab Van in particular, makes exiting this road very dangerous. The bus often parks there too. The problem is people think this is an unused Road. They don't realise its an access to a business.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 10**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

People park for the burger van, never on the roundabout. No one parks on a roundabout! I think it's a shame you intend to ruin the burger van business. We are supposed to be supporting small businesses. If you have some money to spend focus on the speeding around the village and on the bypass.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 11**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I have lived in the village for 23 years and the areas proposed for double yellows to the left of the roundabout have never been parked on. The private land that serves Clovis yes vehicles do park here whilst using the kebab van which does sometimes cause a momentary obstruction but nobody parks here long stay, 10 minutes maximum. This proposal is a waste of funding and purely for the benefit of one business premises which will also be to the detriment of another business.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout) Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I regularly use this road as the school buses pick up and drop off at this bus-stop. There is no safe crossing point for the school children to walk from this bus stop to the village. The children have to stand on the verge and cross the 60 mph road on the bend coming from the roundabout in order to access the pavement by the petrol station to walk to the village. Therefore, parents drive to the bus stop to drop off and collect. Employees of the businesses in the industrial estate also use this road for parking. All vehicles using this road for parking always park on one side anyway. In over 3 years of using this road twice a day for school drop offs/collections, and in over 16 years of living in the village and driving past this road several times a day, I have never seen vehicles parking on the road so as to obstruct the roundabout. I can see the logic in keeping the turning point at the end of the road clear to prevent obstruction to the access to the businesses, but I do not think that this is a regular problem. If people cannot use their common sense to realise that they should not block the access, then painting double yellow lines there will not make any difference. In summary, I think that putting double yellow lines as proposed would be disproportionate, would not achieve the aim of preventing obstruction to the access and would not be a good use of public money.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 13**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The parish council have not had any resident requesting such action. Not sure how we got this far without being informed.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 14**

I support the proposals.

Comments

Response

Thank you for your response.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 15**

I support the proposals.

Comments

There are obstructive vehicles abandoned regularly along this corner of Branbridges Road. Also, due to the 'kebab' van parked on the corner, there are vehicles 'parked' dangerously on the corner and on the grass verge. The yellow lines would be an important safety improvement in addition to the abandoned 'free car parking' that is often the case. I hope you go ahead with your plans, (REDACTED) - local businessman

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 16**

I support the proposals.

Comments

We cant see when exiting the road. Its dangerous. One member of staff had a head on collision two years ago.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 17**

I support the proposals.

Comments

Vehicles park on the grass verges opposite the food van. When exiting the dual carriage way and turning into the road the obstruction means your view is completely blocked. We also cant see when we exit the car park as vehicles park right up against our gate.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 18**

I support the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this property.)**

Comments

Dangerous parking on the verges. Lorries unable to access our premises due to cars parking at the end of the road.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)

Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 19

I support the proposals.

Comments

Views being blocked when exiting the car park and the end of the road

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)

Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 20

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response.

Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)

Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 21

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There are far more dangerous places in the village that could do with Yellow Lines. If you have to put lines on that small area why not just put them by the gate area for about 10m to give lorries a turning space. Also how about policing the areas in the village that have yellow lines.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 22**

I support the proposals.

Comments

Yes, I totally support these plans. Trying to drive past this area is very difficult and pulling out of the garage is made impossible when cars / vans are parked up :) As above, to make a very dangerous entrance to East Peckham, a little more predictable :)

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 23**

I support the proposals.

Comments

I think the food van should be moved or binned have they even got a hygiene certificate I doubt it. It's grim and they buy most of their extras from the coop and sell on and double the price or frozen from their freezer. It's ugly when you turn into East Peckham and it attracts the wrong sort of people to the area including the motorbikes that speed up and down the dual carriageway that have somewhere to eat

Response

Thank you for your comments.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 24**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I think the borough should invest in speed bumps coming off of the dual carriageway into the village. The speeding on hale street and branbridges road is awful and needs to be sorted. It would be a much better cause then spending money on placing double yellow lines. Many, many residents pets have died on hale street/ branbridges road and the speeding is dangerous to children also.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 25**

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I'm not sure if this is the correct way to proceed but I wish to place an objection to the installation of new yellow lines in Branbridges Road I own and operate The Village Grill , the mobile catering van in Branbridges Road.

