

Redacted Consultation Responses

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 1

I object to the proposals

I am 80 years old and when I drive to see my daughter I have no choice but to park on the roads. They have a single drive was with three cars on it already plus one in the garage. If yellow lines are painted then I will no longer be able to visit my daughter as I would be unable to walk the distance from Asda to my daughters and even if I did park there I'd only have three hours! Where am I supposed to park?

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 2

I object to the proposals

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

I am 80 years old and when I drive to see my daughter I have no choice but to park on the roads. They have a single drive was with three cars on it already plus one in the garage. If yellow lines are painted then I will no longer be able to visit my daughter as I would be unable to walk the distance from Asda to my daughters and even if I did park there I'd only have three hours! Where am I supposed to park?

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 3

I object to the proposals

I object to this as my Daughter and partner live in this area and this will push people to park in their road and they will not be able to park near their home.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 4

I object to the proposals

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

I objected as me and my partner don't live together, so at the weekends I always come round to his family's house and don't have enough room to park on the drive as they already have 2 cars parked. So have to park outside of there house.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 5

I object to the proposals

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

If you move the park cars on regent ways it will turn into a rat run meaning that cars will be flying up and down the road. Leading to pedestrians not being able to cross the road and have a higher chance of being hit. Especially as it's a school route there will be more children around.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 6

I object to the proposals

Our road is already congested with people parking on the pavements every day. Yellow lines on Regents Way would cause more to park in our cul-de-sac and cars would speed down Regent Way. Definitely my and cannot understand the reasoning.

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 7

I object to the proposals

It's not necessary and will cause more issues than it solves with displaced parking. Likely cause faster not slower traffic.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 8

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 9

I object to the proposals

This will not address the problem. This will just move the problem to other areas and cause problems for other people.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 10

I object to the proposals

We do not agree to the proposed plans as we feel parking will be forced into smaller side streets causing unnecessary congestion in already crowded areas. Parking down Alfriston Grive already puts cars onto the wrong side of the road to navigate the bends in the road, causing dangerous situations for pedestrians and other road users. Furthermore, due to no footpaths, pedestrians also have to walk in the roadway.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 11

I object to the proposals

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

These yellow lines will force cars into already busy residential roads. The lack of communal car parking for visitors and workers in the estate is what really needs to be addressed.

I agree with the one ways - those roads are dangerous.

However, these proposals for yellow lines are a method of money making and anxiety for residents in an already overpopulated area with insufficient spaces for cars.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 12

I support the proposals

I agree with proposals for Boverde Avenue and Alfriston Grove, For the proposed lines in Regent Way and Discovery drive I am not effected by parking issues on these 2 roads, hence do not agree / disagree with the proposal. Residents in those 2 roads should be responsible for the outcome.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 13

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 14

I object to the proposals

Could you please note that we are not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Alexander Grove, Discovery Drive and Alton Avenue, Kings Hill, shown on plan DD/586/09/B. Comments – parking in general at Kings Hill is already problematic enough without this proposal to restrict it even further, e.g.: where will parents park when they drop off their children at the school if you introduce no parking on Alexander Grove? Given the current situation and the increasing number of houses being either built or planned wouldn't it be better for the council to build a public car park or negotiate parking spaces at the nearby supermarkets as (and I believe contrary to the original covenant) there are too many signed company vehicles being parked on the 'few' public roads which allow parking. In our opinion your proposals are only going to make a bad situation even worse.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 15

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines will not solve the parking problem, all they will do is push the problems elsewhere.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 16

I support the proposals

The location of cars parked on the majority of roads in Kings Hill indicates that the drivers have no regard for anyone's convenience other than their own. At the very least roundabouts and significant junctions should have restrictions imposed, as well as roads where parking impedes the progress of any vehicle, let alone emergency services.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 17

I object to the proposals

I completely agree that yellow lines should be put in places where there is dangerous parking (e.g. very near to roundabouts/junctions - which is illegal anyway) and also that parking should not restrict emergency vehicles, but I think that the proposed double yellow lines will just move the cars somewhere else (smaller roads, cul-de-sacs) and cause issues there. Fundamentally, there wasn't enough thought given to parking in the design of Kings Hill, especially from phase 2 onwards. I don't know what the solution is but I don't think the proposal will fully solve it and will have consequences elsewhere.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 18

I object to the proposals

The extent of the yellow lines is extreme and pointlessly excessive.

There's no need at all to apply every rule in the book to manage the only real issue, that of poor parking habits.

The only lines that need to be put in are those in the immediate vicinity of roundabouts and junctions.

The council can and should be able to differentiate between meeting residents needs versus upsetting everyone with pointless yellow lines. Let's hope that elected representatives can be sensible and act in the interests of those who elected them, rather than following a purely bureaucratic process.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 19

I object to the proposals

This would cause more strain on the town than the relief it's proposing to provide. I think it's telling that no one on the panel actually lives here. These proposals won't work and I urge the council to rethink.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 20

I object to the proposals

Because it will push cars into side roads which are already gridlocked. It's near impossible to get off of our drive with cars parked all around for example and hard to drive up and down Kendall avenue for example because cars are parked all along the road sometimes emergency vehicles cannot pass thru

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 21

I object to the proposals

Parking is already a huge issue on most of Kings Hill. To further reduce it seems utter lunacy and I can only assume it's thought up by non residents within the council?

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 22

I object to the proposals

The yellow lines will result in many more cars being parked in side roads. This will lead to unacceptable levels of parking in streets already congested.

Individual roads need to be separately considered.

This blanket form is undemocratic.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 23

I support the proposals

No issues with people parking but the way they park makes it dangerous. Please consider including the mouth of Baxter Street since new owner moved in, the roundabout and insert road has been blocked by parking by the circle

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 24

I support the proposals

I support to make junctions safer. I think people will end up blocking my driveway though as they will just park further into the road. It is already bad.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 25

I object to the proposals

Whilst I agree that irresponsible parking is an issue for some areas in Kings Hill I don't think that yellow lines everywhere are the answer. If parking violations were penalised as they can & should be then this would stop people very quickly. Parking on or near roundabouts is an example of this. It happens frequently but the offenders are never fined.

Yellow lines could be put on roundabouts or at busy junctions but not on every road. The parking for many houses is inadequate which is a fault of planning. It doesn't matter that they follow regulations when everyone knows these regulations are out of date & completely inadequate for modern living. Public transport in Kent is not good enough to be a viable alternative. In fact in the 17 years me and my family have lived on Kings Hill the bus service has severely worsened!

Please, please rethink this & listen to the people who live here!

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

The Borough Council is not involved in the provision of public transport - this is a function for Kent County Council.

However, the proposals should maintain and improve accessibility for buses through the Kings Hill development.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 26

I object to the proposals

Complete waste of time and money. If you want to enforce anything, do residents parking only. Works in some of the busiest London areas! The traffic parked in roadway often slows traffic and if the developers were forced to provide adequate parking for housing we would never have any issues. Why have businesses such as ASDA been allowed to impose a time limit to parking? Allow residents to use parking spaces here. Totally against blanket yellow lines.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have preferential parking as all are entitled to use the

Where roads have not been adopted, there is a higher level of control available to prevent non-resident parking, but this would be for the owners of those areas to consider rather than for the Council, as we have no involvement in private roads.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 27

I support the proposals

Think it is a good idea.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 28

I object to the proposals

There is insufficient parking for residents vehicles on Kings Hill as it is. Tradesmen are beginning to refuse to come and work if they can't park their vehicles near the jobs. All the yellow lines will do is then to block all the other roads instead. It will end up as turf War!! The answer is to create more parking for residents and visitors on Kings Hill. Yellow lines just moves the problem to other roads.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 29

I object to the proposals

Provision required for visitors and to protect pushing all the cars into side roads.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 30

I object to the proposals

If you impose the parking restrictions the road will end up as a race track as is Tower View. At the moment because of the parking the traffic has to slow down in Boverde Ave! If you impose the Yellow lines are you going to install traffic calming? NO your not!. So please leave it as is so we can all live in peace.!

TMBC Response

The provision of traffic calming, warning signs and safety-related road markings would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 31

I support the proposals

Thank you for your letter dated 22nd September regarding the proposed double yellow lines in Kings Hill.

I am in favour of measures that make the roads safer and less congested for all residents but draw your attention to 3 issues that specifically relate to Boverde Avenue.

Bus Stop Clearway The current bus stop is used extensively by numerous school children between 07:00 and 08:00 on weekday mornings and it is common for 2 or 3 school buses to arrive together. Parking on the road leading up to the bus stop makes it impossible for more than one bus to pull up adjacent to the kerb and the loading of passengers is a slow process. This means other buses block the road while they wait, causing severe traffic congestion. I suggest that the proposed double yellow lines are extended from the roundabout up to the bus stop clearway in Boverde Avenue to alleviate this problem.

Bus Offloading The routing of the buses in the afternoon is predominately from Discovery Drive down the West side of Boverde Avenue. There is no bus stop on this side of the road and buses stop randomly next to the grass verge or our driveway so that the school children can alight. Many of the children then swarm around the bus to cross the road without necessarily applying due care and attention to other traffic. This practice is dangerous and avoidable by routing the buses to the designated bus clearway particularly if the road leading to the bus stop is clear of parked vehicles.

Speed Awareness The safety of children is further compromised by the speed vehicles drive on Boverde Avenue. It is a straight road and there is a tendency to drive too fast. As part of the process of making Kings Hill a safer environment, particularly for the children, I believe that physical speed restrictions such as speed bumps should be introduced on the road to curtail speeding. I trust that these observations will assist you in this review and will be happy to attend an in situ inspection to provide clarity if required.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 32

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 33

I object to the proposals

This will only cause cars to park further into smaller roads, causing more disturbance for residents. Or it will encourage people to park in dangerous places.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 34

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 35

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 36

I object to the proposals

The main parking issues are in the centre of Kings Hill around e.g. Queen Street and this is apparently excluded and falls under another jurisdiction. PLEASE sort this out as it is dangerous-so many times we here emergency vehicles cannot access roads. What needs to happen before someone takes action.

The available parking in places like ASDA sits empty due to rule changes and ownership negotiations whilst other streets are full of displaced cars. PLEASE look at this strategically for all.

I agree with the yellow lines in general indeed we need them but this must be done in close coordination with Liberty and councils who need to manage the impact on remaining roads where cars will then be displaced. In short the large number of organisations involved are not working together or communicating together and with the residents.

The pizza delivery operation in Queen Street uses every available space and blocks the main thoroughfare every day.

Please do better!

TMBC 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.

The management of the supermarket car parks is outside the control of the Borough Council - if the owners have had to introduce parking controls it indicates that there have been issues with non-customer parking.

However, the Management Company employed by Asda have arrangements in place that those wishing to use the car park on a long-term basis can obtain season tickets, so the parking is controlled.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 37

I support the proposals

I would actually like to see the yellow lines at the entrance of Bancroft Lane extended as far up to the roundabout near Cellini Walk as cars actually park around that roundabout!

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 38

I support the proposals

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

The ridiculous parking has been allowed to go on far too long; the yellow lines are long overdue

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 39

I object to the proposals

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

We don't have a place near home where to park our cars, we are going to struggle.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 40

I object to the proposals

Many vehicles are parked against the rules of the Highway Code and this isn't enforced so who is going to enforce fines for parking on yellow lines? Also, I am concerned about the displacement of vehicles into roads without lines. Surely a more sensible solution is to assist residents in making better decisions about parking, surveying empty car ports where vehicles are parked on roads (such as in my own road) and providing solutions such as permitting vehicles to park overnight again in the supermarket car parks. I don't believe that yellow lines are the answer to the problem.

TMBC 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.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 41

I object to the proposals

Kings Hill it is a family place when live two or more member of family using vehicle due distance to work or commute so this restriction will affect the life and quality of many member of this parish, I understand some roads needs restrictions but this will create a war between neighbours for parking space around restriction areas.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 42

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 43

I object to the proposals

People are not going to give up their vehicles just yet. Possibly in the future when public transport is better and cheaper and travel to where they want to go. There must be a compromise. Keeping school entrances and junctions clear of traffic is a must and more considerate parking is necessary across KH. Perhaps residents can decide amongst themselves to only park on one side of a road and not opposite each other (alternate weeks like the bins). Perhaps residents who do not use their allocated parking space, can let someone else use it? Advertise on TMBC web site?

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 44

I object to the proposals

I think this does not alleviate the issue of parking in kings hill and is very shortsighted. This would not stop car ownership and there is no option of parking elsewhere so it will move the cars to other roads nearby. You cannot dictate car ownership which this really tries to do.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 45

I object to the proposals

Whilst there are undoubtedly issues with selfish individuals parking where they shouldn't, these parking restrictions will just shift the problem elsewhere; residents park on the roads because they don't have the space elsewhere- gardens are too small for sheds and many houses don't have lofts (all a consequence of greedy developers packing too many houses in) so people have to use their garages for mowers etc etc instead of cars, and as soon as they have teenagers who drive they need x4 spaces but have x1. Yellow lines and traffic wardens are not the answer and will ruin Kings Hill.

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within Kings Hill as the roads are not part of any conservation area.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 46

I object to the proposals

I support any proposal that makes Kings Hill a safer place to live, but this proposal will make Hazen Road which is already dangerous a danger to life. Having lived on Hazen Rd for 15 years I know more than anyone the challenges we have as a result of poor parking but the main issue will be the additional car displacement onto Hazen Road from the junction with Tower View to beyond the entrance to the Landings development (Estimated 500 Yards), this complete stretch of road is already single lane as a result of parked cars causing danger to life or cars in the following scenarios;

1) When turning into Hazen from Tower View (Normally you have a car parked immediately on the junction, resulting in a sharp stop.

2) Larger vehicles not being able to turn in or out of Woodford Grove without curbing

- 3) Cars not able to turn in or out of Hazen Road as it turns right again without curbing (At No 10)
- 4) Cars exiting the NEW Landings development will not be able to see any oncoming traffic.
- 5) Attempting to leave Hazen road at the junction with Tower View.

This problem must be solved not made worse. Previously you included this section of Road and I don't understand why it would be removed. In trying to solve one problem in this case you make Hazen Road more dangerous than the problems you trying to solve.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 47

I object to the proposals

I'm worried yellow lines will devalue our property as well as that the cars/vans will start to fully park on the pavement instead of partially as they do now and that this will make walking to school in the morning with my toddler in his buggy even more dangerous as we will be forced to use the road.

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within Kings Hill as the roads are not part of any conservation area.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 48

I object to the proposals

Putting in restrictions will only move the parking issues onto other roads, many of which are already struggling. More parking needs to be added not removed. Many houses have drives but there are also many that do not

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 49

I support the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 50

I support the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 51

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 52

I object to the proposals

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

I believe this proposal intends to make parking and emergency access safer in Kings Hill but I believe it will actually do the opposite. The cars that get parked on the roads that have double yellow lines need to be parked somewhere. Double yellowing the main roads will force parking in the side roads. As residents of one such side road off of one of the proposed double yellow lined roads that really worries us. Already, when cars double park on our road, we struggle to get in or out in a normal size car. An emergency vehicle would not get down our road. Also, people park on the pavements to enable double parking, which forces pedestrians to go walk in the road. As, like many other roads in Kings Hill, our road is mostly 4 bedroom houses but with only a maximum of 2 off road parking spaces the road is always full as it is. Forcing more cars to park on our road and the many others like it is just dangerous and cannot be justified under the objectives of the proposal.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 53

I object to the proposals

As residents of a side road off of one of the proposed double yellow lined road we are concerned that the proposal will force more cars to park in our road. Already, when cars double park on our road we struggle to get in or out in a normal size car. An emergency vehicle would not get down our road. But as our road is mostly 4 bedroom houses which only have a maximum of 2 off road parking spaces the road is always full as it is. Forcing more cars to park on our road and the many others like it is just dangerous.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 54

I object to the proposals

We own 2 cars and park one in our (single) garage, and one on our driveway (behind our gates), so keep both cars off the road. Our driveway is accessed via a large communal courtyard, that already, at times, has people parking cars in it that restrict and impede access to our gates and driveway.

Furthermore, as it is, Dawn Lane is littered with vehicles up and down the road, sometime directly opposite on both sides, meaning that there is only sufficient width for a single car to pass. By restricting (to such a severe extent because pretty much the entire Discovery Drive is being proposed for double yellows on both sides) parking on Discovery Drive, this will simply drive the parking onto the surrounding side streets like Dawn Lane, in effect compounding an already bad situation rather than alleviating it.

This isn't addressing the issue or resolving the problem, it is simply moving it to another location, under the guise of creating thoroughfares and safety. Well what about the thoroughfares and access ways that won't have double yellows, they will simply be swamped with parked cars, and undoubtedly result in acrimony amounts neighbours and the community.

There are times when people have parked directly opposite the opening of our courtyard onto Dawn Lane, meaning that we are unable to actually leave in our cars, especially if you also have cars parked on either side of the exit. Restricting parking on Discovery Drive is only going to (in my opinion) significantly worsen the issue, and hardly be an improvement for us, where we actually choose to keep our cars garaged or parked on our driveway within our property boundary.