This road is not a busy road as it is a dead end which only leads to the entrance of the commercial unit behind. My van also sits well away from the roundabout.

There are no local residences so the installation of these lines would not benefit any householders or businesses.

I have operated my business in this location for seven years without problem and have built it up to be a successful local resource.

Most of my business occurs after 5 pm and therefore any customers coming to the van do not interfere with anyone. To be honest I cannot see any advantages to anyone if these lines are installed. I would ask that you seriously consider my objection

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Our aim is to maintain access along the public Highway and to and from commercial premises for large vehicles.

**Formal Consultation response – East Peckham, Branbridges Industrial Estate (south of roundabout)
Response ref: DD-598-09 East Peckham - Branbridges Road - 26**

I support the proposals.

Comments

I confirm that we are fully in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the onstreet parking arrangements for Branbridges Road (cul-de-sac), Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/09. The proposal as it stands whilst not reducing the available on road parking will significantly;

1. help reduce the number of times access and egress to our site is blocked for large lorries by parking at or around our gates

2. help prevent parking at the junction with the main road which makes it very dangerous at times entering or exiting the cul-de-sac due to the proximity to the roundabout. In addition, over the summer we had a number of travellers parked in the cul-de-sac blocking the access to our site which Kent Highways were unable to do anything about as there were no double yellows near our gates.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Hildenborough, Woodview Crescent & Brookmead

Response ref: DD-598-12 Hildenborough - Woodview Crescent & Brookmead - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

We strongly support the Council's proposals. Woodview Crescent j/w Brookmead is now becoming increasingly dangerous to pedestrians and vehicle traffic. It has become a parking lot for non-residents commercial vans.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Hildenborough, Woodview Crescent & Brookmead

Response ref: DD-598-12 Hildenborough - Woodview Crescent & Brookmead - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Unfortunately, for what ever reason I was not included in your informal consultation, in spite of living almost opposite Woodview Crescent. The area to the north of Woodview Crescent (Tonbridge Road end) is frequently used for parking by residents of and visitors to both Meadway and Woodview Crescent. Frequently large DPD vans are parked opposite our house taking up useful parking for residents of Brookmead, Meadway and Woodview Crescent. The imposition of double yellow lines in this area will just cause the parking situation to move further along the road to the next junction. I am worried that this could require us to make a long walk to a parking space, a space that would be too far away from home to be aware that the alarm on the car had been set off, and we would be unaware that an attempt at theft was or is happening. I understand the road safety issues but feel this may be better addressed by imposing a 20mph speed limit as has been done in many parts of Tonbridge unnecessarily, and then the proper enforcement of this speed limit.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Hildenborough, Woodview Crescent & Brookmead

Response ref: DD-598-12 Hildenborough - Woodview Crescent & Brookmead - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

We write to confirm that we support the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodview Crescent & Brookmead shown on plan DD/598/12.

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 01

I object to the proposals.

Comments

1. All this will achieve will be to have the daily commuters vehicles further down Springfield Road and inconvenience residents.

2. Do you have enough traffic wardens to actively police the double line?

Please note this is the first official notification that I have received

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction, bend or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Springfield Road, Larkfield. At present, fishermen using the lake behind Springfield Road park on one side of the road opposite the lake entrance. This does not cause any problems. It tends to slow down the traffic coming round the bend which can only be a good thing. I have noticed that when there are no cars parked, cars seem to speed round the bend.

Another reason for objecting to yellow lines is that fishermen and other people would just park further down Springfield Road and thus stop residents from parking outside their own homes. This would also restrict visitors to properties at the top end of Springfield Road from parking.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction, bend or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Would like space for 1 or 2 cars near entrance to Hanover Green as we the tenants find it hard to walk up hills from the car park with shopping as we are all in our 70's

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction, bend or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented. However, it remains that loading and unloading can still take place on double yellow lines so residents wishing to unload shopping nearby can still do so.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

My concerns are:

1. This will cause additional parking outside other Springfield Road properties situated beyond the double yellow lines.

2. *The all day parking of vans and cars at the bottom of Springfield Road at the junction with Brook Road already makes turning into, and out of, Springfield Road both difficult and dangerous.*

3. *How will the parking restrictions be monitored?*

4. *Suggest making the double yellow lines outside Hanover Green continuous, from the junction with Lunsford Lane. This avoids cars needing to use the offside lane going down Springfield Road to avoid the parked cars. (Hanover Green has its own parking area.)*

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 05

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Springfield Road, Larkfield. However, as a resident of Hanover Green (association for over 55s), I would like to stress the importance of having restricted parking from the existing no waiting time to the new proposed no waiting time. The residents who reside in flats 7 to 10 and 11 to 14 who rely on their family and friends to pick them up and drop them off etc cannot park near the foot path to Hanover Green as there are "park and riders" who park their vehicles all day and sometimes all night occupying the spaces!! There are always contractors, maintenance workers, window cleaners, gardeners, food deliveries, etc, who need to be as near as possible to both entrances to Hanover Green. Ideally, as several residents have disabled badges, the 1st space near the footpath could be a "Disabled" parking space and with what's left of the road time "Restricted" parking. Unfortunately, Springfield Road is used as a "rat run" to avoid vehicles driving over the speed bumps in Lunsford Lane by drivers. When there are cars permanently parked near Hanover Green drivers.....including me have to drive on the wrong side of the road extremely slowly to potentially avoid having an accident with oncoming vehicles that can't be seen due to the bend in the road. Therefore, it would make it 100% safer if there were NO vehicles parking permanently in the road. Thank you so much for taking the time to read my email, and I will appreciate a positive outcome

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road

Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 06

I object to the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction, bend or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers

should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Larkfield, Springfield Road
Response ref: DD-598-16 Larkfield - Springfield Road - 07

I support the proposals.

Comments

No parking on the bend if Springfield Road is necessary. We know local residents need somewhere to park, but over road is used by business people and workers parking their vehicles all day long, which we are against.

It is up to the planners to find parking places for local residents without parking directly on the corner.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

I would extend the double yellows even further in 3 places 1) To cover the full bend passed the proposed extension up to property no 113 as vehicles parked there (usually a large van) block views as you pull out of the 'T junction' opposite property no 29

2) Also extend lines from the bend on opposite side up to property no 29 again as vehicles (again often a large van) parked there and force you as you enter road onto RHS as other vehicles are trying to pull out of 'T Junction'. I have had several near misses here!

3) On side of loop where property no 10 is either, on road parking bays on one side of the road and double yellows on other to stop vehicles parking on both which often means a tight squeeze for normal vehicles, let alone delivery or emergency ones. This problem down not occur on the opposite side of the loop as everyone there parks on allocated bays or one side of road only!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

The proposed new double yellow lines are a great idea, but they should be extended to reach either side of the existing double yellow lines on that part of the road. The bend on that part of the road is not only narrow, but on a slight incline, so it would be safer to have double yellow lines on both sides of that corner of Howard Drive. If a gap is left, vehicles will still continue to park there, and it will still block some visibility for vehicles entering the road. Too many cars come around that corner in the direction of leaving Howard Drive too fast, and anything parked on that corner (right next to no'113) will block visibility.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the additional double yellow lines on the grounds of safety. I object to these double yellow lines not being replicated on the other side of Howard Drive immediately opposite these new lines. There are three properties protected by the proposal, yet there are fourteen left unprotected on the other side. The new lines protect two exits, with two house exiting one, and one household the other. Directly opposite we have fourteen households effective exiting one, very busy and active, 'driveway'.