This feels like a very crude approach to tackle the problem, where some more creative thought could surely delivery a solution that works for all, and potentially alleviates the problem.

For example, why not follow a number of London boroughs and charge people for parking permits. with a limit on the number granted to residents. If you don't want to pay, well you have the option of using your driveway/garage for the purpose it was intended. If people do pay, well there is a revenue source for the borough council/parish council. Furthermore you could look to ticket/fine folks parked without permits.

I just feel that this approach is not the correct one to alleviate the issue and retain the support of the community.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 55

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 56

I object to the proposals

This will only exacerbate the parking issues that exist in the area, and not enough thought has been given to the proposals as they are in their current form. More skill full planning and properly consulted measures are warranted, not this current broad brush approach

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 57

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 58

I object to the proposals

The proposals are hugely excessive.

There are a few areas which would benefit from parking restrictions but on the whole they are unnecessary. A small targeted enforcement of current rules would be sufficient. Some areas would benefit from one way systems such as Queen Street.

The adoption of the proposed yellow lines would cause absolute chaos in all side streets in kings hill and in all likelihood add to problems of access for the emergency services.

I suspect the idea of the yellow lines is to allow access for further development which are currently restricted due to the size of the roads adjacent to the area.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 59

I object to the proposals

Unfortunately the generic response from some local residents stating people should use their garages, drives etc are lacking in knowledge of the somewhat poorly designed garages that accompany many of the houses in our development. These ineffective designs being coupled with the current modern lifestyles, I believe these proposed plans will exacerbate problems, especially in the side roads in phases two and three. Whilst people parking on bends, corners or pavements is annoying, it's not exactly the end of the world and in fact can be seen as traffic calming.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and

driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 60

I object to the proposals

These proposals are completely out of balance and disproportionate. There are no access issues on Discovery Drive. You are providing no other alternatives to the parking solutions. The dangers for the other roads also needs to be considered. You could widen the roads, introduce permits, have allocated bays but this would require you to actually think about solutions together with the people who live here. To say you can't fix historic planning is a joke. You approved the plans in the first place and you continue to do so with the new building on Kings Hill. This is a completely residential area, you have removed bus routes meaning car is one of the only options - once again penalising working people.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 61

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 62

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 63

I object to the proposals

I have lived in Kings Hill for 14 years and NOT ONCE have I been held up due to parked cars. I use my car repeatedly and daily. Putting in yellow lines will make the roads faster and thus dangerous. At the moment the occasional parked cars act as traffic calming. To out in yellow lines will force cars into side roads and create a problem. There are zero positives for yellow lines in KH. They will be dangerous, cause congestion in side roads and a total waste of precious public funding.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 64

I object to the proposals

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

This will cause chaos.

Cars with no reason to slow down, no places for visitors parking on discovery drive or surrounding areas.

There will be arguments between neighbours and civil disputes as there will not be adequate places to park.

In short a terrible idea to implement this.

It will drop property prices in the area significantly as well

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 65

I object to the proposals

These are my thoughts.

1) Maybe a layaway for buses to pull on to so they are off-road - expensive though.

- 2) If you have to install yellow lines only enforce them when there are buses at beginning and end of day. There are no buses on a Saturday / Sunday or bank holiday. enforceable morning & evening only.
- 3) There are only 7-10 buses a day each way and they only run Mon-Fri!
- 4) I have never seen a traffic queue outside our house with parked cars holding up buses.
- 5) Maybe look at reducing height of bushes around junctions to improve visibility.
- 6) People do not generally park at junctions in this area & do not park on both sides of road, especially I have never seen anyone park by traffic calming measures.
- 7) There maybe only 1 bus an hour which is very infrequent.
- 8) Extreme amount of money to be spent which is not warranted in these times and could be better spent on a more urgent and pressing problem. Hammer to crack a nut!
- 9) The children's park in Melrose Avenue has visitors that park in Melrose Avenue which prevents residents parking. This overflows into Discovery Drive & yellow lines will only compound issue.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 66

I support the proposals

I do support the introduction of "No waiting at anytime" restrictions but I would be interested in the council's opinion on where exactly do they expect the cars currently parked in these areas to park after the restrictions are introduced? Although I am not directly affected the cars will have to go somewhere but where?

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 67

I support the proposals

We do support these changes, nevertheless there are some outstanding topics that require attention:

1. Discovery Drive speed limiters: it's an issue today that many (cars and bus) largely exceed the speed limit in an area highly used by pedestrians and cyclist, also children playing and elders walking. I believe this matter requires a solution, I've seen daily near misses and car/busses/trucks largely exceeding the speed limits and -in some cases- driving from the opposite side of the road.
2. Affordable car park: isn't our case, but it's a reality some houses have more cars than car parks available, I believe a solution is to allocate a window time for cars to be parked in car park supermarkets at an affordable cost.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 68

I object to the proposals

Disputes with neighbours as lack of parking.

No visitor parking.

Totally unnecessary and increased speeding without parked cars to slow traffic

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 69

I object to the proposals

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

Not enough spaces

Will lower cost of properties

No visitor parking at all

Civil disputes with neighbours

Increased speeding

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 70

I object to the proposals

I drive along regent way multiple times everyday and have no issues with the current parking. While I appreciate some areas of Kings Hill are more susceptible to dangerous parking and could possibly benefit from yellow lines, I strongly feel we must limit the yellow lines to smaller, less volume of traffic roads.

The parking on regent way currently is a superb traffic calming measure and removing these parked cars is going to cause an increase in higher speeds and ultimately more accidents/deaths on our roads.

It's vital more homework is done before any decision is made, I'm very concerned we're making a massive mistake here.

Thanks

Daniel

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 71

I object to the proposals

If double yellow lines are painted on Regent Way, where will all the parked cars go? My road! We already have people who don't live in our road who park here and its already a problem without adding to it.

Also no parked cars in Regent Way = a motorway like Tower View. The parked cars make the traffic slow down and it'll therefore be safer for pedestrians.

Please reconsider, there isn't a problem so don't cause one.

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 72

I object to the proposals

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

I object to the double yellow lines being put in Regent Way.

Firstly, this will mean that everyone who parks on this road will now park in Sunrise Way, meaning my family and I will not be able to park in our own road. It is cramped enough anyway and this will cause many problems for us and the other residents living in Sunrise Way.

Secondly, the removal of parked cars in Regent Way will increase speeds of cars. This is dangerous for us residents in Sunrise, as well as the many parents and children that use this route to go to Discovery School.

I hope this is reconsidered, as the parked cars are not causing any hassle (it makes everyone drive slower and safer). We should know as residents of Sunrise more than anyone, and it's not affecting us. Adding double yellow lines on Regent Way will cause lots of hassle. Thank you.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 73

I object to the proposals

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

Horrendously busy as it is parking at home, let alone adding double yellow lines on the road outside. Only going to cause more issues for all of the surrounding houses.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 74

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 75

I object to the proposals

If double yellow lines are enforced on residential roads then where are residents, their families and visitors to park?

What alternative parking arrangements do you propose for the residents of Kings Hill?

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 76

I object to the proposals

My daughter attends the school and it will be chaos

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 77

I object to the proposals

I have lived on Sunrise Way now for a few years. The parking in our small cul-de-sac has got worst with every year. This is because of residents who live on the cricket pitch, who are now parking down our road. They don't have parking for themselves or if they do there isn't enough so spill onto Sunrise Way. If double yellow lines are put in on Regent Way, that will move the car parkers from that road to want to use Sunrise Way as well as those from the Cricket pitch, leaving little to no spaces for my family or friends who visit.

The road of Sunrise is already far too small and we are often woken up by the bin collection as they can't get their truck down our road due to heavy and double parking (cars either side). My concern is if there is a fire, there will be no room for a truck to get down the road which will result in casualties and even deaths.

At present this isn't too bad but with the idea of potentially an extra 50 cars looking for spaces to park, it is clear to anyone that they will double park or take spaces from the residents of Sunrise Way.

I think double lines for the corners of the round where the round about is would be a good idea as sometime people park too close to the exit of Sunrise which hampers viewing of oncoming vehicles but in general the parking and speed hasn't been an issue on Regent Way.

A better solution would be to create a pelican crossing or lights on Regent Way after Lancer Drive leading onto the cricket field. This would slow traffic and allow the parents with children from Discovery School to cross safely. It should cost much as you have a crossing there, just no pelican, signs or lights.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 78

I object to the proposals

We will have people parking in Sunrise Way obstructed the pavements which will inevitably cause stress for those who live here and worst case accidents.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 79

I object to the proposals

This will just make those who cannot park where they can safely currently park squeeze into other roads making any known current issues a million times worse. This worries me...it can cause an accident not only to adults driving but little one's waking to and from school

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 80

I support the proposals

Having lived for over 20 years in this property on the corner of Boverde Avenue and Discovery Drive, I consider that the new double yellow lines should extend on BOTH SIDES of Discovery Drive from the junction with Boverde Avenue to the junction with Alderwick Grove. The present proposal will shift parking to outside 125-129 Discovery Drive. These 3 houses share a driveway onto Discovery Drive and it has been my experience that exiting the driveway into the main road is hazardous as sight lines are blocked by vehicles parked either side of the driveway and virtually on top of the 2 junctions either side of the driveway. It is hazardous not only for those exiting the driveway into Discovery Drive but vehicles travelling past the parked cars do not have a clear view of emerging vehicles/pedestrians. MY RECOLLECTION OF THE PREVIOUS PROPOSAL FOR DOUBLE YELLOW LINES CLEARLY RECOGNISED THIS BY PLACING YELLOW LINES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE DRIVEWAY LEADING TO 125.127 AND 129 Discovery Drive.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 81

I object to the proposals

Thank you for your letter of 22 September regarding the proposed addition of double yellow lines to some parts of Discovery Drive and the surrounding roads. We are very disappointed to note that unfortunately the proposal has not been amended despite our previous objections. We strenuously object to your proposals; specifically the gap in the double yellow lines immediately opposite the shared driveway for numbers 115 –

123 Discovery Drive. Five houses share this driveway, with currently 14 vehicles owned by the residents using the driveway on a daily basis. In addition to this, there are five teenage children who are likely to have their own cars in the near future, increasing the number of vehicles using the driveway every day. Forcing parking opposite this entrance is very dangerous and will likely lead to an accident. Discovery Drive is an extremely busy road. The proposed gaps in the double yellow lines will require all parking to be bunched in 2 locations: one immediately following the roundabout with Boverde Avenue and opposite our shared driveway, and the other opposite the entrance to Bancroft Lane. Leaving these two gaps in the double yellow lines will make Discovery Drive increasingly dangerous for all users, slowing the traffic rather than allowing it to flow freely as it does today. Our request would be that you either leave Discovery Drive as it is today with no double yellow lines, or that you paint continuous double yellow lines on both sides of the road from Rougemont to Boverde Avenue.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 82

I object to the proposals

Ridiculous idea

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 83

I object to the proposals

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

I dont agree with the areas planned there is no need for this and it will then cause issues in areas that are quiet as people will start to park their cars elsewhere causing further disruption.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 84

I object to the proposals

I object! With the number of roads to be included and the number of cars involved I cannot see how the proposals will help as many cars will be pushed into already cramped side roads. I, myself, only have one parking space with my property and a garage that is too thin to house a normal sized car! Where are we supposed to park if the yellow lines go ahead!

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 85

I support the proposals

We particularly support the new bus stop clearways as so many children use the school bus etc and there have been numerous hazardous situations because of parked cars, so the sooner the better. We also want to suggest the double line to be extended opposite the entrance / exit of the driveway in front of 97 - 99 Discovery Drive to stop cars from parking there instead / blocking the drive way. Thank you.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 86

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 87

I object to the proposals

We live at (REDACTED) and have previously objected to these proposals. We know that all our neighbours on both sides of the road also object to them, but it seems KCC take no account of what the residents who are affected think. There is currently no issue with parking in the vicinity of our house, so why change the status quo? By introducing these proposal it will encourage people to park where there are no yellow lines which will then make it difficult to get of our drive. We also need space for visitors to park, so as a minimum the enforcement should only be Mon-Fri during the day. I'd also like to know who wants the double yellow lines and why they are needed. I repeat I vigorously object to this proposal.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 88

I object to the proposals

The council states that the proposals are intended to ease traffic movements and improve visibility at the junctions which is good and well but how does this address two of the three complex parking issues which you have named to be:

- 1) Requests for increased parking space
- 2) Need for safer roads that are more accessible for deliveries, services and emergency vehicles

Addressing point 1 firstly. The introduction of double yellow lines where intended will directly result in the displacement of vehicles to areas where it may cause (and in all likelihood will) a future problem which you state the council wishes to avoid. In particular, vehicles previously parked in Discovery Drive will be displaced to Alderwick Grove, Cobham Drive, Quindell Place, Dawn Lane etc. The reason for this is that the council refuses to tackle the underlying problem which is the lack of parking space within the development and particularly close to homes.

The council's second point refers to the need for safer roads yet I fail to understand how the introduction of double yellow lines will achieve this. In fact, studies have shown that the introduction of double yellow lines creates space which cause vehicle speeds to increase. In just the past 2 years since your June 2021 consultation, we are aware of at least two pets having been killed in Discovery Drive as a direct result of speeding. It is only a matter of time before a pedestrian or child is injured.

Furthermore, please find below our comments in response to the July 2021 consultation which remain relevant and with critical issues remaining unaddressed.

The reasons given for the proposed changes are to improve traffic movements, to maintain access to properties, to maintain public transport facilities, to improve visibility at junctions and to improve safety near schools. The result of these changes, if implemented, will not achieve the above without resulting in a greater risk to residents while further compounding the severe shortage of parking in Kings Hill for the following reasons:

The severe shortage of parking space close to homes is the key issue which the council refuses to address and main reason why residents will object to these proposals. Adding double yellow lines will result in residents having to park in courtyards thereby restricting access to garages and properties in general which does not make any sense as maintaining access to properties is one of the primary reasons for the proposed changes. Furthermore, residents will be left with no alternative but to park in areas such as Phase 1 thus creating the same problem but in a different part of the development. In other words, the severe shortage of parking facilities within Kings Hill should be addressed first in order to prevent the issues mentioned above. There are options available to the council such as land directly to the front of several homes throughout Kings Hill which could be converted into parking spaces. At the very least, property owners could be afforded the opportunity to convert the land to parking space at their expense.

Speeding is another key issue and especially in Discovery Drive. Vehicles parked on the road have resulted in reduced instances of speeding and have been far more effective than the bollards in Tower View. If double yellow lines are implemented nothing will prevent speeding which could result in accidents and possibly, fatalities.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 89

I object to the proposals

I AM NOT in favour of the Borough's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Discovery Drive (Winston Avenue to Melrose Ave), Kings Hill shown on plan DD/586/15/B.

These representations/comments are made for there not to be additional double yellow lines in Kings Hill:

Unnecessary - The purpose of introducing these measures seems to be for revenue. Contravention of the Highway Code can be discretionarily applied in Kings Hill – and elsewhere. It only becomes the Highway code when double yellow lines are introduced – hence TMC will be creating the issue in the first place. Some Local Authorities and Councils have adopted a more practical application – without the need for double yellow line restrictions due to understanding their community. I would ask that TMC does the same. Work with us.

Not supported by collision or safety data - The collision data does not support the need for these measures. There have been only 2 recorded serious collisions on Kings Hill between 1999 – 2021, one of which was a single vehicle with single person injuries, which therefore appears to be driver error. Both collisions were on roundabouts where residents would not park anyway. The slight collisions during the same period is only 3. There have been fortunately no fatalities during this period. Although the data on the Kent County Council/TMC site is only shown until 2021, there is no other collision data which shows an upward trend in collisions requiring these stringent parking measures. Inadequate design for existing parking - Most of the homes on Kings Hill have inadequate off-street parking. Given the continuing growth of house-build on and around Kings Hill, challenging sufficient parking for new builds would at least minimise further parking issues, rather than allowing continued growth of housing without parking infrastructure. Homes with up to 5 bedrooms on Kings Hill normally have space for 1-2 cars, which is woefully inadequate resulting in many homes having to street park – perfectly understandable, legitimate and practical. Poor design of house parking results in residents parking nearby. This is not the fault of the residents.

ECHR - No one parks in Kings Hill for convenience. It is for accessibility. Those parking are either residents, visitors or work in the area. Article 8 ECHR provides the right to respect for private and family life. This is hampered and restricted if visiting family cannot park and therefore cannot visit. These parking restrictions may pose problems for residents who need to travel to work or elsewhere by car including those who may be infirm or suffering a disability. It may limit what activities residents, visitors and workers can do. Travelling for work often requires the use of a car, at least occasionally. These measures impact on the respect for family life. 6) Causing increased collisions - There is likely to be an increase in collisions including of children with cars being shunted to-and-fro onto driveways and condensing parking availability into smaller spaces. Environmental damage - The air pollution will increase with cars having to do small manoeuvres to move cars around on small driveways etc. Environmental aesthetics - The aesthetics of the area will suffer hugely. Cars parked on roads will be replaced with wheelie bins, where space has had to be given-over to cars. Kings Hill is currently a nice looking environment to live. It will not be in the future. Understandably, residents will be putting more bins out on public display. Future safety implications - Rarely do residents park inconsiderately currently. Inconsiderate parking will inevitably increase. Vehicles rarely, if ever cause an obstruction or danger currently. With more cars squashed into a smaller space they may well

do. Diluted traffic calming - Parked cars act as a traffic calmer. Where drivers have to avoid cars and give way to oncoming traffic where appropriate, this reduces speed. Without this, areas of Kings Hill will see more speeding cars – not necessarily over the speed limit, but faster than appropriate for the conditions. The top 3 contributors to fatal collision are speed, not wearing a seatbelt and distraction (often mobile phones). You will increase the opportunity for speed with these measures. Speed bumps are expensive and not good for the environment (emissions). Reduced convenience - Parking can continue to be convenient without the need for these restrictions. In respect of the Bus stop clearway this is again unnecessary, unless you are going to make it 'time' appropriate, such as outgoing bus-stops 7-9am Monday - Friday and incoming bus-stops 3-5pm. It does not need to be all of the time as it introduces unnecessary restrictions.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 90

I object to the proposals

There are no problems with people parking on the roads in my area. This does not impact traffic, crossing of the roads (as long as the cars are parked wisely) and people's safety. I have lived in Kings Hill since 2001 and never have I felt unsafe to cross roads or concerned about traffic. I know there is a growing population in Kings Hill, but even now I am not concerned. These plans have clearly been orchestrated by people who do not live in the area, in which these plans will not affect them in the slightest.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 91

I object to the proposals

I object to the consultation.

There should be NO parking on the main bus route roads through Kings Hill. Safety should be the priority. This consultation does not provide a safe solution.

Parking zones opposite 113 & 115 Discovery Drive are too close to the entrance to Bancroft Lane which will result in traffic collisions (this is also the case with the parking opposite 119 Discovery Drive). In addition parking areas in the stretch of the consultation Discover Drive (Rougemont to Bogarde Avenue) are on opposite sides of the road resulting in buses having to weave through traffic, again this will lead to traffic

collisions. There is no need for these parking areas. As I come back to make all areas NO PARKING but allow delivery companies to drop-off at any point.

Personally I have school age children and the creation of parking zones outside our house will make the road more dangerous outside our house and you are therefore putting my children at more risk through this proposal. Essentially you are creating a traffic obstacle in this space which risks injury.

As I come back to this point, there should be NO parking on the main Discovery Drive through road. Delivery drivers should be allowed to drop off but there should be no parking. It is unclear from your proposals how these restrictions will be policed. Investment needs to be made in policing this so that NO parking is enforced.

Currently there are two areas of trouble spot on Discovery Drive where parking is careless causing traffic risk / danger. One of these is by 65 Discovery Drive where cars are parked on the road by a traffic calming measure and then again at 99 Discovery Drive where multiple cars are again parked on the road near to a traffic calming measure. These measures should be addressing those particular issues not creating MORE DIFFERENT PROBLEMS for residents.

TMBC 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.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 92

I object to the proposals

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

It doesn't need to be on as many as these positions as you say it needs re looking at the advised roads

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 93

I object to the proposals

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

Discovery Drive is a bus route and looking at the plans the double yellow lines offer gaps on both sides of the road resulting in the buses 'weaving' around potential parked cars which worries me with my children getting on the buses every week day to get to school. Surely Discovery Drive is a key ring road and it should be no parking at all, especially as all homes have their own allocated parking and driveways. Who will pay for the parking attendants to enforce these new parking restrictions? Kings Hill residents already pay a premium to live here or is this a money making exercise for tmbc?

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 94

I object to the proposals

I object to this proposal but agree with double yellow lines around junctions/roundabouts as there are people who park really close which makes it difficult to navigate round them.

There does need to be more areas allocated on roads, where parking is able or lay-bys introduced and lose some of the big green areas. This could be done on Discovery Drive. Unfortunately people have more cars in their household than allocated parking. Also everyone has visitors, where are they to park? If the double yellow line are introduced this will make the side roads more busier. A solution for parking needs to be found if the yellow line are approved. Please listen to the residents who live here.

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 95

I support the proposals

I am concerned re access for emergency vehicles when cars are parked both sides of the road.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 96

I object to the proposals

If you want to make KH safer put in a permanent 20mph speed limit. The design of the houses and roads barely allows enough space right now for cars. Adding yellow lines will cause complete chaos. I think a speed limit will make the estate much safer .

TMBC Response

The provision of traffic calming, warning signs and safety-related road markings would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 97

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 98

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 99

I object to the proposals

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

I object to the yellow lines in Braeburn Way. This is going to cause residents not be be able to park outside their own houses. The yellow lines on Discovery Drive and Fortune Way will have a knock on effect to residents on Braeburn Way and surrounding roads such as Winston Avenue, as these residents will be parking in Braeburn Way causing households like myself stress where to park when returning home. I agree to yellow lines on main roads and roundabouts but not down the smaller side roads. I believe that the lines will not stop residents from parking inconsiderately, it will just add to the problem, as they will park wherever to get parked close to home. Why should residents be made to walk miles to park near their house, we pay enough to live on Kings Hill. Unfortunately builders are not providing enough parking when building their developments. The yellows lines will also devalue our properties.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 100

I object to the proposals

TMBC cannot go ahead with yellow lines on Kings Hill without providing a solution first for the displaced vehicles. Due to the poor planning of Kings Hill it has meant there are not enough spaces for each household. It is unreasonable to think a garage will be used to park a car in it.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 101

I object to the proposals

Parking Objection

Too many roads are included rather than targeting the roads that need it. (Hazen Road)

Yellow lines extend to far into the corners and beyond crossing points.

The installation of these lines will take space from residents/visitors or trades people.

No provision of additional parking spaces for visitors in these areas.

This is just a revenue stream for TMBC.

The cost of enforcement will be a burden on taxpayers.

We already have litter patrols/parking restrictions at the shops this plan is not in the spirit of Kings Hill.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 102

I support the proposals

roads were never intended to be car parks! kings hill has been ruined by inconsiderate parking, on pavements, roundabouts, grass verges.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 103

I support the proposals

My garage / parking spaces are accessed via anisa close. To access this road we use fortune way. Fortune Way has been struggling for years with 2 Lane traffic. It potentially turns into 4 lanes sometimes towards discovery. Outside waitrose car park (68-80 fortune) on the left hand side is a very blind spot going forward towards discovery. Cars continuously park here. It is very dangerous and frustrating trying to pull out and then having to reverse because a car is driving towards tower view. I therefore support the application for one way traffic here, towards tower view and also support yellow lines.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 104

I object to the proposals

This will cause more problems pushing cars onto pavements and roads without double yellow lines. Also it will limit areas for visitors, deliveries and workmen to park. I feel double yellow lines will cause more dangerous parking and tackling the current poor parking would be a better use of funds.

Double yellow lines will not be visually pleasing and change the look of Kings Hill causing a decrease to property values and deterring future purchases of property

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 105

I object to the proposals

I live on the junction of sunrise way and Regent way. Putting yellow lines on sunrise. will just result in all of those cars trying to park along Regent way. I have elderly parents who support me with childcare for my young children. They need access to be able to park near to my house which they will be prevented from doing it for sunrise way. Cars parked along Regent Way. Any yellow lines on Regent Way will remove the line of cars currently parked. These cars insure that traffic does not travel along Regent way too fast.

On days where there are no cars parked along that road, cars travel far too fast, making it unsafe for my young children or my dog to walk out of the house onto the grass. I am strongly opposed to double yellow lines in this area.

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 106

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines are not necessary in all but a very few roads/junctions. They are unsightly and existing parking will be condensed into the few roads that are not highlighted in the proposals. This will undoubtedly lead to disputes and traffic accidents. Too many houses have been crammed onto Kings Hill, with more projected, which has led to this problem. Leave us to manage our own parking.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 107

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 108

I object to the proposals

My end of Regent Way works with parking on one side. If you restrict parking on both sides of the road the cars will move into the side roads causing another local problem.

And how are tradesmen going to work with heavy materials if they are on double yellow lines (No parking at any time)?

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 109

I object to the proposals

The residents of Regent Way park with consideration. The road is never blocked by vehicles parking on both sides of the road. There is already an issue with cars speeding along the road!! If this plan is to be permitted for Regent Way, then road humps or such like will have to be installed as the road will become dangerous. I also assume that additional parking will be made available for people visiting. There are many roads on the development where parking is a much serious issue and extremely restrictive for emergency vehicles. Regency Way is not such. I cannot see that Beacon Avenue is on the proposal!

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 110

I support the proposals

I'm getting in touch in response to the Kings Hill Parking Review – Formal Consultation: Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) to let you know that I am IN FAVOUR of the proposals shown on plan DD/586/18/B. I have lived on Kings Hill for 20-plus years and never known the parking to be so inconsiderate and dangerous (to both pedestrians and motorists alike).

If people used/could be bothered to use their garage for its true purpose rather than storing stuff they never use, the parking on the road/pavement problem would be more than halved. And why do people have to park on the pavement, causing obstruction? Why should parents with young children, walkers, dog walkers, the elderly, disabled be expected to walk in the road to pass the parked vehicles? Also causing a hazard for emergency services and utility services. I would like to add these comments on the plans:

- What plans are there in place to enforce the yellow lines? With the yellow lines and no waiting already in place in parts of Tower View, it seems that if you put your hazard lights on it's perfect fine to park there or in the cycle lane. Unless there is some sort of 'deterrent' I place, people will just do as they like.
- With the plans for Kendall Avenue - might I suggest that the proposed yellow lines are extended to level with the green walkway from Tower View down to Ruby Walk. The current parking on the road means that for the residents with the first driveways on the left and right of Kendall Avenue (from entering in Regent Way) means it is hazardous/ dangerous exiting and entering our driveways as they are often infringed by parked vehicles.
- Levelling the lines with the green walkway would also make it safer for pedestrians crossing, not have to step out behind parked cars.
- There is a serious accident waiting to happen for drivers pulling out of Kendall Avenue into Regent Way as vision is totally obstructed by parked vehicles - which are actually contravening the rules of the Highway Code being parked too close to the edge of the junction.
- Hopefully, also, with yellow lines in place and no parking on the first section of Regent Way (before the Kendall turning or people parking up to post a letter) it will reduce the risk of accidents with people coming off the Tower View/Bovarde roundabout at excessive speed. Sorry if this seems like a rant but the parking and driving on Kings Hill needs serious reviewing - let's have speed cameras in place, there is a serious if not fatal accident waiting to happen.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 111

I object to the proposals

I object to the proposals to apply yellow lines to Regent Way as they are unnecessary. I have lived on Regent Way for 10 years and never once has the parking caused the access to be restricted enough to not allow emergency vehicles through. Therefore you have no evidence to justify their installation. Indeed if you install double yellow lines on Regent Way you will cause parking to become a great problem on the smaller roads and this will absolutely mean they will be blocked for emergency vehicles.

It is also worth considering that the parking that occurs on Regent Way naturally causes cars to drive slower and your proposal to remove the parking through the installation of double yellow lines will cause

cars to drive faster along this stretch and will eventually cause serious injury or a fatality to a child. This clearly has not been considered.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 112

I object to the proposals

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

Speeding vehicles, danger to pedestrians. Money making opportunity for the council. Lack of parking on the estate anyway. I can understand yellow lines on corners, but nearly the whole road is ridiculous. A large majority of houses are family homes, with potentially adult children who can drive. A one car family would be few and far between. This will cause the side roads to be congested. Perhaps permit parking would solve some of the issues, like people running car businesses from home and taking all the parking, this way also the council can make some money!

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 113

I support the proposals

I agree with yellow lines around junctions. Not sure about yellow lines outside my house but we do have a problem with parking , only 1-13, only two residents park outside their house but at times there might be 10 cars parking. I dont know where they live. But I'm unable to even have a visitor parking at times. Can it not be resident parking outside your own house?

I don't know where or who owns these cars, its not fair as its not the household that is parking on Regent Way.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 114

I object to the proposals

Unfortunately the amount of houses allowed to be crammed in on Kings Hill didn't allow for the parking of vehicles owned by the owners. I have 3 children, all now working and driving their own car. 5 bedroom house, 5 cars and only 2 spaces including my garage. Please advise what facilities the council suggest will be available for parking and how far from home will this be?

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 115

I support the proposals

I would like to see the waiting restrictions on the south side of Regent Way extended by approx. 15m to improve the sight distance for vehicles exiting the shared drive of No's 4, 6 & 8 (plan supplied)

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 116

I object to the proposals

I have been a resident on Regent Way for the last 12 years. I have seen the number of cars parked on the road steadily increase over the years due to the need for more vehicles within the home. This isn't only for ease but there are a number of families that have lived here for as long if not longer than I have with children who are now of an age where they too now are driving. If the yellow lines are put onto Regent Way (Although you have labeled the roads they will come out of on your proposal not Regent Way itself) it will seriously reduce the number of cars parked on the road, yes, but I ask you where will these cars then park? The houses that have been built around here have 1 parking space in front of a garage. There are very few visitor spaces that are already at full capacity in the parking lots behind our houses.

The road itself is never blocked, it is not a hazard for emergency vehicles or buses and there is never a back up of traffic. People currently do the speed limit down the road with the current parking arrangements, so the yellow lines you are proposing will allow people to drive faster up & down the road making it more dangerous for not only those that live on the road but the dog walkers, families on walks or bike rides & tens of schoolchildren that walk up & down the road each day. This as well as the vehicles & cyclists that will be turning in & out of the multiple side roads on Regent Way

I propose that the yellow line proposal is completely not necessary, you haven't considered the points I have raised and all you will do is push people out of Kings Hill.

As to the other roads around Kings Hill, I feel the same applies. Where will they park? How will you control the speed of motorists moving around Kings Hill? Where will visitors park when all of the available space is taken up by residents?

I hope you review these points thoroughly when considering your final decision. Kings Hill has had very little road traffic accidents over the last 20-30 years and I feel the money you are investing in this proposal could be better spent elsewhere

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 117

I object to the proposals

There is a lack of parking all ready yellow lines are going to make the back smaller streets completely over parked with a risk that emergency services will not be able to reach the destination which will then be all down to tmbc . There is plenty of room on regent way to put parking lay-bys,

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 118

I support the proposals

I support fortune way becoming one way. I agree junctions and roundabouts needs lining to stop inconsiderate parking and to clear the bus routes. I do just wish some overflow/visitor parking was being created at the same time. There are many little car parks around kings hill that are nearly used. Why can't these be made for public use? For example there are two by the cricket pitch, one in queen street, two by linear park, the allotment car park.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 119

I object to the proposals

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

There needs to be better thought put to this. I agree some areas i.e schools needs zigzags and yellow lines but not entire roads! This proposal is half designed without wider consideration for the residents of KingsHill.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 120

I object to the proposals

Not enough parking as it is

Will look absolutely ridiculous with green paint everywhere in an area thats meant to have a 'village feel'

No evidence provided of emergency vehicles unable to attend emergencies

No evidence provided of safety issues as it is now

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 121

I object to the proposals

The reason why I object to this is due to the increased parking which will push traffic onto the side roads and cause major issues with residents living in these roads and being able to park in their street or even access their own driveways. If cars are pushed from the main roads onto side roads, emergency service vehicles will also have issues accessing these areas.

There is a solution where parking bays could be built into existing large grass verges in problem areas.

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 122

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 123

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 124

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 125

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 126

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 127

I object to the proposals

I object to the proposed parking restrictions, they are unjustified, excessive, unnecessary and will lead to a highway safety problem.

I also raise issue with the consultation details as the Statement of Reasons and the notices displayed on lampposts do not include the full proposals for Regent Way and the details provided on the TMBC consultation webpage <https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/parking-transport/parking-review-kings-hill>

are very confusing as the description doesn't mention parking restrictions, only the one-way traffic proposal for Fortune Way and Milton Lane.

I wrote during the previous consultation in July 2021 and that letter was signed by other residents of Pearl Way who wanted to petition against the parking restrictions. This was hand delivered to TMBC and sent via email to parking.office@tmbc.gov.uk. The proposed parking restrictions have not been changed in the current consultation and so it seems that no consideration has been given to the petition and the views of the residents who will live with the consequences of the restrictions, if implemented. My understanding is that petitions relating to highway matters should be considered by JTB members, however no acknowledgement or response has been received to date.

Regent Way is approximately 7m in width, allowing ample space for even the largest vehicle to pass a parked car. Please see below an extract from the Department for Transport Manual for Streets which shows an HGV can pass a car on a 4.8m wide carriageway and 2 HGV's can pass safely on a 5.5m wide carriageway. Clearly with a 7m carriageway, such as Regent Way, there is no issue with access for through traffic caused by parking, however, residents and visitors to Pearl Way will be impacted by the parking restrictions along Regent Way as the speeds will increase along Regent Way presenting a highway safety issue for drivers and cyclists turning out of Pearl Way and for pedestrians wishing to cross Regent Way.