This exit is extremely dangerous due to the parking of cars and vans in the unrestricted section to the right hand side - the section where I feel should also be double-yellow - make this a total blind spot for traffic approaching from Norwich Avenue. I accept that there may need to be double yellow as per your initial proposal, to obviate the blind spot for those three dwellings, for traffic leaving Howard Drive. But if that's compelling, then even more compelling is the need to restrict on the immediately opposite side: 1 - the same blind spot issues; 2 - Fourteen households at risk, not merely three; 3 - Traffic approaching from Norwich Avenue inevitably does so at greater speed than that exiting Howard Drive towards Norwich Avenue. I reported all of these key points in the informal consultation phase without any response, although I am unsure as to whether any should have been expected. As this is the formal stage I would hope that a detailed report will be produced. Is it possible to be actively involved in the discussions, face to face, by the body that will decide on these issues? I would welcome the opportunity, as would representatives of many of the fourteen households whose safety seems not to have been taken into consideration within the scope of these proposals.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 04

I support the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

This is my second communication via this format. I need to correct a factual error in my earlier submission. The dwellings being 'protected by', or having the 'risk reduced by' the proposed extension of the double yellow line are not three (as I had stated) but just two. I have just further checked and measured the driveway 'aperture' for these two dwellings and compared the width with the exit / aperture for the fourteen households directly opposite. They are identical. The proposal I have received is clearly an attempt to limit the obvious risk from approaching vehicles (leaving Howard Drive, heading towards Norwich Avenue) when the view of those two households (when exiting) is restricted by vehicles parked in the currently unrestricted section of Howard Drive on the[ir] right hand side. Directly opposite, we have precisely the same risk due to parked vehicles, currently parking in the unrestricted area immediately to the right hand side (with traffic approaching Howard Drive from Norwich Avenue). The unequivocal point of issue is that on one side just two households would have reduced risk, on the other side fourteen households would benefit from extending the restriction. My case is that both are completely valid but, if you were constrained to carry out just one change, it would be on the opposite side of Howard, presuming that safety is the major generative logic behind this proposal. I would be very happy, as stated earlier, to be directly involved in any 'live' consultation / consideration as and when the decision is actively being made. Eugene

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 05

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

As previously stated I both support and object to the specific proposals. Further consideration of the planned change shows the intention to extend the double yellow lines past property, and outside the fence boundary of #23 (Norwich Avenue). What I find confusing, if not contradictory, is that vehicles literally never park in this earmarked area - they simple cannot, because vehicles are allowed to park directly on the other side, and to park (where you are proposing to extend the restriction) would completely block the road. So, putting double yellows where no one parks - this seems a little odd, at the very least. My difficulty is that the proposal will protect the exit/entrance of two families/dwellings while, directly opposite, the exit of fourteen families/dwellings (#s 1 to 27) is constantly at risk, because of parking being allowed along that part of Howard Drive running alongside #1 Howard Drive. I continue to wonder, no matter how often I consider this, why you would not protect fourteen exiting households, yet be happy to protect two. My request is that the scheme be altered to protect all sixteen by extending the restriction on both sides of this section of Howard Drive. I believe an accident will happen, not on the side you have identified, but on the very much busier opposite side, where the exit/entrance is adjacent to #1 Howard Drive. Please, I ask you to review, revisit and consider revising your plans.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

Just wanted to respond to the formal consultation with the reference: DD/598/21A Howard Drive. I wholeheartedly approve of the plans to extend the double yellow lines with regard to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive. Please do it!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Stop wasting money we do not want it and the council cannot afford it. Send a representative to talk to me. We strongly disagree. My views have not changed. Life is hard enough. Carers will not be able to visit. My daughters cannot visit. The car parks here are empty.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 08

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 09

I support the proposals.

Comments

I suggest that the proposed double yellow line is further extended as marked on the enclosed plan (plan enclosed)

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 10

I support the proposals.