As some time has lapsed since my previous letter and petition were submitted I have rechecked the crash record along Regent Way and Pearl Way and found that there have still been no recorded personal injury crashes within the latest 5 year period as can be see from the extract from Crashmaps below:

The fact that there are no recorded personal injury crashes along the whole length of Regent Way and Pearl Way indicates these roads are safe as they are, without the restrictions. The existing on-street parking along Regent Way slows traffic speeds and acts as traffic calming. There is no safety problem and no regular issues relating to access. With budget cutbacks, a cost of living crisis and everyone else making savings where they can, surely the limited resources we have available to us should be spent where they can achieve the most impact, so why not target this funding on areas where there is already a proven crash record and where that funding can make a positive impact to highway safety!?

I do not consider that there is a need for such extensive restrictions at the junctions and in particular at residential cul-de-sacs. In the case of the junction of Regent Way and Pearl Way, currently no parking takes place to restrict visibility. The only restriction to visibility is the landscaping at the junction which often becomes overgrown. I would like to point out that current guidance for visibility splays on residential streets is given in the Department for Transport document Manual for Streets. Paragraph 10.7 of Manual for Streets2 'Obstacles to Visibility' states that parking in visibility splays in built-up areas (such as Kings Hill) is quite common, yet does not appear to create significant problems in practice.

I am very concerned that the details of the consultation are so unclear and will result in members of the public not responding to this consultation exercise. The list of locations in the Statement of Reasons does not list Regent Way and neither do the notices placed on lampposts.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 128

I object to the proposals

The removal of the parked cars on Regent Way will lead to an increase in vehicle speeds and this will be more dangerous for pedestrians crossing Regent Way and for drivers and cyclists turning from side roads into Regent Way.

In addition, the consultation is flawed because the omission of Regent Way from the list of roads affected on the lamp column notices is misleading and will result in residents not taking part in the consultation.

Residents are only able to object or support the whole list of affected roads rather than object to some and support others. To be fair and reasonable objections/support should be gathered for each road separately.

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 129

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 130

I object to the proposals

Increased traffic speed in area thereby increasing risk of accidents

TMBC Response

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 131

I object to the proposals

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

Concerned parking moves from Regent Way into Pearl Way, blocking drives and cul de sacs, as well as pavements.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 132

I object to the proposals

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

I object to the proposed parking restrictions, they are unjustified, excessive, unnecessary and will lead to a highway safety problem.

I also raise issue with the consultation details as the Statement of Reasons and the notices displayed on lampposts do not include the full proposals for Regent Way and the details provided on the TMBC consultation webpage <https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/parking-transport/parking-review-kings-hill>

are very confusing as the description doesn't mention parking restrictions, only the one-way traffic proposal for Fortune Way and Milton Lane.

Regent Way is approximately 7m in width, allowing ample space for even the largest vehicle to pass a parked car. Please see below an extract from the Department for Transport Manual for Streets which shows an HGV can pass a car on a 4.8m wide carriageway and 2 HGV's can pass safely on a 5.5m wide carriageway. Clearly with a 7m carriageway, such as Regent Way, there is no issue with access for through traffic caused by parking, however, residents and visitors to Pearl Way will be impacted by the parking restrictions along Regent Way as the speeds will increase along Regent Way presenting a highway safety issue for drivers and cyclists turning out of Pearl Way and for pedestrians wishing to cross Regent Way.

The fact that there are no recorded personal injury crashes along the whole length of Regent Way and Pearl Way indicates these roads are safe as they are, without the restrictions. The existing on-street parking along Regent Way slows traffic speeds and acts as traffic calming. There is no safety problem and no regular issues relating to access. With budget cutbacks, a cost of living crisis and everyone else making savings where they can, surely the limited resources we have available to us should be spent where they can achieve the most impact, so why not target this funding on areas where there is already a proven crash record and where that funding can make a positive impact to highway safety!?

The drawing included in the online consultation page indicates parking restrictions along a significant length of Regent Way whereas the list of locations in the Statement of Reasons does not list Regent Way and neither do the notices placed on lampposts along and near to Regent Way. This is confusing – are there restrictions proposed as per the drawing or as per the list in the Statement of Reasons?

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 133

I object to the proposals

Implementing yellow lines is not the answer to the parking issues in Kings Hill and will create further problems for smaller roads and lead to dangerous driving speeds around Kings Hill.

The plans for yellow lines on Regent Way are excessive and unnecessary. We live just off Regent Way and even with cars parked along the roads cars regularly drive at high speed, this will be made much worse with no natural traffic calming and it will become a race track. With school-age children walking to school crossing Regent Way this is a real concern.

We live down a small road and cars unable to park along Regent Way will push into our road causing parking problems and blocking driveways.

The yellow lines on the loop at Crispin Way at completely unnecessary, there is limited parking in the school car park and yellow lines around the drop off loop will lead to chaos at drop off and collection times.

The yellow line proposals do not allow for visitor parking or contractors when having work carried out. Where will these people be able to park? There is no local long-term parking available in Kings Hill, with nearly all car parks now having a time limit.

The plans have no consideration for the residents of Kings Hill or the safety of children and families crossing roads.

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 134

I object to the proposals

The proposal for double yellow lines in Regent Way will speed up traffic making it more unsafe. Considering it is heavily used by school children for access to secondary school bus stops and parents & children for access to Discovery school, this would be an irresponsible change with no foreseeable advantage.

It will also force the existing parked cars into side roads which have no full parking spaces built in, leading to cars parking 'half' on the pavement. This will hamper access for pedestrians, particularly disabled and parents with pushchairs. It will also complicate access to existing driveways when people park opposite, not to mention hampering access for emergency vehicles, refuse collection and deliveries.

These changes will definitely result in frustrations and a rise in parking related altercations.

Finally the authorities have not proof timely made the residents aware, as if it is being rushed through under the covers.

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 135

I object to the proposals

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

Because the speed will increase on Regent Way and it will push all the cars that park there onto side roads like ours

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 136

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 137

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 138

I object to the proposals

The proposals more a problem - need a wider solution to avoid accidents. By putting yellow lines on Alexander Grove, traffic + parked cars with no doubt move to Discovery Drive as I have marked. This part of the road is currently a race track and either all Discovery Drive needs yellow lines or expect an accident.

In addition, the Council needs to make it clear that unadopted roads such as Elstar Place & Rubins Okace are private and parking should be forbidden here. (Plan supplied)

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 139

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 140

I object to the proposals

Not enough parking on KH as it is. This will make it much worse.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 141

I object to the proposals

I object to current scheme/wholesale yellow lines on roads within Kings Hill. If the scheme provided yellow lines at T junctions and roundabouts to prevent unsociable parking then that would be acceptable.

There is a serious lack of Parking and spaces for visitors on Kings Hill due the the inadequate planning requirements for parking.

Yellow lines on many roads will cause a knock on effect with the cars moving to other side streets and causing further issues.

Please please utilise existing legislation to penalise the offenders who park near junctions/roundabouts and do not take a broad rush approach to parking in general on Kings Hill.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 142

I support the proposals

In favour for obvious safety reasons.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 143

I support the proposals

Parking is out of control & dangerous. Pedestrian access to footpaths is often blocked.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 144

I support the proposals

For too long cars have been parked actually on roundabouts - like Discovery Drive/Fortune Way causing obstruction and blocking the view of drivers and pedestrians. There is also uncontrolled double parking on many roads on Kings Hill. Whilst this is completely due to the lack of planning by TMBC, KCC, Liberty Property & Developers - having lived on Kings Hill for over 25 years it is now out of control and whilst I can see that in many cases the parking problem is going to simply shift to other streets - we have no alternative - given it is unlikely that extra parking provision will be retrospectively be made - there is no money in supplying 'valuable building land' constantly being over developed and ever smaller plots - given the mind set of local officials and developers. Money is only consideration - with the original goals and promises of Kings Hill in 1990s sold out many years ago! We the residents live and pay for these poor policy decisions and money 1st - environment and living conditions 2nd undemocratic decisions.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 145

I object to the proposals

The increased yellow lines on Alton Ave/roundabout will push parking into the cul-de-sac areas of Alton Ave which will block people's driveways and increase congestion for residents . Noone parks on the Tug of War roundabout anyway so the proposals are unnecessary.

One of the reasons that Kings Hill stands out from other towns is that it does not have unsightly double yellow lines. These proposals will cause the area to lose its unique appeal and any parking issues will increase making the area even more blocked up as there will be nowhere for residents to park. This will also have a knock on effect on road safety. The plans are not well thought through and should be got rid of. Kings Hill will become the same as other towns and less desirable to live in.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 146

I object to the proposals

This will push cars to park further up Alton Avenue, which will cause issues outside our house, for reversing out of the driveway and for pedestrians. If there are parked cars in Alton avenue, it will cause issues from the bend from Townsend Square. I object to these proposals.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 147

I object to the proposals

The displaced traffic from the new yellow lines in Alexander Grove will cause major problems in Alton Avenue. I can understand that roundabouts should have yellow lines but not all of the other roads. It will cause chaos on Kings Hill and turn neighbour against neighbour. This is the second time I have raised these comments as I responded to the first request for feedback two years ago.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 148

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 149

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 150

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 151

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 152

I support the proposals

I think it would be a good thing to do as fortune way is dangerous I moved in to my property over 20 years ago & every property has a garage drive way or car port for there cars vans etc except my property I only have one garage nothing else the property should of had a garage & car port but Berkeley homes mucked up I would say 95 percent of houses & apartments do not use there garages or car ports it's disgusting that's why the street is like a car park I did have permission from the council when I moved in as I had no option but to park in the street

Kind regards

Mr Moat

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 153

I object to the proposals

I agree with some of the proposals for yellow lines on junctions and corners but not all. The excessive plan for the yellow lines is going to push more cars who do not have sufficient parking i.e. driveways, or garages or parking spaces onto smaller non-yellow lined roads. Where we live each house is only allocated one parking space and each house has 2 to 3 cars due to the fact of the children have grown up now Work and need to drive to be able to get to work as the public transport here is appalling. Currently the roads behind my home Baxter way and Cardinal Walk are absolutely packed with vehicles from residents and non-residents of these roads. By adding additional double yellow lines is going to push more vehicles from Winston Avenue, Brayburn way, Melrose Avenue ect onto these roads causing complete chaos and potential confrontation. We have lived here as a family for the past 18 years and I can say probably 14 of those have been happy years, but since the over population and constant building and now double yellow

lines and lack of parking, I can say we are officially unhappy. If we could afford to move off of Kingshill we would but as part of a shared ownership scheme and a minimum wage Family We are trapped.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 154

I object to the proposals

A one way system on fortune way is completely unnecessary as even with parked cars there is room for 2 cars to pass. This will simply displace the traffic on to the adjacent roads primary Winston avenue.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 155

I object to the proposals

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

Pray tell ,where are people going to park. It seems you bright sparks haven't thought about that. And what about people visiting where are they going to park. You should have built more car parks but no, wanted more housing with not enough parking.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 156

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 157

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 158

I object to the proposals

Once again, I strongly object to this preposterous proposal. I must reiterate my point made in my previous objection: why did TBMC permit the construction of four 3-4 bedroom houses along Fortune Way with provisions for only one allocated parking space?

I raise the same questions again: where will these vehicles go? Has anyone conducted a thorough analysis on this matter? And what about visitor parking? The current capacity simply cannot accommodate the volume of vehicles.

Regarding the one-way proposal, the primary question that comes to mind is a simple 'why?' How does this intend to encourage a shift in parking habits? People will merely circle the block in search of another space. It truly defies logic. Moreover, this will inevitably cause significant inconvenience and disruption for those who reside off a one-way system. It will lead to vehicles continuously circling and add to the traffic along Queen Street, which is a heavily pedestrianized zone and ill-suited for an influx of vehicles.

Also to note, the adjacent car park along Queen Street is consistently at full capacity during working hours and certainly lacks the space to accommodate the substantial influx of vehicles that will be displaced by the parking restrictions.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 159

I object to the proposals

Car parking space is limited already. Further restrictions - apart from the addition of yellow lines on bends - will create more problems, not solve any.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 160

I object to the proposals

To park a second car would be very difficult after yellow lines are imposed at Fortune Way and Discovery Drive. Any road parking would be extremely competitive at best. Paying for parking a long way away or walking a long way away will be the only option if I'm lucky.

Kings hill concept living does not fit well with aesthetically displeasing yellow lines.

I personally find other resident drivers very accommodating and generally of good disposition when navigating parked cars that, in places, make the roads single Lane. I have no problem with this or anything else involved here.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 161

I object to the proposals

Whilst I have a space which I use for parking this will not enable me to ever have visitors or most of the residents on Kings Hill. There are no areas for visitors to park - we were able to use waitrose and Asda at one time but unable to now due to time restrictions.

There are insufficient parking spaces for the size of houses - 1 or 2 is not sufficient. I agree that there is some appalling inconsiderate parking on kings hill and that can still be dealt with under current legislation.

Another option is to make some of the problem streets eg Fortune Way, Queen Street one way thus making parking available and making it safer for all to drive, cycle, walk and live on Kings Hill.

I have lived here since 2011 when there was not the number of houses that have been built. No consideration has been given to parking or adequate spaces for 4/5 bedroom houses.

The proposed restrictions will make side roads even more hazardous (hazen road and Milton lane) as more cars will try and park there with less consideration for others.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 162

I support the proposals

We are in complete agreeace with the parking restrictions proposed. This is sufficient. We DO NOT agree with a one-way system for Fortune Way. Just monitor parking restriction results. Not only will the flow of traffic increase. Also we have a large community secured parking entrance with access on Fortune Way. The one-way system will cause residents many issues especially those who have no front access for service vehicles.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 163

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 164

I object to the proposals

Where are people meant to park their cars? Are you going to create a residence parking. Our parking is already impacted by Waitrose visitors parking their cars in residence spaces.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 165

I object to the proposals

I agree that people should not be parking on blind bends, pavements and roundabouts but there doesn't seem to be anywhere else to park, without good old eurocar parks slapping a ticket on your car. I also object that Fortune Way should be made one way. As I live right at the very bottom, close to the entrance and exit of Fortune Way, this is going to make life very difficult for us residents and the people shopping in Waitrose.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 166

I object to the proposals

To make Fortune Way one way traffic. I am not in favour of double yellow lines.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 167

I object to the proposals

I partly support the proposal of making Fortune way a one way however there should be considerations for an option to park on the space of the corner of Richmond and Fortune (next to 62 Fortune Way.) alternatively consider providing residents with parking permits for visitors. The lack of parking will create issues on the back streets like Richmond.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 168

I object to the proposals

Parking is already inadequate this will make matters much much worse

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 169

I object to the proposals

As a resident of Fortune way (a large 5 bedroom home) we have only 1 allocated parking space. We do have a garage, however our family car is too large for us to park it inside and for us to be able to open the doors to exit the car. In the 2 years I have lived here, we have not experienced any real parking concerns or issues. Yes, some people park opposite the Waitrose entrance, on the roundabout where Fortune Way meets Discovery drive, and on occasion, blocking the crossing point on Fortune Way and Braeburn. These specific areas would benefit from parking restrictions. Taking away the parking on Fortune Way will simply allow drivers to speed. The parked cars currently serve as traffic calming. Furthermore, the crossing point at Braeburn, which is on a bend, will be considerably more dangerous to use, and as a mum of young children, I would worry for their safety. Making Fortune Way a one way street leading from Waitrose up to Discovery Drive, would solve all issues. Residents can still park (except for the new restrictions put in place as mentioned above) and crossing the road will be safer due to calmer traffic traveling one way.

I also object to the widespread double yellow lines across various sites. Again, there are specific points where this would be beneficial (roundabouts, junctions etc.), but taking away parking spaces in all these areas without providing an alternative area to park, will simply cause these vehicles to be parked and squeezed onto unaffected roads. This will perpetuate the problem, as more dangerous/thoughtless parking will occur in the rare areas that can be used, with vehicles mounting pavements. So then what? Will these roads then be restricted too? Where does it stop? I urge you to take the time needed to review the parking situation thoroughly. I understand that complaints come in from people who do not live in these areas. People are always quick to complain, but are rarely keen to comment when things are working just fine.

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 170

I support the proposals

Vehicles mount the pavement to pass where cars have parked on blind bends. vehicles travelling against them cause a block to the road, often the cars on the pavement drive across walk ways, these too are blind exits for pedestrians. Its a fatality waiting to happen.

You have been made aware!

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 171

I support the proposals

Whilst I agree KH doesn't have enough parking, people need to use garages and driveways where possible / they also need to stop parking in dangerous places eg close to junctions, on roundabouts etc which are the areas these proposals seem to target

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 172

I object to the proposals

It won't solve parking issues of inconsiderate parking or any other issues. But it will cause overcrowded parking problems on nearby roads. It will also negate the natural speed calming which parking on the proposed road's currently benefits from.

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 173

I object to the proposals

No need to turn a village into a town. It would be catastrophic. It's not necessary. Just a new money making venture for the council.

TMBC Response

The introduction of parking restrictions does not make the Council money. Enforcement action involves the issuing of penalty charges, which assist in covering the costs of the provision of the Parking Service, and the maintenance of the parking road markings and signs.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 174

I object to the proposals

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

Yes, something needs to be done about the dangerous parking on and near junctions/roundabouts, but putting double yellows on so many roads will not help. Instead this blanket approach will make all those roads clear routes for people to speed along making the roads less safe for children. Also, the cars need to be parked somewhere, so all the other roads will become overcrowded with inconsiderate parking.

Unfortunately the lack of providing parking spaces that developers have been allowed to get away with had caused this issue. If they had been made to provide a sensible number of spaces related to the size of the houses then there wouldn't be the need for on street parking.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 175

I support the proposals

The sports park fills up and empties with lots of cars going in and out. There will eventually be a complete gridlock

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 176

I object to the proposals

Whilst I completely agree with yellow lining around junctions and roundabouts the issue with yellow lining most of the roads is that the cars currently parked on these roads will simply move into smaller roads, creating even more of an issue for the quieter, smaller roads. This will increase inaccessibility for refuse trucks, emergency vehicles and cause immense stress for local residents. This will also increase frustration and anger amongst and between local residents. There is also no way of using public car parks for visitors to properties due to time limits on most of the public car parks now. Ticketing of inappropriate and dangerous parking would be much more useful in stopping vehicles parking dangerously than blanket yellow-lining most roads in this area. Where are visitors meant to park??!! This is a ridiculous idea quite frankly. House prices will drop and kings hill will become less sought after if there is no road parking allowed at all. This will simply move the problem, not deal with it.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response Page reference 177

I object to the proposals

Speeds will increase to dangerous levels if parked cars are removed.

I do not believe there has ever been a child involved in a traffic accident on Kings Hill within the roads of this review.

Displaced parking will cause greater problems in smaller side roads.

Lack of parking is the biggest problem so reducing spaces will exacerbate the situation.

Double yellow lines are ugly and not in keeping with landscape of Kings Hill.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 178

I object to the proposals

I would like to know the theory on how do you see this will help the area with its parked cars.

How do you foresee the impact of side roads, will this decrease the value in housing?

Also, will the double yellow lines be patrolled to enforce the restriction?

Can you confirm this painting of the yellow lines is not because there another underlining agenda I.e emergency access to gain planning permission?

TMBC Response

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 179

I object to the proposals

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

This will cause further problems to additional roads, and I don't feel yellow lines are the solution. Kings Hill has an issue with parking areas, and restricting this further without providing additional parking will cause further problems. Clear parking bays without the use of yellow lines might be a better solution, with signs in critical areas to detract visitors and residents from parking too close to junctions and crossings.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 180

I support the proposals

Too many vehicles parked inconsiderately / dangerously causing hazards

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 181

I support the proposals

I agree with the proposals. Some of the parking around Kings Hill is dangerous and causes issues with visibility which should have been picked up by a Road Safety Audit when the estate was built. Unfortunately not enough parking spaces are built with properties whereby a 5 bed house will have only 1 space but the household could have up to 5 cars. Residents parking is often at the rear of properties and people tend to want to park in front of their house instead of using the parking spaces they are given.

These TROs will make Kings Hill a nicer place to live as will result in less aggressive driving and should also lead to less neighbourly disputes

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 182

I support the proposals

Support the proposals. Except. Not sure why the top end of Fortune Way (by the golf club) is to have double yellow lines - because this parking doesn't really adversely affect the flow of traffic/isn't dangerous. It may cause vehicles to park on Discovery Drive which will be more of an issue as this is a faster moving road with bends that don't have great forward visibility...

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 183

I object to the proposals

Where will all the cars that currently park where the yellow lines are proposed go? It is already overcrowded and will only get worse if builders keep building without supplying adequate parking facilities

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 184

I object to the proposals

Due to lack of parking facilities elsewhere. The cars have to go somewhere and this just moves the problem into other streets

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 185

I object to the proposals

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

I feel yellow lines should be in place at/just before junctions and roundabouts for safety.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 186

I object to the proposals

There should be a blanket yellow lining of many of Kings Hill roads. Lots of the houses were built with a garage that is too small for a car and not sufficient to park in. Double yellow's seem to stringent for the area where accidents and issues are not that frequent. However, roundabout and junctions could have some yellow lines to ensure safety here

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 187

I object to the proposals

No provisions for cars to park as many houses do not have the correct amount of parking allowance, or the local council have allowed garage conversions (for example) to remove valuable parking spaces

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 188

I object to the proposals

There is no denying that there are parking issues in Kings Hill, but putting double yellows everywhere will make this problem worse. The cars that park on these roads have nowhere else to go and will force them into other roads. The problem is that houses are not provided with adequate parking per household, applying yellow lines doesn't solve this.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 189

I object to the proposals

Whilst acknowledging that there are some areas that do require yellow lines, by adding them to all the areas listed you are just pushing the issue into the side roads, that will then have access issues. Also if the main roads are clear, this is likely to increase cars speeding.

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 190

I object to the proposals

Really inconvenience having double yellow lines right outside my property. I have a disabled mother who visits and helps me out with my child while I work. Would be a problem if she has to walk far to get to my house if she has to park away from my house.

TMBC Response

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 191

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 192

I object to the proposals

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

Effects house prices and still doesn't solve the problem

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 193

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines push the problem on to someone else it does not solve it. Stop granting car port changes to garages and accept new developments with suitable parking provision - realistic spaces.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 194

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines push the problem on to someone else it does not solve it. Stop granting car port changes to garages and accept new developments with suitable parking provision - realistic spaces.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 195

I object to the proposals

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

Yellow lines do not solve the problem it pushes it into other roads

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 196

I support the proposals

Cars are essential especially since the removal of certain bus routes. Yellow lines will only force them to park on the connection small roads pushing problem on. The Council needs to enforce/honour the car ports, only accept new developments with suitable parking provision.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 197

I object to the proposals

The garages and parking spaces are not sufficient for the amount of cars needed in King's Hill. This will make the current parking situation worse, smaller roads will become impassable for large vehicles and emergency vehicles and even more dangerous for road users and pedestrians.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 198

I object to the proposals

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

No provision or alternative solutions for existing cars. Plans will just make other roads even more congested and cause further problems. These parking restrictions will just displace the current "problem" to other roads. I do not believe the reasoning behind the restrictions, I have never seen emergency services or delivery vehicles get stuck due to parked cars. If anything, this should have been addressed by TMBC during planning stage of phase 2, not 20 years later.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 199

I object to the proposals

It will cause parking chaos all over Kings Hill

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 200

I object to the proposals

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

There is not enough parking as it is, removing more of it with double yellow lines creates parking issue for other smaller sides roads where cars will simply move to. The days of families owning one or two cars are over, children are unable to move out until they are much older due to house prices so having 3 or 4

vehicles per house is not rare. Plus visitors, where are people meant to park? On Discovery Drive, you are trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist, but in the meantime creating the residents a problem.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 201

I object to the proposals

I strongly disagree to the yellow lines outside my house - where do our visitors & family park when visiting me which very important to me being (READCTED) - Also, all the side roads are crammed with cars already. Where are all the cars going to park to see there children into the school? We have no problems with them parking outside the houes as they are only there for a ew minutes. Are there going to be alloted times on these yellow lines, or are they going to be all day & night?

Who is going to maintain the upkeep and who is going to pay for the wardens?

We pay 2 lots of services now. On the corners I understand and agree with but all the way along Discovery Drive is out of order.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 202

I object to the proposals

Cancelled bus route which we use to use to commute via train station

If you want to reduce cars better public services are needed first

TMBC Response

The Borough Council is not involved in the provision of public transport - this is a function for Kent County Council.

However, the proposals should maintain and improve accessibilty for buses through the Kings Hill development.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 203

I object to the proposals

The proposal will have a detrimental effect on residence who need to Park on some roads. We have 2 cars and only one off road parking space. Parking in side roads has never been a problem it is the parking too close to roundabout and schools that are the problem! Enforce the highway code and don't penalise the residents that need to park on some roads. If discovery drive gets double yellow line and no parked cars then it will become a race track for speeding cars that are already starting to speed through the road!

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 204

I object to the proposals

I agree with double yellows for safety close to junctions but not the extent of the lines. Stopping parking on some roads (or one side) will lead to too much parking on side streets

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 205

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 206

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 207

I object to the proposals

The parking control measures already introduced in Tower View, consisting of double yellow lines, built out pavements and bollards, were wholly unnecessary and detract from the previously very pleasant street scene. To add even more parking restrictions in our village would be a waste of money and effort while making Kings Hill look less than accommodating to its residents and visitors.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 208

I support the proposals

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

These proposals would effectively manage and regulate parking in the Roads listed in the parking review. The proposals are based on the principles of the Highway Code and will ensure that access through the estate is done in a safe and effective way.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 209

I support the proposals

Should allow for better visibility at junctions and hopefully encourage people to use their driveways & garages. See no reason to object.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 210

I support the proposals

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

All householders signed a covenant stating that they would not park on main roads.

Over the course of 20 years the amount of traffic moving around Kings Hill and parking in inappropriate areas has increased dramatically. Families have grown and many young adults now have their own cars. However, there is no parking provision for these vehicles and it is unfortunate that this situation has been allowed to happen.

As well as the increase in traffic, the standard of driving leaves a lot to be desired; too fast, too impatient and no consideration for other road users or the walking public. The current speed monitors do not appear to deter speeding. A speed limit of 20MPH is plenty and consideration should be given to having it introduced throughout Kings Hill.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 211

I support the proposals

Main through roads were always supposed to be kept reasonably clear of parked vehicles and so enabling asmpmph flow of traffic, from bicycle allow

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 212

I object to the proposals

I object to all of the proposals related in this consultation. This is unnecessary, this is not a problem that needs such a heavy-handed resolution proposal and is a waste public money.

This will unsafely push all the cars that park considerately into the tighter back streets off Discovery Drive, normally where more children are playing, significantly hindering movement & access to residential properties, negatively impacting visibility and safety in these streets.

This will negatively impact trade & deliveries around Kings Hill. This will make far more difficult of people/ families visiting residents of Kings Hill. A significant negative impact to resolve a perceived issue, which doesn't need resolution.

This will not improve traffic movement, instead makes them more difficult and unsafe in the street surrounding the proposed yellow lines roads, this will also impact access to those properties.

Public transport (buses) in Kings hill are almost non existent post COVID, and when the odd bus does come through access is normally fine as people give way to each around the roads, so these proposals is excessive for the perceived issue which doesn't need resolution.

Visibility at junctions along discovery drive are normally more hindered by the landscaping or other traffic 'calming' items (round-a-bouts etc) rather than the cars parked considerately on the side of the road. Are these impacts to visibility going to be addressed?

Tight areas around fortune way/ Queen St/ Milton way need a more considered specific resolution, specific to those areas, rather than a blanket double yellow of all Discovery Dr and the unconsidered impacts to the back street.

Access around schools need a specific time related solution to the 30mins per day for school drop off & pick up (management/ supervision type) , rather than the heavy handed 24/7 negative impact to everyone else around them.

These doesn't appear to be any specific consultation to the residents of the wider Kings hill estate, which means this isn't a proper public consultation.

This proposal is ill considered in actual impacts to wider parts of Kings Hill. Will only make things worse.

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council is not involved in the provision of public transport - this is a function for Kent County Council.

However, the proposals should maintain and improve accessibility for buses through the Kings Hill development.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 213

I object to the proposals

In my opinion people park sensibly and so no need to change

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 214

I object to the proposals

Not in favour unless illegal parking is going to be monitored effectively by CCTV or other means. This is going to cause additional congestion further down the road or illegal parking at drop-off & pick-up times. It would have been more help to have a new zebra crossing installed to ensure safe crossing for our children.

TMBC Response

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 215

I support the proposals

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

Fed up with people parking on roundabouts and being unable to safely exit my road.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 216

I object to the proposals

I object to double yellow lines on discovery road which is not dealing with the parking issues but pushing it into side roads which already have enough vehicles parked in them. It will also mean vehicles travelling at higher speeds along discovery drive

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 217

I object to the proposals

moving parked cars from the larger roads, will only impact on the smaller roads. This will only prove to push the issue from one place to another, together with the council being responsible for the potential dangers that this poses. ie emergency vehicle not being able to pass by, cars parked, so pedestrians can't past and utility service unable to collect rubbish on. regular basis. Kings hill is promoted as a family location and most families have at least 2 children who have grown up here and now drive. Households would be fighting for parking spaces, and could lead to a bigger problem than we have now. Council and planners have allowed the builders to leave very little space for cars with garages being too small to fit modern cars. The council and planners have also allowed those with with garages barns, to either put garage doors on, or turn integrated garages into living accommodation thus reducing their parking capacity. This has backfired on the council and now we are paying for this. I am proud to say that the kings hill location is very pleasant and we pay a lot of money for it to stay that way, but to put yellow lines everyone and push cars to squeeze together in smaller back roads is ludicrous and I would like to know who decided on this and their thoughts on where all the cars will go. I am sure that the builders of future developments and estate agents would not be happy if this goes ahead as it would cause a lot of people to think twice about moving here. Normally when restrictions like this are put into place there have been reported issues or accidents, I am not aware of any in the 16 years that I have lived here. It would be interesting to know -

1. How is this going be policed
2. who pays of the policing
3. who pays for the introduction of yellow lines
4. what are the proposals for where all the cars are going to go, (they won't just disappear)

The one - way proposals I feel are a good idea and long overdue.

I trust that common sense prevails can Kings Hill can remain the family orientated location that was intended without neighbours and friends scrambling for parking spaces potentially causing public nuisances.

TMBC 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.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 218

I object to the proposals

The proposals will just force all the cars that are currently parked on those roads up the side roads and obstruct them/ making it impossible for emergency vehicles to come out. The proposals go way too far and block out safe parking areas on the bigger roads, rather than just target the areas where bad parking is actually hazardous. Further, currently the parked cars act as a speed reducing measure. Lastly the proposals offer to alternative parking facilities.

The plans should be amended to focus only on the areas they are actually needed. People in Kings Hill have the cars they have and need places to park them. By covering the whole of Kings Hill in unnecessary yellow lines you will just force the problem elsewhere and onto other quiet roads which will then, in turn, become dangerous.

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 219

I object to the proposals

There needs to be more consideration to planning applications by builders with not enough provision currently provided. These yellow lines will push cars into the smaller side roads causing increased accidents and making access to pathways for disabled and pushchair's impossible. The introduction of additional parking bays along roads by cutting into grass verges would assist rather than yellow lines.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 220

I object to the proposals

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

I cannot understand why this has even been discussed, it will only move cars onto more dangerous areas. This has not been thought through and it appears that no one from the council has actually been on kings Hill to see what mayhem this will cause. It is a complete waste of time and our money, there are many more issues on kings hill that this money could be used for, ie drain covers, car parks, public nuisances. Who is going to police this and who is going to pay for it, as the current restricted areas are not policed now! . I can see a lot claims for injury and damages coming. I do think the consideration of one - way in the centre of kings hill is a good idea and one that we have thought should have been done a long time ago

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 221

I object to the proposals

I cannot see how any intelligent person sees that this will work. Side streets will be parking nightmares and the safety of residents and other car users will be compromised. The smaller roads will have the issue of more cars parking, causing issues for emergency services, rubbish collectors, food and retail deliveries. roads will become blocked and dangerous for pedestrians. I cannot believe that this has even been discussed with our looking for other solutions ie more capacity for car parks, not allowing garages to be turned into accommodation, car barns being allowed to have garage doors put on.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 222

I object to the proposals

Insufficient parking across kings hill to support the number of residents, the measures seem disproportionate to the action required.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 223

I object to the proposals

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

I object to this as putting yellow lines down will just push the already parked cars into the side streets that will NOT be able to take the load! We're does the council think these parked cars will park once the yellow lines get enforced.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 224

I support the proposals

The junction of Discovery Drive and Holly Way gets very congested at times of school drop off and pick-up. Lately an Ice Cream Van has been parking in the bus stop area.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 225

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 226

I object to the proposals

If you decide to put double yellow lines along our road. This means a road that's always busy for parking anyway will be come busier and likely mean more people parking up curbs or having to park further away from their properties.

Also it may cause issue for delivery drivers/bin collectors to get down our road if you restrict parking.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 227

I object to the proposals

There is no clear benefit for the proposed yellow lines near Clearheart Lane.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 228

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 229

I object to the proposals

As a resident of Kings Hill for several years I cannot see a reason to put yellow lines anywhere in Kings Hill especially near our house. In the time I have lived here I have never experienced a problem driving any stretch of discovery drive. The knock on effect is that if those cars cannot park there, they will park in the side roads which are already full of cars and more pavements and trickier junctions will be parked on which causes problems for disabled people, pushchairs and emergency services. Also the parked cars act as a traffic calming for drivers who want to use Kings Hill as a race track. This will make the area less safe for our children and everyone on the whole. The other areas of Kings Hill have managed so far without yellow lines and allows for households with more cars than parking spaces to park without daily parking wars. Less parking will devalue our houses and put people off buying in the area as they don't want a problem parking their car.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 230

I object to the proposals

There needs to be provisions for alternatives before changing the rules and punishing your residents when they can't park near their homes. All the way along Discovery Drive could be widened in areas to provide additional parking.

Any new build applications must have adequate and realistic parking provisions or be rejected. I believe there will be significant push back towards our local council & councillors on this issue.

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 231

I support the proposals

I both agree and disagree the yellow lines.