Comments

This is an email to confirm that I SUPPORT the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive, shown on plan DD/598/21A.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the yellow lines and anything that reduces the road width being severely restricted by numerous Twice Recall taxis and the continuous pavement parking outside numbers 10 -18 The worry is where are Twice Recall taxis going to park after the yellow line update The car parks sit empty and cars are parked on their doorsteps-literally.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove

Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

I am writing to you to support the new proposals of the yellow lines in Forest Grove. Having yellow lines as you enter Forest Grove will allow emergency services to access the road easier when necessary however, my only concern would be that the house between 1 and 11 but opposite 16, have multiple cars and they park in the middle of the road on occasions so I'm unsure if this would cause issues elsewhere.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove

Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

Good afternoon. I support the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements as shown in the above plan.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove

Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

I am writing to you in response of your proposed parking restrictions for Forest Grove and Shipbourne Road. I am in agreement for the new no waiting zones highlighted in red on Shipbourne Road. Although I still feel very strongly that the restrictions either side of Forest Grove entrance should be extended further as visibility is severely restricted by parked cars and extremely dangerous when trying to turn right in particular out of Forest Grove onto Shipbourne Road, there have been so many near misses and it is an accident waiting to happen. In relation to Forest Grove, I live at number 9 around the central island, if the new proposed double yellow lines are actioned along the straight entrance road down Forest Grove, all of those cars that currently park there will park around the central island instead and when they do this it blocks my driveway along with the other few houses that have driveways around the island, we cannot get on and off our driveways if someone parks opposite which has always been a nightmare. Please could I kindly request that if double yellow lines are not going to put around the whole central island that something is implemented for those with driveways such as having double yellow lines in sections around parts of the island where there are driveways opposite so the homeowners will always have access?

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove

Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

In response to the new parking proposals in Forest Grove, namely the section from no 30 down to 18, I can see no added value to marking this section with yellow lines, we live at no [REDACTED] Forest Grove and very rarely have cars blocked this section of the Grove, only people dropping off and picking up. No one ever parks and leaves their cars for more than a few minutes and by putting lines in this section will only cause unnecessary animosity amongst certain residents. All of the residents from 22 to 30 have access to rear parking to their properties anyway and I believe use this. I would not like to see unsightly yellow lines painted down both sides of this very narrow stretch of the Grove. The only access issue to his section is visitors to no 32 parking directly outside this property and would stop an emergency vehicle coming down. I therefore object to the unnecessary waste of money to unsightly mark a part of road which is not the issue to the access problem on the grove.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove

Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 05

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There is absolutely no point in me, even as living in Forest Grove and Tonbridge giving you my point of view. I've lived in Forest Grove for 48 years... so your going to do what you want anyway... while I'm on the subject, you have ruin Tonbridge anyway - yellow lines everywhere - no rights to park these days - our rights have long gone: keep on building I would-? NO NOT in agreement What you need to do is - clear up all streets its disgusting - we still have 1st years leave & rubbish in Forest Grove - for years & years Cleanup!! would be very important than yellow lines!! Dont you THINK!! I've spoken to (REDACTED).

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove
Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

Please see attached pictures showing the necessity for the yellow lines to extend to 32 Forest Grove as it is here that vehicles park and impede the entrance to No's 26, 24, 22, 20 & 18. Often we cannot exit our house due to poor parking and worry about emergency vehicles having access if needed. We assume that once the lines are in place that those areas will be policed and monitored by parking officials. (photos provided)

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Forest Grove
Response ref: DD-598-26A Tonbridge - Forest Grove - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Suggest as before for the green island should be cleared and made into herringbone parking to ease access around said green as shown on map (plan supplied)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented. Unfortunately we cannot look to make physical alterations to the public highway, as this would be for Kent County Council to consider.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Baltic Road

Response ref: DD-598-27 Tonbridge - Baltic Road - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

As I have to enter onto Baltic Road from the rear lane at the back of our houses, it is extremely dangerous as you can not see any traffic coming over the rise from the junction at The Drive (some cars are driven well over the speed limit) also would like more yellow lines between water works and post box (see map).