Obviously they are needed on Discovery by the school. Also on corners and near roundabouts and bus routes.

Only problem is, where will people park that don't use or haven't got a car parking space.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 232

I object to the proposals

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

- Where will friends and family park when visiting Kings Hill.
- We have a beautiful cricket pitch which often has opponent games and there will be no where (as the car park on Tiffen Way is tiny) for players and observers to park

- The parked cars near the schools keeps cars moving slowly in the mornings and afternoons if there are no parked cars, moving cars can drive up to 30mph and I genuinely feel this is when an accident could happen
- We are surrounded by local villages with limited school places meaning many students attending the three schools aren't able to walk to school and drive up to 20 minutes - how will parents be able to get their children to school on time if there isn't sufficient road to park close to the school (the drop off zone can't be used by younger children who need to be chaperoned to the gate)
- We have beautiful bricked roads and the yellow lines will be an eye sore

Whilst I think the parking on Kings Hill can be a little chaotic at times on the whole this does not impact life enough to warrant yellow lines being introduced. Please reconsider these proposals.

I strongly object

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 233

I object to the proposals

I believe the introduction of these double yellow lines will push vehicles needing to park into the residential side roads such as McArthur drive where there is already parking issues.

This will degrade the lives of local residents and reduce house values with cars blocking residential streets and driveways as they already do.

This will also cause a risk to emergency services vehicles and the public if fire engines need to access the smaller residential road, this would be prevented by diverting the parked vehicles into the side roads.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 234

I object to the proposals

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

By implementing double yellow lines you will only move the problem into the surrounding residential roads. McArthur Drive already faces problems with parking and there have been numerous occasions where both residential and EMERGENCY vehicles have been unable to gain direct access to their property due to driveways being partially blocked or poor parking causing obstruction.

By adding double yellow lines, the cars that currently park on Discovery Drive will just park elsewhere causing larger problems for residents and as noted above, in the tragic event of a house fire, additional cars parked in the road would completely block a fire engine gaining access to properties which is a potential threat to life.

Double yellows are NOT a practical solution to the problem on Discovery Drive.

Perhaps consideration of parking permits for the residential roads between certain hours or single yellows operated in daylight hours would be a far better solution.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 235

I object to the proposals

Pushing parking onto side roads, just moving the problem elsewhere

Nowhere for visitors or workmen to park

Yellow lines should be kept to roundabouts only where there is a clear violation of Highway Code

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 236

I object to the proposals

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

Persons currently parking in Discovery Drive will only park in the adjoining roads (Of which one is ours) and reduce the parking opportunities in our road. Please enforce against people not parking in their garage/carport/designated parking spaces as per the covenant.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 237

I object to the proposals

As a local business owner who's business is 96% based on Kings Hill this has the potential to have a significant impact.

I have invested in electric vehicles for workers to use to help support a positive impact on the local environment.

Introducing these would have a significant impact on our ability to service the residents of Kings Hill. We would not be able to park close enough to the majority of our customer properties. Inevitably this will lead to an increase in costs, which will need to be passed on. Which is not fair on local residents or us as a local business. Please accept this as our objection to the proposals.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 238

I object to the proposals

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

The introduction of yellow lines would be detrimental to the entire development for many reasons.

1)safety - the lack of vehicles parked along the roads in question would provide a "perfect" race track for those that feel the need to use it as one, especially at night. Inevitably this will result in death/serious injury. If this was to occur those they approve the scheme would be partly liable.

2)lack of parking, is and always has been a problem on Kings Hill (and any other new build developments). This is down to developer greed and lack of encouragement by local authorities to encourage reasonable capacity for visitors to properties and also growing families.

3)cars are always going to be a necessity, there isn't the suitable infrastructure for people to do away with cars and never will be.

- 4)Kings Hill has often been marketed as an ideal development for families. This would actually not be the case if these are to go ahead. Where do people park?
- 5)garage/car ports, we have a garage with our property, unfortunately it is not big enough to park our car in and actually open the doors to get in and out. We have a smallish car, a VW golf size vehicle.
- 6)property value/marketability - this would have a significant negative impact on house values and their desirability. It would actively discourage people from looking at properties on Kings Hill.
- 7)it isn't a problem, yes there are some tight roads, one way systems would help in some areas. This is a situation that is being created largely by the local authorities as an income generator.
- 8)use existing powers, police and traffic wardens already have powers to enforce any traffic offences - these should be used first. They currently aren't.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 239

I object to the proposals

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

The introduction of yellow lines would be detrimental to the entire development for many reasons.

- 1)safety - the lack of vehicles parked along the roads in question would provide a “perfect” race track for those that feel the need to use it as one, especially at night. Inevitably this will result in death/serious injury. If this was to occur those they approve the scheme would be partly liable.
- 2)lack of parking, is and always has been a problem on Kings Hill (and any other new build developments). This is down to developer greed and lack of encouragement by local authorities to encourage reasonable capacity for visitors to properties and also growing families.
- 3)cars are always going to be a necessity, there isn't the suitable infrastructure for people to do away with cars and never will be.
- 4)Kings Hill has often been marketed as an ideal development for families. This would actually not be the case if these are to go ahead. Where do people park?
- 5)garage/car ports, we have a garage with our property, unfortunately it is not big enough to park our car in and actually open the doors to get in and out. We have a smallish car, a VW golf size vehicle.
- 6)property value/marketability - this would have a significant negative impact on house values and their desirability. It would actively discourage people from looking at properties on Kings Hill.
- 7)it isn't a problem, yes there are some tight roads, one way systems would help in some areas. This is a situation that is being created largely by the local authorities as an income generator.
- 8)use existing powers, police and traffic wardens already have powers to enforce any traffic offences - these should be used first. They currently aren't.
- 9)there is plenty of space along the main roads to introduce some parking lay-by systems.
- 10)fundamentally it is down to the lack of foreword thinking of those that introduce planning policies locally. This “problem” was inevitable.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 240

I object to the proposals

There will be no where for family to park when visiting our young children.

There will be no where for parents to park to safely drop their children to school.

All it will do is moving the cars to residential roads which will cause those roads to get congested.

TMBC 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.

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 241

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 242

I support the proposals

Cars are parked inappropriately, they need to use their garages and spaces.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 243

I object to the proposals

I agree on some roads that parking is dangerous and obstructive to emergency vehicles, drivers and pedestrians (Milton Lane and Hazen Road) but the extensive number of roads proposed for yellow lines is disproportionate to the issues. Some issues are down to inconsiderate people not parking safely and enforcement officers could issue penalty notices for this rather than yellow lines over so many roads where not needed. I don't believe the proposed yellow lines on Discovery drive or McArthur Drive are needed or proportionate to the very few issues that exist.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 244

I object to the proposals

Being a small road that Francis lane is we already have issues with parking, my worry is that yellow lines on discovery drive will make this even worse due to people using the smaller roads for parking!

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 245

I object to the proposals

Parking can currently be extremely difficult for residents within the area. I walk my son to school everyday and the traffic around for the school pick up and drop off is managed well by drivers. There is no danger to pedestrians and apart from having to wait for one way flow traffic there are no issues. The impact of the yellow lines on local residents would far outweigh more space for drivers for school pick up and drop off. The majority of parents walk their children to school or use the cricket pitch car park if driving.

There would be 50+ cars just from the roads around where we live unable to park. Many families with young children forcing them to park and have to walk them further to their front door. This would be at 5-6pm at night when most families are returning home from a long day at work/in childcare.

TMBC 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.

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 246

I object to the proposals

Tmbc have granted planning with in many instances max 2 parking spaces per property. They have since allowed many garage conversions and determined that garages do not count as parking space so many properties now have just one space. Public transport is woefully inadequate to enable people to work and live without a car. Therefore most households will have 2 vehicles and those with grown up children who cannot afford to move out and multi generation households will have more vehicles. Those with work vehicles also have more. To now restrict parking in many areas where it does not cause an issue is pointless and will cause unnecessary congestion by displacing parking elsewhere; as the need for vehicles won't disappear. The scheme is based on Highway Code but kings hill layout has so many closely placed junctions; strict application creates almost continuous yellow line areas which is not required. Adjacent roundabouts and prominent junctions can be considered appropriate but the proposed scheme is unnecessarily excessive and will be a permanent detriment to the area. It is noted that the considerable objections last time were set aside. Some support the most major junctions but not wholesale lining due to it creating more issues than it solves or creating an issue where none currently exists due to displacement. In making the main roads almost completely free of parking will encourage speeding. Areas near the schools will also be horrendous due to displacement because again a number of pupils are not a close distance from the school and there will be no place for such cars to now park in the morning and afternoon drop off and pick ups; the likelihood of totally congested roads and injuries will only increase. The scheme needs substantial rework, although I remain quite unconvinced it will be reviewed or revised given it was previously decided to implement it regardless of the problems it will create.

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 247

I object to the proposals

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

The parking provision on side roads in KH is already inadequate. By putting double yellow lines on the major roads and forcing people to park on the side roads, it will make these roads impassable... it will also lead to the blocking of pavements and unsafe parking near junctions.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 248

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 249

I object to the proposals

This situation calls for intelligent application of the double yellow lines. I 100% agree with issues that are around the shop & doctor area. However the impact of double yellows further into KH would cause significant issues. I have a 5 bed house with 1 parking space, it will also push other residents cars into my road which will cause confrontations, devaluing of property, increase in noise and pollution in general more angst which is avoidable.

This is a great opportunity for you to think of some new solutions, removal of grass verges and replacement with parking spaces, communal parking areas etc

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 250

I object to the proposals

This will cause cars parking on discovery drive to park in our road, causing blockages and arguments. It is unnecessary to put double yellows anywhere other than on fortune way and queen street where the double parking is dangerous

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 251

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 252

I object to the proposals

Please come and look at parking now from residents not living in our road and this is before the proposal to yellow line the main Discovery Drive. It is difficult enough to navigate at times . Where are our visitors going to park? This will create conflict between neighbours and who wants to look at ugly double yellow lines. It simply needs parking wardens with authority to ticket dangerous parking on roundabouts and junctions??

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 253

I support the proposals

Parking too close to roundabouts is awful. Parking on blind corners is just as bad. The road around the discovery school needs double yellows in its entirety before a child is knocked over and killed.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 254

I support the proposals

I have problems parking outside my at various times. I therefore welcome these proposals.

Since this consultation a further part of Tiffen Wayj has been adopted.

Could therefore the double yellow lines be extended further into this road to the new boundary?

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 255

I support the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 256

I object to the proposals

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

Why, just why? Where does TMBC believe residents will park once these restrictions are in place? I support putting double yellows in dangerous places, but not where it causes a local issue with no solution offered.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 257

I object to the proposals

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

Whilst I am often frustrated by residents parking "on" roundabouts, I understand this is usually due to a lack of available parking. Implementing further parking restrictions will be an unmitigated disaster and will end up pushing cars to other areas, potentially dangerous ones. I am shocked this is being considered.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 258

I object to the proposals

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

I agree with some of the placement of some of the yellow lines specifically on roundabouts and junctions where people park irresponsibly but to put them everywhere will just cause problems for residents parking everyday

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 259

I object to the proposals

Just put lines on roundabouts and major junctions

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 260

I support the proposals

Dangerous parking is an issue all road users have to deal with, not just the vocal few who are to be inconvenienced. Parking on pavements is also rife and people need to think less about themselves. Pavement users have a right to be able to walk without having to enter the road to pass a car blocking the pavement.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 261

I object to the proposals

Whilst accepting that some action is required, there needs to be greater consideration of where existing vehicles shall park, and alternative provision must be made accordingly. Such actions might include replacing current grass verges along Alexander Grove and Discovery Drive between Alexander Grove and Fortune Way with marked parking bays, which could be installed in tasteful fashion.

Similarly, the solution to parking along Fortune Way should not simply be displacement of existing vehicles, but conversion to 1-way with marked bays and a toons to prevent parking too close to junctions and crossings. This is best served by kerb design as yellow lines require costly enforcement actions to be truly effective.

In either case it is key not to penalise residents for the council's prior lack of foresight in approving plans that lacked adequate and realistic provision for the size of properties constructed.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 262

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 263

I object to the proposals

Milton Lane & Queen Street should be one-way. Proposed double yellow lines are too much.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 264

I object to the proposals

I am in favour of both Milton Lane & Fortune Way to become one-way, also consideration for this should be given to Queen St. New double yellow lines to prevent parking around roundabout is too severe as is proposed double yellow lines marked in pink. I have delineated proposed end lines. (plan supplied)

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 265

I object to the proposals

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

I have lived here for 20 years and parking has always been a problem, with your proposals this will only add to and not resolve the problems. In addition the traffic management should be looked into further as both Milton Lane and Queen Street should be considered one way traffic which will assist

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 266

I object to the proposals

A decision should not be made on parking restrictions along any of Alexander Grove or the section of Discovery Drive between Alexander grove and fortune way, until full proposals for the potential one way traffic on fortune way and Milton lane have been developed. This is because the traffic flow on all these roads are influenced by each other and will be affected and Alexander grove, discovery drive, fortune way, and Milton lane, need to be analysed together as a single strategy. There is no point implementing parking restrictions on some of these roads until a strategy has been developed for all these roads, as the current proposed restrictions if implemented now may have a negative impact on any future proposal for Milton lane and fortune way.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 267

I object to the proposals

People park on yellows and ignore the one ways already here. What we need are posts where people shouldn't be parking to stop people parking there physically and keep council costs low. This would prevent the need for the council to pay humans to physically monitor the area for parking and will enable our services through with restrictions on corners plus protect the drop curbs which is the accessibility issue.

TMBC Response

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 268

I object to the proposals

Where are the cars going to park? Shame on the council and developers for creating the parking issue in the first place

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 269

I support the proposals

I live on the roundabout of Discovery Drive/Fortune Way, I welcome any changes on these roads because since I have lived here (June 2023) I have seen so many incidents where cars have had near head on collisions, another problem is the School buses trying to overtake parked cars on Discovery Drive, they have to swing out onto oncoming traffic, then swing in left to go pass the calming small/roundabout, then they have more cars parked and again have to swing into the traffic again. At one point I thought the school bus was going to topple over on its side. I am really concerned and worried.

The other concern is the speed some motorists do across the roundabout, not even stopping at the junctions to see if another car is coming, maybe the white lines on the junctions could be clearer. I welcome these changes.

Forgot to say on the small calming roundabout some cars drive on the right side of the calming if there is too many cars parked on the left side.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 270

I support the proposals

I think it is a wonderful idea, so much traffic congestion on these roads.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 271

I object to the proposals

Making Milton Lane one way is a ridiculous idea. Do not do it.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 272

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 273

I object to the proposals

An alternative for residents to park needs to be offered first. I agree with roundabouts and junctions being marked, but a lot of us, who pay extra to live here, will now be considering moving. We have a driveway and garage, and we park both our cars in tandem. When my son passes his test, and begins his life at work/college, where is he supposed to go? We use our spaces but there just isn't space for him too. Why should he be punished? Mark out the dangerous parking areas, keep discovery a clear zone, but don't kill off the side roads. We, the masses need somewhere to go.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 274

I object to the proposals

I have lived here for 15 years. I do not support the idea of the one way system at Milton Lane. For example, when there are the rubbish collections you can get stuck going down the street behind the lorries emptying from every close along the road and there will be no escape from that.

Milton Lane parking is a problem as people park on both sides of the road. If there were parking bays on one side (they may need to have permits) and the other side was kept free that might help the flow.

I understand that Queen street could not form a circular one way route back because it is unadopted in places. Whilst the cars that park on the corner of the Fortune Way roundabout are a nuisance, they have never caused much of an issue and I do not think lathering yellow lines all over the roads is the solution to the inherited problem that we have not been given future proofed parking when this part of the estate was constructed. Car ports particularly are too small for most modern day cars, as are garages. These plans will only push parked cars further into the estate which has been inadequately planned for parking. Residents have already inherited enough issues associated with this bad planning.

Double yellow lines are not in keeping with the aesthetic of the estate which we all pay a lot of additional money and service charges to keep looking nice and upmarket. Also, double yellow lines will no doubt, when implemented, turn into a money making scheme to punitive catch out drivers with fines rather than just improving traffic flow, as it has in most other places.

It is very difficult to retrofit this inherited problem I will admit!

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 275

I support the proposals

Please please please can add Milton Lane to the list! Parking is awful and dangerous as someone who has been living in the area nearly 20 years it has constant nightmare on many occasions to get to Nan from my house!

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 276

I object to the proposals

I support the proposal of Milton Lane being a one way system. The road isn't wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass safely even without parking issues. Fortune Way still needs to be two way to allow for traffic from Discovery Drive to Tower View.

The proposals of double yellow lines - Around the roundabouts and access routes is a good idea pulling out of Fortune Way towards the golf club can be dangerous as you can't see what is coming. Also as this roundabout is off set many people just go straight across.

Alexander Grove, Anisa Close and Fortune Way - double yellow lines - I object. This isn't solving the problem of the parking as it just moves the cars to other places on the estate. There needs to be a solution that everybody can work too. Using Asda carpark on the left as you go in. It's empty most of the time.

Permits could be bought to allow parking. Where do our visitors then park? There isn't any visitor parking in the vicinity. 3 Hour parking around the village is restrictive. This needs more thought and planning.

The parking on Kings Hill is bad and it's obvious the developers didn't have the forethought to think about expanding families and garages that are not fit for purpose. Cars are too big to fit in most peoples garages, we struggle with a mini.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 277

I support the proposals

Milton impassable for emergency vehicles, etc due to parking (especially of commercial vans) and cars parking on pavements limiting wheelchair and pushchair access. Alexander Grove dangerous especially at school times

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 278

I object to the proposals

Having lived in Carlton Close for some 6 years, it has always caused me much concern, as to how inconvenient and more importantly dangerous the parking in Milton Lane is. Likewise for much of the local area.

Owing to the inconsiderate and dangerous parking at the junction of Milton and Carlton, it is often not possible to turn in or out of Carlton.

Parking on the pavement in Milton, (much worse here, than other roads/pavements) makes it impossible for pedestrian's to remain on the pavement.

This frightening scenario is far worse for parents with buggies, wheelchair users, and kiddies on scooter/bikes.

Because of the parking, do we wait for a fire engine/ambulance being unable to reach the emergency, with dire consequences?

It can only be a matter of time, before death or serious injury is caused by this inconsiderate and selfish parking.

I find it difficult to have any sympathy with any parking problems.

There is ample free and safe parking, two minutes walk away.

Home owners were well aware of the parking facilities, offered with their home.

If this is now not sufficient, why should they be allowed to park dangerously?

How much of the parking problems is caused, because garages are not used?

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 279

I support the proposals

I am in favour of the Borough Councils proposal for changes to the on- street parking arrangements for Discovery Drive (east of Alexander Grove) Kings Hill , shown on plan DD586/10/B.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 280

I support the proposals

I am in favour of the Borough Councils proposal for changes to the on- street parking arrangements for Discovery Drive , Fortune Way and Milton Lane , Kings Hill , shown on plan DD586/11/B.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 281

I object to the proposals

Milton Lane is untenable. The proposals will channel further parking into Milton Lane. If adding restrictions to surrounding roads, restrictions must be added to Milton Lane to aid flow of traffic. Even if Milton Lane becomes one-way in the future, it will need parking restrictions on one side of it all the way down and around all access points to stop it becoming entirely blocked by delivery vehicles, refuse trucks, unloading etc, so I don't see that there is a reason not to put restrictions on Milton Lane at the same time as the surrounding roads. Also, you have to explain where the cars forced to park somewhere else will go - garages are clearly not being used for cars, but that is because the house builders were permitted to build narrow garages in an area where residents tend to buy wider vehicles (we have two cheaper smaller

Vauxhalls, but struggle to get out of the car in the parking bay in front of our garage and no hope in the garage). I suggest turning the stretch on the north side of Discovery Drive parallel to Milton Lane into parking, the roads are wide enough to lose some verge there without impeding travel along Discovery Drive (just less slightly for those living on south of Discovery Drive, but better for everyone trying to move around the centre of Kings Hill). Cars forced off Milton Lane and other roads can park there within short walk of homes.

TMBC 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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 282

I object to the proposals

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

One way traffic down Milton lane will lead to it becoming a dangerous rat run and cars will travel dangerously fast close to Kings Hill school.

I believe that there should be a stop sign at queen at junction with fortune way as there are many near misses at that junction AND a priority sign in favour of those travelling from tower view towards discovery drive in the area where there is a blind bend and the road narrows.

I would prefer there to be designated parking bays so people CAN park but only in assigned areas. This could cover fortune way, hazen road, Milton lane and Alexander Grove. Cars NEED somewhere to park so residents should be given permits to asda or KHCC car park so they can still park fairly close to their residences

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 283

I object to the proposals

It is simply not possible to remove parking spaces without giving residents an alternative place to park. Those who are objecting are the select few with driveways for multiple cars, who are paying no regard to the majority in Kings Hill who have 1 space per house hold.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 284

I object to the proposals

Whilst I can see the reason for proposing restrictions on roundabouts and junctions, I feel the proposals are excessive and will cause issues with cars needed to park elsewhere. I can see no sense in restricting parking in Fortune Way opposite the golf course.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 285

I object to the proposals

We are not in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for the following reasons We do not believe there is a need to place the proposed double yellow lines along Discovery Drive, Fortune Way and Milton Lane. We have lived here for 8 years and we have never encountered anything other than an occasional minor bottleneck along the roads in question. The main issue, in our view, is parking further along Milton Lane

which occasionally completely blocks large vehicles from getting through. If the parking restrictions go ahead then the residents and workmen currently parking in the proposed double yellow line areas will have to find somewhere else to park. Any workable proposal should address and provide a solution for this issue. This proposal contains no such suggestions or proposed solutions .

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 286

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 287

I support the proposals

I feel coming out of Milton Court on to Milton Lane needs to be double yellow lines as cars parked directly at the entrance/exit is almost imposible to get out. The yellow lines need to continue past the entrance.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 288

I support the proposals

I would like to see residents only parking on Alexander Grove out of school hours as parking is taken up by large vans of owners who do not live on Alexander Grove

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 289

I object to the proposals

I believe the proposals will be detrimental to Kings Hill. Previously parking was better when residents were able to use the parking areas which are now time limited to 3hrs e.g. by Crispin Way. Now the car parks are empty whilst the streets are full. Surely there are better solutions to the issues, the proposal will merely force people to park in areas outside of the restrictions.

TMBC Response

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.

The management of the supermarket car parks is outside the control of the Borough Council - if the owners have had to introduce parking controls it indicates that there have been issues with non-customer parking.

However, the Management Company employed by Asda have arrangements in place that those wishing to use the car park on a long-term basis can obtain season tickets, so the parking is controlled.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 290

I object to the proposals

Additional Car parking spaces needed

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 291

I support the proposals

Although in favour of Milton Lane one-way system we feel street parking should be better policed to enable "EMERGENCY VEHICLES" access at all times.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 292

I support the proposals

I am in favour of the Borough council proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for discovery drive kings hill

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 293

I object to the proposals

I object to the proposals of double yellow lines being enforced in huge areas around Kings Hill. I totally agree that there is/are parking issues. In the main I would state that these issues have been caused by inadequate parking being provided to the private home owners. You will note for example that in Milton Lane at the Alexander grove end, the huge provision of parking for those in the social housing in the last close before Alexander Grove. However we are in the situation we are in. I live on Laxton Walk, I have a garage, I own 1 car a small SUV Kia sportage. My Car can fit in the garage, but you cannot open the doors and exit the vehicle due to the width of the garage. I have neighbours in Edgar close and Milton Lane, who cannot all access their garages or parking spaces if they all want to park at the same time. the parking is not fit for purpose. I park on the street, as do many others. I always park in a considerate manner. However I accept that others do not. However we should not all be punished for a few individuals. I do agree that some road should be made one way streets to ease congestion and parking issues, this would seem a sensible solution, especially in Queen street, Fortune way and Milton Lane for example. Another thing I am concerned about is that by adding yellow lines and clearing roads that speeds will increase. I have young children, one aged 10 who makes his own way to school. Increased speeds on these roads, I fear will lead to more accidents, injuries and potentially deaths.

I am also concerned about where all the cars will go, they will all still need to park somewhere. Then the parking issues spread and it becomes another roads problem. More additional communal parking is required. Some of the newer developments in kings Hill have much better parking facilities, after mistakes were learnt. But those of us that live in the restricted parking area should not be punished for that. Maybe marked parking on pavements on one side of some roads, allowing full pedestrian access on the other side of the road pavement. Cut outs in some pathways to create new parking bays, again with a view to having the other side of the road clear of obstructions for pedestrians.

Placing yellow lines is not the solution.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 294

I support the proposals

People park dangerously without any consideration for neighbours. We all have assigned parking and we should use that, and only that.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 295

I object to the proposals

Because it will create more problems than it solves. Cars moved on by the number of yellow lines proposed will migrate to other roads causing further issues on already congested roads. A better proposal would be strategic yellow line placement combined with a “Considerate Parking” campaign followed up with sporadic ticketing if needed.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 296

I object to the proposals

I think obviously parking is an issue as planning has allowed too many houses without sufficient road space. Roads can fit one car down in one direction. Queen Street, Fortune Way and Milton should be made one way roads. This would restrict issues with passing traffic .. yellow lines should be placed at junctions but consideration has to be paid to residents and their parking it's not their fault the council allowed plans for small roads and over populated residents accommodation in such a small area

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 297

I object to the proposals

I have NEVER seen any vehicles parked on the Silver Ball Roundabout in the 12 years I have lived on Kings Hill. This is excessive and unnecessary. I strongly object to this proposal as it would be an eye sore and not in keeping with this entrance to Kings Hill.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 298

I object to the proposals

We need parking solutions not parking restrictions that will increase the issues within the community (has anyone thought where all the existing cars will be relocated...? also speeding? ...there are a lot of youngsters and irresponsible drivers that speeding at the moment putting vulnerable people/kids/pets at risk, has anyone thought how an empty road would look for a such a driver...? Restrictions should come as a solution to an existing problem and it's very obvious that in this situation will only increase the problem and not sorting it out...

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 299

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 300

I object to the proposals

Parking on Fortune Way and Queen Street are not an issue. Parts of both roads are restricted to one way in oarts so cause issues, making them one way alleviates the jams, the braks and the shouting matches that ensue!

I can understand yellow lines at junctions and roundabouts, but wider use of yellow lines would be an absolute nightmare.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 301

I support the proposals

We support the parking yellow lines but we are against the one way traffic flow as it will create excessive speed in a built up area.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 302

I object to the proposals

The council should be using powers under the Highway Code to fine people who park within 10 meters of junction

The previous consultation was 6 against and 4 for with additional 2 for so this is not an overwhelming for the lines within residents so unless your going to take residents views why waste money consulting

I have lived here 18 years and parking in Quern Street (with the exception of right on the junction of Fortunes way has not daisies problems

Traffic flows along Queen Street are not what they used to be and perhaps a traffic survey needs to be carried out

Clear road will cause more speeding and we already have bikes racing along QS at 1 in the morning

Yellow lines will make the area look visually horrible and devalue property

We on the Crest Nicholson development Carters Grove have no visitor parking and garages that are too small to get car in and get out of

Yellow lines across cut overs to drive ways is not necessary as I have never had a problem getting out of my drive

The council are just trying to penalise motorists and these cars will not magically disappear. Family's have grown and therefore children are staying at home longer which is going to mean more cars and therefore parking is needed on Kings Hill and rather than keep wasting residents money (third consultation) let people live there lives (especially as most of you don't live on Kings Hill) as use the high way code which is there to be applied to sort the inappropriate parking by the minority.

I am also against the global yellow lines around the rest of Kings Hill it is not needed or wanted

You could work with Liberty around the private part of Queen Street around business and parking which is a danger. You could also work with Liberty to restrict lorry sizes in QS and resident roads to 7.5 ton as the roads are not built for vehicles in excess of this and would cut carbon foot print

TMBC. Need to work with Parish Council and residents of the roads not just cart blanc bring in yellow lines (doubles as well) every where where traffic flow does not require this. Could consider singles if there has to be lines or lines only at main junctions

Work with Liberty Asda and Waitrose to give back the community parking in theses car parks (as specified by Andrew Blevins).

Provide secure parking for commercial vehicles

Provide additional parking spaces (use the councils money better)

Look at residents/visitor parking schemes

Anyone requiring a tradesman is not going to be able to get one if there is double yellow lines everywhere and no where for them to park

No to yellow lines in QS and Kings Hill use Highway Code like other councils do

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 303

I support the proposals

Parking on the bends and at ends of turnings makes driving up and down Fortune Way a dangerous road. Until you navigate round the bend by Waitrose you are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road, hoping that no one is coming towards you at speed (a common occurrence). Parking on the corners of turnings i.e. Richmond Avenue forces vehicles to drive on the pavement one because they are going too fast or just because they refuse to slow down and give way, plus there is no where to turn into. The ramp at the junction of Richmond Avenue/Fortune Way is not fit for purpose and makes driving on the pavement a better option for a lot of drivers.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 304

I support the proposals

Yes please to one-way street. It is unbelievably busy road, non-stop traffic! One-way system will relieve it a lot. One-way please!!

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 305

I object to the proposals

There only needs to be lines in places that it is unsafe to park in. At junctions. Blanket yellow lines is going to seriously effect people's day to day lives in a negative way

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 306

I support the proposals

I feel the residents' views who live on the road should be considered above the wider community.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 307

I support the proposals

I feel the residents' views who live on the road should be considered above the wider community.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 308

I support the proposals

I think a one way will solve all the problems as you will not meet an oncoming vehicle.

I do feel that if a one way through Fortune Way is adopted then there will be no need for the double yellows as viewing is only a problem if you encounter an oncoming vehicle.

There are many apartments in this road and I don't think it would be fair to remove the parking as they will only then block up other roads. I think the parking can remain the same if we can secure the one way system.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 309

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 310

I object to the proposals

Regarding Regent Way <https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/file/1377/dd586-18a-regent-way-tower-view-to-sunrise-way>- I fully support the proposed double yellow around junctions and roundabouts but I think for Regent Way double yellow lines should be consistently on one side of the road not both as current proposal favours one set of residents above others further up the road

TMBC 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.

The Council cannot intervene to require residents to share any unused off-street parking facility.

However, there are a number of online parking services that allow residents to "rent out" private parking places.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 311

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 312

I object to the proposals

I feel the introduction of double yellow lines will be unsightly and will have a detrimental effect on house prices and salability

TMBC Response

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within Kings Hill as the roads are not part of any conservation area.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 313

I object to the proposals

They look ugly. There is nowhere to park as greedy planners/councils squeezed too many houses in with no parking considerations. The population is ageing so more young people with cars with soon be living in Kings Hill.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 314

I object to the proposals

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

There does not appear to be any solution or guidance as to where residents and visitors are supposed to park, once the proposed restrictions are implemented. The restrictions will likely cause residents to park in unaffected streets, leading to the same issues that these restrictions seek to reduce. This will cause friction amongst residents. Consideration must be given to providing additional parking spaces to residents along some of the roads affected, even if this means utilising some of the green/scrubbed areas.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 315

I support the proposals

Please add Hazen Road to the proposal. Currently it is impossible to use the pavements here and once yellow lines are added to the surrounding roads it will just get worse with those displaced cars parking here.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 316

I object to the proposals

There isn't enough parking as it is without putting double yellow lines everywhere, maybe if they built the houses a bit further apart and weren't so interested in just making as much money as possible then it wouldn't be a problem as we would all have at least 2 or 3 parking spaces, I can't imagine there are many people for the double yellow lines, just seems like a money making scheme to me, as if we aren't all struggling as it is, and getting taxed on absolutely everything you want to enforce yellow lines which people then will get ticketed for as there isn't enough parking!!

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 317

I object to the proposals

I object the planned proposals. I have resided in Braeburn Way for 15 years and have never had issues with parking or obstructing footpaths. I don't understand the need for yellow lines in Braeburn Way junction with Melrose Avenue to Winston Avenue. There are far worse parking issues around other areas of Kings Hill. Namely, Queen Street and immediate surrounding roads.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 318

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 319

I object to the proposals

My son goes to The Discovery School. The proposal will make it extremely hard for us to drop him and pick him up from school.

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 320

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 321

I object to the proposals

I agree with the proposed parking restrictions at the kerbside in terms of safety and accessibility however, there needs to be a workable solution to where all these cars are going to park otherwise we are not going to address the issue.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 322

I support the proposals

The roads on Kings Hill are always very congested, with parking often obstructing roads and pavements. Yellow lines are a great idea to help address this.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 323

I support the proposals

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

Parking on Kings Hill continues to be a problem and does need addressing. The main problem is one which is the fault of the Planning Committee. There should be at least two parking spaces for each house on Kings Hill. Development of family homes is very concentrated (just look at the new houses being built around the linear park) and most houses often have only one parking space or garage. Many households with older children have three or four cars and nowhere to park them. I would suggest that any further development on Kings Hill should include a minimum of two parking spaces and that space id allocated for more car parks or garage development.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 324

I support the proposals

Agree with making roads safer

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 325

I object to the proposals

The council has allowed 4 bed homes to be built without adequate parking spaces

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 326

I object to the proposals

The introduction of double yellow lines in areas seems unnecessary. In my opinion, the primary issue at hand is the occurrence of traffic bottlenecks caused by two cars traveling in opposite directions when another car is parked. Instead of resorting to double yellow lines as a solution, it would be more beneficial to conduct a comprehensive traffic study, analyzing both peak and off-peak hours. This study can identify which specific roads are prone to blockages and congestion, thus enabling a more targeted and effective resolution.

Throughout the country, there are numerous roads where parking is allowed on either side, and traffic flows smoothly in a single direction. That is what could be done instead.

Implementing double yellow lines in these areas will essentially force those who park there, particularly at night, to find alternative parking within the development. This restriction could lead to overcrowding in other areas and create a ripple effect throughout the community.

Additionally, it's worth noting that garages in Kings Hill are generally small (suitable for only very small vehicles) and often serve as storage spaces and parking in the driveways is quite rare in the development. Given their limited capacity, residents frequently rely on on-street parking.