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Baltic Road

Response ref: DD-598-27 Tonbridge - Baltic Road - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the proposal because I think it will be much safer

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Baltic Road

Response ref: DD-598-27 Tonbridge - Baltic Road - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Baltic Road shown on plan DD/598/27 On safety grounds alone, extending the double yellow lines is a sensible proposal. We fully support the double yellow lines being extended. Having witnessed how difficult it can be exiting the driveway from the rear of these 9 properties affected. We often suffer the same problem as we are next door to their driveway. The 20mph speed limit is seldom adhered to on this short stretch of Baltic Road making exiting their driveway and ours risky, so by extending the double yellow lines and losing just one parking bay, it will allow more visibility and will make entry onto Baltic Road much safer!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

It is a dangerous corner if a car is parked there even though we could do with every available space

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

With regard to the proposal of extending permit only parking to last all day in Woodside Road - not only is there no need for this (there are plenty of spaces during the day on week days), it would be hugely inconvenient for anyone visiting residents - friends, family, carers, tradespeople for example. This is just not needed or wanted here.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 05

I support the proposals.

Comments

This minor adjustment addresses the issue without inconveniencing the needs of residents

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

I think you need to update this form. I support the proposal to introduce two new parking bays outside number 1 and 13 Woodside Road as per the letter dated 6th Oct Phase 14-Form-DD/598/28. I have not received a request to consider double yellow lines outside 123.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 07

I support the proposals.

Comments

I am writing to SUPPORT the new proposals under the above reference. As I understand it, the current parking restrictions will stay as they are and the proposed changes are to make two new parking spaces. I agree with the amended proposal but would like to comment on a couple of things... (1) When the new house was built at number 123 Woodside Road, it was built knowing that there was a raised kerb with a parking space. We have subsequently lost that parking space but the raised kerb is still there so don't see how that makes it any easier for them to park and it also makes us one parking space down so if these two new spaces are allowed then we will only in effect have gained one space. As there are houses on both sides of the road but parking on one side only, we will never have enough spaces for each household and even more so as many households have more than one vehicle anyway so any extra spaces are welcomed with open arms. (2) Looking at the map that was enclosed in the letter, I don't know where the double yellow lines outside number 61/63 have suddenly come from as there never has been any there. I realise that probably doesn't make any difference in respect of this proposal but could do in the future so just wanted to bring it to someone's attention.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to any changes other than the extra parking spaces proposed.

Response

The proposals will increase parking availability.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodside Rd, as shown on plan DD/598/28A. Firstly, the plan shows: "Existing Permit Holders only, Mon-Fri, 8.30-9.30am" (permit parking bay)". This is incorrect, as the actual promulgated hours are Mon-Fri 9.30-10.30 am. Therefore the plan contains misleading and inaccurate information. Secondly, my wife receives regular short visits by various health workers and NHS staff, including District Nurses. If all day restrictions are in place, it would be not possible to pre-arrange permits for their vehicles, as the registration numbers would be unknown until after they arrive. It would also be expensive and wasteful to buy numerous all day permits for visits that usually last less than 30 minutes.

Response

The proposals will increase parking availability.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 10

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the changes to the yellow lines but not to all day parking permits.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

Having received your letter dated 6th October 2023, I am somewhat confused whether or not I should be objecting to the original proposal to extend the parking permit times or should be supporting the revised proposal to 'omit the permit parking arrangements', and so I need to state: I object to the original proposal [to extend the parking controls to all-day] and support the revised proposal [to leave the times required for permit holders only as they currently stand]. Thank you for listening to

the concerns of those most affected by the proposal for Woodside Road (Phase 14-Form-DD/598/28); it is very much appreciated.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 12

I support the proposals.

Comments

This is to confirm that I agree with the modified proposals.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 13

I support the proposals.

Comments

Regarding the proposals for two new spaces on the plan, I support this.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 14

I support the proposals.

Comments

Regarding, the proposals for Woodside road. I would like to inform you that the information you are presenting online is incorrect. It only asks about introducing double yellow lines outside 123 woodside. This is wrong, as there are already double yellow lines there. They were painted in many months ago. Furthermore, it does not ask if we agree or disagree to the other proposal to create two more spaces in other locations in the road, as shown on the revised plan. Therefore, anyone who tries to respond on the website to the formal consultation is presented with the wrong information! Regarding the addition of the two spaces, I support this proposal.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 15

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the proposed new parking plans.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 16

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the removal of double yellow lines to add 2 parking bays. Against changing permit times.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 17

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 18

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the councils proposed changes to on street parking for Woodside Road. These are: to increase parking bays & to keep the existing parking permit times

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 19

I support the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

Hi I agree to extra parking places being created in Woodside Road. I would like an additional - eg. 1-2pm -parking time zone in the afternoon like other roads nearby as this currently increases non residential parking in our limited spaces. But I would not like all day time zones.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 20

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I think the current parking arrangement is perfectly adequate.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Woodside Road

Response ref: DD-598-28A Tonbridge - Woodside Road - 21

I support the proposals.

Comments

Please note the information online in question 5 of the form "Phase 14 Intends Amendment 57" is misleading. It asks me to either support or object to "double yellow lines for woodside Road" referring to No.123. This is not the issue. It is to revoke the double yellow lines by No.1 and no.13. This needs to be changes o the online form (NB this correction was made when bough to our attention).

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Woodbury Road & Falkland Place
Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 01

I object to the proposals.

Comments

It is already difficult for my partner and son to find parking close to my home at busy times as I only have space for one car on my drive. Restricting on road parking further will just exacerbate the situation for myself and other residents.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Woodbury Road & Falkland Place
Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Parking in this area is already difficult. The addition of these yellow lines would move the problem, not fix it. I have lived in this road for 26 years and all of a sudden there is an issue??? It would also create friction between neighbours, in what at the moment is a harmonious area. I'm sure the money to carry out this pointless proposal could be better spent on more worthy projects in this time of austerity.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Woodbury Road & Falkland Place
Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object under the reasons that all you are doing is moving the problem up the road that will impact other residents.

Please extend the yellow lines to the top of Woodbury covering kerbside parking outside no 5, numerous accidents, damage and issues have occurred due to large vehicles parking on very small kerb spaces. If the yellow lines were extended as above I would support.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Woodbury Road & Falkland Place
Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

Due to vehicles parking either side of the drive it is difficult to safely see when joining Woodbury Road and we have had some near misses

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Woodbury Road & Falkland Place
Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 05

I support the proposals.

Comments

Both exiting and entering the junction can be particularly tricky as approaching vehicles are not visible. Also access for emergency vehicles (which thankfully is not a regular occurrence), could potentially be severely restricted.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

1. View is obstructed when vehicles parked on and around the junction, very difficult and dangerous to see oncoming vehicles (also contrary to The Highway Code Rule 243).

2. If vehicle exiting Falkland Place, any vehicle on Woodbury Road trying to drive into Falkland has nowhere safely to wait.

3. Refuse collectors and delivery lorries can often not enter Falkland Place due to parked vehicles. Hence, rubbish has not been collected, or deliveries not able to be delivered.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Instead, use single yellow line to restrict parking on a Monday (i.e. bin day).

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I am writing to object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodbury Road and Falkland Place, Walderslade, shown on plan DD/598/30.

The current setup does not cause any disruption to us residents on the junctions. Putting in the previously enforced double yellow lines has created quite a lot of problems for parking for residents around the area. Having additional double yellow lines will magnify the issue. Therefore I am not in support of the proposed changes.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 09

I support the proposals.

Comments

These double yellow lines are essential to ensure access to Falkland Place. We have had a number of instances where the refuse vehicles have been unable to turn into this road due to illegally parked cars and if these were to impede emergency vehicles such as fire services a major incident could occur. Access for 15 to 17 Woodbury Road is also essential for any emergency vehicles.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 10

I support the proposals.

Comments

I live at (REDACTED) and fully support the proposals for changes to on street parking at the above

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

Whilst I agree with most of the proposed changes with the double yellow lines I do also have concerns. The concerns being that there are multiple households that have a drive for one vehicle without the option to extend. This results in numerous vehicles street parked which in the most is fine. I agree with the double yellows outside my house and stretching up the road (no one parks that side anyway). However, I would suggest that we reduce the proposed double yellows that extend into Falkland Place as much as possible so only the corner is covered. I would also not put double yellow lines on the right hand side as you come down Woodbury. Lots of vehicles use this this area to park and alternative options are not available. Agree with the rest. The main issue is number 10 Woodbury that has 7 vehicles and does not use their drive appropriately. Hopefully the double yellows will change that.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I objected last time and still object. The new plan is even worse with more yellow lines. I suggest for the lines opposite my house to start by front of house No.10 so I can hopefully park and so can my visitors, Have started cycling into work (considered getting rid of my car) and suggest trees on the Walderslade Woods and glass & left over bits car which burned here are removed/cut back. I am disheartened by the whole ordeal.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-30A Walderslade - Woodbury Road and Falkland Place - 13

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I agree that parking on the corners of the suggested roads is a problem but by restricting the cars parking I do not know where these cars will park should the restrictions be enforced.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-31 Walderslade - Tunbury Avenue - 01

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I am writing to you regarding the subject reference; New "no waiting at any time" parking restrictions... Tunbury Avenue.

We originally agreed to this proposal, with the recommendation that yellow lines be included on Tunbury Avenue opposite Longhurst Drive. We received no feedback to this recommendation and now see that they are not included in the formal consultation.

Therefore, unless yellow lines are also included where indicated, we do not support the changes. Should the plans be changed to include these additional lines, then you have our support.

This request is to ensure that the Longhurst Drive junction is completely clear and that parked vehicles are not simply moved from the top of Longhurst Drive to Tunbury Avenue. (Plan supplied)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-31 Walderslade - Tunbury Avenue - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

In response to the proposed 'no waiting at any time' parking restrictions (double yellow lines) Tunbury Avenue, Walderslade, Chatham - Walderlade Ward (REDACTED) object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Tunbury Avenue as show on plan DD/598/31.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-31 Walderslade - Tunbury Avenue - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

We agree to yellow lines outside our property as the buses are constantly outside our house with engines running (pollution) trying to get around parked cars.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Walderslade, Tunbury Avenue

Response ref: DD-598-31 Walderslade - Tunbury Avenue - 04

I support the proposals.

Comments

*Dear sir ref your yellow lines plane for Tunbury Avenue , would you please extend the yellow lines to the junction of Longhurst avenue with Tunbury By finishing the lines opposite outside number 79 people are going to park outside my house (REDACTED) and others past my house, we have problems now with people parking outside my house making it very dangerous to emerge from our driveway.
Thank you*

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 01

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements as there is not enough parking spaces as it is. I am disabled and regularly struggle to park on West Street as it is, without adding double yellow lines which will only cause more stress to park my car. It will also cause more friction within the community as residents already fight over car parking spaces. Where you are proposing to put the double yellow lines the resident that lives on the corner knocked the wall down to his front garden and Russett Homes was going to take him to court for damaging the property but KCC decided to put a dropped kerb in for him along with TMBC and he is now reversing over a pedestrian walkway.

I think it would be wise if the Joint Transportation Board of councillors came in the evening to West Street to witness the parking problems themselves.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

With reference to the above proposal I'm disagree with your plans. If a car is park behind the disabled space it doesn't stop the person at number 37 gain access to his property. There is not enough parking for the rest of the property's to park as it is. As the resident from mountain close (who have parking behind there property) park there.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Good morning, in response to the decision to go forward with proposed “no waiting time” restrictions on west street I would like to strongly disagree with this proposal. I am (REDACTED) and already it’s hard to park near my property. The tenants across the road at mountain view(some of who have two vehicles and others have garages) park where they want thus we tenants in our 5 bungalows are already unable to park. This is extremely ill thought out and would squeeze even more vehicles down in an already congested area. Thankyou for the chance to object and I look forward to your reply.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

In response to your proposal to paint double yellow lines at the address in west street wrotham I along with other neighbour's strongly object to this proposal on the grounds it will do away with two much needed parking spaces. Already there are more cars than parking spaces.

Why not stop yellow lines at the end of dropped curb. As for disabled bay shown it definitely needs re defining to make it clear as none blue badge holder's use it all the time. One vehicle has not moved out of it for the last few weeks.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

This page is intentionally left blank