Considering it's rural location and few public transport alternatives more households need two cars. The introduction of double yellow lines will further restrict available parking options, compounding the issue.

In summary, rather than resorting to a blanket approach of double yellow lines, a more nuanced and evidence-based solution should be considered. Conducting a thorough traffic study will provide valuable insights into the actual problem areas and allow for a more tailored response implementing one way roads (without the double yellow lines), preventing potential negative consequences for the community, especially in this area know for its limited parking alternatives.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 327

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 328

I support the proposals

I am in favour, with one exception. The exception is Fortune Way - I wish to object to the lines being placed in the area highlightes in blue in the attached drawing. (Plan supplied)

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 329

I object to the proposals

This is a massive over reaction to an issue. Either hire a traffic Walden for KH so that illegal parking on roundabout and junctions can be monitored or just install double yellows on those areas. Where are all the cars go that use these roads to park today??

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 330

I object to the proposals

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

I stay with my GF family while we are one day wanting to move out. I live in Maidstone now one parks like some strange people on kings hill, who seem oblivious and entitled.

I like the idea of safe passing points but seriously ... you are looking to take away and restrict actual residents parking places ?

Where are wardens ? Why can't they slap on tickets ? Stop people from parking in the silly places ?

Don't take away peoples parking rights !

Not supported

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 331

I object to the proposals

Lived in KH for 20 years, believe there will be too many restrictions and not reasonable. Too many lines will be introduced making it totally unfair for home owners. Yes there are dangerous areas where stupid people park and need reminding DONT park here, but on the whole this can be worked around. Possibly the intro of a one way system round Milton, queen st, fortune way would make the area safer and ensure parking is still plentiful without danger from vehicles needing to pass and stupid people who don't have patience and mount kerbs

I support KH would benefit from slight review not to the massively over the top linage ... who thought up these plans ? Surely not a local resident

I would ask you to vote to the locals ... remind them that the minority of selfish people have made it necessary to make a change, but ask this to be a reduced, smaller change Way too dramatic and unnecessary

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 332

I object to the proposals

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

Good morning,

We have lived in KH for approximately 20yr a moving from Stirling Rd to Cleeve Court. I wholly support that there are many 'pinch points' that need to be addressed as there are dangerous adopted parking locations. I sincerely believe that the quantity of lineage / restrictions are hugely over the top. The area that most concerns us fortune way, running from Waitrose to the golf club. Yes, the bend by Waitrose is a blind one, so just introduce a line to ensure the actual corner isn't parked on, helping vision, again ... there is a walkway halfway along fortune way, this would benefit from a line, that just loses one maybe one and a half parking space, then moving to the roundabout ... it's simply the parking ON the roundabout which creates a blind view that would benefit from a line, not the WHOLE area. Where will people park ?

The part of fortune way that heads to the gold club ... I believe this shows Lineage - why is this ? The road is ample width and there is a safe passing/waiting point ? Where are people to park. Most houses are 4 beds or more and therefore multiple people live in these homes. House prices ... life etc is way more harder and expensive meaning youngsters are having to Stay at home for longer - a far cry from when we left home late teens early twenties and snapped up homes for around 30k ... yikes ... if only life was that simple

I plead that there is a review of the quantity of lineage ... I agree and support that roads have become dangerous and there could be an improvement ... but believe there are TOO many lines and this will cause much disruption and distress

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 333

I object to the proposals

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

Don't live here but visit and stay with GF

Why take away parking ? Are you for real ?

Stop dangerous parking and ill educated individuals don't penalise the rest ! Just the minority

Maybe consider one way system

Take way parking for many , what would

That achieve ?

Use green grass areas along discovery drive for parking areas - don't develop more home. Sort parking for residents

Not supported

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 334

I object to the proposals

I'd like to see a reduction in parts of the proposal and would suggest other forms of enforcement are explored and considered and communicated to residents for consideration that could complement a yellow line proposal

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 335

I support the proposals

On exiting Cleeve Court it is increasingly difficult due to the amount of parked cars. They are parked from near the roundabout to the corner of Cleeve Court making it dangerous to leave our homes safely> Vehicles coming up Fortune Way cannot be seen on exiting Cleeve Court.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 336

I object to the proposals

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

Why ? A range of selfish individuals have parked dangerously causing this whole uproar of proposed parking changes ??? Why not just the security men, that everyone is charged for to do a better job, place penalties on cars remind them that parking on roundabouts is dangerous and not compliant with high way code ? This will soon get them

Moving. Kings Hill we're happy to get litter police to do their jobs ... ensuring litter fines were implemented. Way too many lines, seriously ? Has someone got too much time on their hands ? Why block everyone in ? Where can they park ? Are Liberty going to add more parking points along discovery ? Use the green grass areas ? Or are they still looking to use these areas and continue with planning permission to build MORE homes ? More cars ? More parking issues ? There are ample areas to collect and create safe additional parking spaces ... why is the area so greedy ? Why not create a lovely green spacious area ? The whole thing is bonkers.

Do not take all of the road parking away, ridiculous... just review it, making minor charges will make a huge difference and make it safer happier easier place to drive along ... what will be gained by upsetting everyone ... bet the planners don't live locally ... poor poor poor view !!

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 337

I object to the proposals

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

Absolutely NOT ! Who in their right mind would support the stupid amount of restrictions? I ask, did someone simply sit in their office bored ? Thinking how can I get a bonus or impress my boss ? I'll redesign an estate and disrupt hundred probably thousands of residents ?

Agreed there are people who park inconsiderately, but only a small amount. These areas .. cars should be addressed contacted individually and reminded to park in better places ... and not cause problem. Nowhere else I visit shows people who think it's ok to park on blind spots or an actual round about.

Most people I pass are good drivers and share the road ...

Do not penalise the whole of an estate ... just small

Adjustment to would be suffice Absolute waste of time and too much

Review your plans ! Do not support this in its whole

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 338

I object to the proposals

My father who is disabled will have to park further from our home. I don't think he can get a disabled bay marked out. It's not fair and things like this haven't been thought through. Yellow lines are not needed in our area. Another way for the council to make money at residents expense.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 339

I object to the proposals

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

We won't be able to park our car in its usual place where it is in nobodies way. Ridiculous

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 340

I object to the proposals

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

Just silly - not needed and will inconvenience residents who already pay lots to live here.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 341

I support the proposals

Conflicting views on this however I'm more towards supporting the proposals. The number of times I've nearly had head on collisions caused my careless drivers offside parked cars obstructing their own side of the road because they refuse to wait. Although this is caused by impatient drivers, parking contributes.

When the sports park "kicks out" you can sometimes be waiting for minutes for a stream of 50+ cars to exit in order to get home, this is impacted by parking on the main roads.

We live in a close, and due to inconsiderate parking right at the junction, visibility is non existent (parking less than 20m of a junction is already unlawful). This makes emerging from the junction dangerous.

I also disagree with previous views regarding where households will be able to park their second, third, fourth cars. I choose my home based on it having enough parking for my needs, and on the understanding that should I need additional parking that this cannot be guaranteed and may need a short walk to my home.

My concerns with enforcing no parking on main roads will be speed. Parked cars at present create a natural speed calming and I can guarantee that once the cars are removed, people will use the long clear straights to way exceed the speed limit.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 342

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines will be unsightly. They will just push cars on to surrounding roads. Not all roads in Kings Hill have parking problems but they soon will. It might deter people from moving to an area where there clearly is not enough parking in certain areas. Could parking be allowed in Asda car park?

TMBC 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.

The management of the supermarket car parks is outside the control of the Borough Council - if the owners have had to introduce parking controls it indicates that there have been issues with non-customer parking.

However, the Management Company employed by Asda have arrangements in place that those wishing to use the car park on a long-term basis can obtain season tickets, so the parking is controlled.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 343

I object to the proposals

There is already an issue with limited parking available for residents and workers (offices are not given enough parking for the capacity of their buildings).

Introduction of yellow lines will simply put more pressure on areas without lines and so congestion in these non restricted areas will be heightened.

Introduction of permit parking may be more appropriate.

It would also be of greater benefit to create safer crossing places (pedestrian crossings) outside the schools. This would mean that parents can drop their children further away from the schools in the knowledge their children could access school safely using safe crossing areas.

TMBC 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.

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Where roads have not been adopted, there is a higher level of control available to prevent non-resident parking, but this would be for the owners of those areas to consider rather than for the Council, as we have no involvement in private roads.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 344

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 345

I support the proposals

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

I feel that people are parking very inconsiderately, causing hazard and danger at junctions, parking on the roundabouts causing vehicles to have to drive over them because they are so close to the junction preventing vehicles going round them.

Double parking at junctions making it difficult to come out from side roads without having to manoeuvre the car several times.

Stopping or parking, which is preventing Buses, Emergency Vehicles passing.

Causing hazard and gridlock at school times.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 346

I support the proposals

On numerous occasions I have found it difficult to enter Discovery Drive due to what I feel is selfish and dangerous parking. On many occasions I have had close calls because of stupidity in parking and other drivers along several parts of Discovery Drive. I feel the introduction of appropriately placed double yellow lines will improve safety for those that drive as well those that need to access Kings Hill. (Buses, bicycles, delivery vehicles as well as emergency service vehicles)

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 347

I support the proposals

It's becoming dangerous when exiting Victory Drive due to traffic parked especially during school times due to inconsiderate parents who decide to use my garden to the side of the property as a footpath, of which there isn't one as the land is part of the property as per the land registry. A welcome development would be for KCC to adopt the road and implement double yellow lines which will then probably be ignored by the parents who see no objection to trampling over my garden making it an eyesore. I have spent money on plants and bushes all to no avail and cars are continually blocking both the pavement and my parking

space to the rear of the property. I understand that TMBC is unable to assist, I can just wait in the hope that KCC adopt the road.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 348

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 349

I object to the proposals

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

Though I fully understand the need for the proposed double yellow lines, my concern is it won't reduce the number of vehicles in Kings hill parking it just means other roads will get snarled up with people parking where & when they can, causing even more problems if your road doesn't have yellow lines it means people will be parking where they normally wouldn't causing massive arguments and inconvenience to "ALL" residents! It's a ticking time bomb and an alternative solution needs to be found....how about making some of the grass verges "lay-by's" and only allow permit holders to park in them?

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 350

I object to the proposals

This issue has been badly handled by TMBC. There is a view at large that officers and those they report to are arrogant, adopting a we know better than you approach. Some communication about how the parking problem was created in the first place (ie. the ridiculous plot densities and lack of carparking in parts of Kings Hill) would be a starting point for putting things right, followed by the council committing to listen, explain and engage. The proposal for double yellow corners seems eminently sensible. However, it is the wrong approach for a street's length like Fortune Way, where a better scheme would be to have residents only parking on-street 9am to 7pm enforced by a single yellow line, 4 notices and a permit which residents would renew annually for zero cost. It must never become a one-way street. Finally, for the avoidance of doubt, these density problems are firmly in the council's hands. So, reduce plot density and require all homes to have two parking spaces in addition to a garage, and listen to your residents and voters, not Prologis/Uberly.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 351

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 352

I object to the proposals

Already issues with parking

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 353

I support the proposals

Most homes are provided with garages, drives or at least parking spaces. People should use them and not park on the road. A parked vehicle on the road is an obstruction and causes problems for delivery vehicles and for refuse disposal vehicles.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 354

I support the proposals

I think parking on Kings Hill is a mess and we need a solution.

Maybe parking pockets for those who has no parking space or a garage. But something should be done. And for now - YELLOW LINES would be a good solution for a while.

Some families have a 3 bedroom house, two parking lots and 5 cars.

Beacon Ave is a mess too. But I couldn't see a proposal for that road. Hope we will have a double yellow lines there too. Many of those houses have a garage but they park on the road.

Please please please - fix this mess ASAP.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 355

I object to the proposals

This is a significant concern given the challenges we already face with parking in Kings Hill.

There are more and more houses popping up with inadequate parking allocation for the average family. The majority of houses that were built in Phase 2 and now going into Phase 3 only allow parking for 1 car. Where do the council believe people need to park, not to mention any visitors to the area?

Once yellow lines go in, the problem will be pushed into side roads not impacted which will create a major concern for residents of these roads, especially when people will be parking directly outside their properties.

Removing the ability to park in the main roads mentioned, will also allow for an increase in speeding throughout Kings Hill. It will also result in residents becoming aggravated and take out their frustrations on neighbours or people living in close vicinity of one another.

This is another money making opportunity for the local council which is extremely short sighted, and changing the sought after area Kings Hill once was.

Rather make some roads a one way system to promote traffic flow and don't allow so many new houses without properly reviewing their parking design which provides each house at least a space to park for 2 cars like most house have in Phase 1.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 356

I object to the proposals

I am concerned about the effect this will have on the neighbouring unadopted roads as many people have more vehicles than allocated parking spaces per property. In addition, the likelihood of increased vehicle speeds on the roads (should double yellow lines be implemented) is a particular concern as currently the parked vehicles serve to slow the passing traffic. I do see merit in painting double yellow lines at junction corners and roundabouts but not along entire roads as proposed.

TMBC Response

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 357

I object to the proposals

There isn't enough parking on Kings Hill as it is. I can see a point for lines near junctions but not on all of the roads that are suggested.

A better suggestion would be to half some of the green strips on the side of roads like discovery drive, beacon avenue and regent way, to widen the road and allow for parking. What will happen if all these roads get closed for parking is all those cars will have to park in side roads that are already narrow and create complete chaos. We have a house with a garage but if I park my car in my garage I can not open the door to get out. Most of the garages built are not fit for purpose

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 358

I object to the proposals

Parking is already a problem on kings hill with developers and Liberty not taking into consideration that house holds have at least two cars plus as children are staying at home longer. The yellow lines will therefore make people park on our road which is already over run with cars which will undoubtedly cause arguments and fall outs

How about you provide more parking or open the car park at the cricket pitch which is permanently closed and never used

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 359

I object to the proposals

I do not object for personal reasons but am interested to know where parents of children at The Discovery School are supposed to park to drop of/collect their children. There are over 600 pupils, many of which don't live within walking distance to the school. Over half the children in my sons class do not live in Kings

Hill. I imagine that, if this goes ahead, many more parents (of older children) will have to use the drop of zone. This will mean more cars coming into school grounds and traffic on Discovery Drive.

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 360

I object to the proposals

Where's everyone going to park?

Who's going to police the parking, because I can only assume that you're going to have to employ parking wardens?

This will also be an eyesore.

TMBC 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.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 361

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 362

I support the proposals

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

Please add yellow lines to Beacon Avenue

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 363

I support the proposals

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

Whilst I might support yellow lines around key roundabouts and junctions I feel this proposal is excessive and unnecessary. We live in houses that have been built (and are continuing to be built) with inadequate parking for the number of people per household meaning that parking on the road is unavoidable. Most residents do this in a thoughtful and considerate manner, it is just a few that do not. It would be far better to target the few offenders with notices supported by the Highway Code rules than to effectively punish just about everyone that lives on Kings Hill. No account has been taken of where the cars are meant to move to if yellow lines are introduced when there is absolutely no alternative to parking in the road. It will just force cars onto other roads creating more issues and problems where they previously did not exist. Transport links for Kings Hill are poor verging on non-existent so having your own personal transport i.e. cars is essential. I also believe the excessive introduction of yellow lines along the full length of roads will just encourage speeding and increase the potential for accidents. What we need is better parking options for households plus speed control measures to make the roads safer for everyone, not blanket yellow lines across the whole of Kings Hill. Finally what thought has been given to visitors ? We hear daily about the importance of mental health, and good contact with family and friends is an essential part of that. Where are our visitors and friends to park with blanket yellow lines along the roads ? In the majority of areas there are no designated visitor bays at all, and the residents of the small number of areas that do have them will no doubt find that if yellow lines come in to the level indicated that they need the visitor bays for their own cars. Appears to me this is a clear case of " A sledgehammer to crack a nut !!!!!"

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 364

I object to the proposals

The available parking in the surrounding areas is already limited especially at school pick up and drops off so where are all of the parents expected to park when dropping their children up?

TMBC 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.

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 365

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 366

I object to the proposals

Although I agree that the limited implementation of double yellow lines in specific areas around the centre of Kings Hill may be appropriate, I object to the current proposals for double yellow lines on the following points:

It is not a collaboration with Kings Hill Parish Council and Liberty Property Trust.

The main support for double yellow lines seems to be along the lines of “We the undersigned demand double yellow lines in all of Kings Hill, except where we live”.

There are increasing issues with cars driving at excessive speeds on the roads of Kings Hill, reducing the obstacles from parked cars will exacerbate this.

I am not aware of any situation where buses or emergency vehicles have been prevented from proceeding along the main distribution roads; there seems to be a lot of hearsay.

Where are affected cars meant to park? There is already an issue on Milton Avenue and the displaced cars will make this worse.

If you are worried about visibility at junctions, ensure that the roadside planting is first brought into line with safety requirements.

The initial consultation is flawed and should be reviewed, such as number of houses fronting affected streets. Feedback on residents’ comments should not have been so lightly dismissed. Prologis did a much more extensive survey when they were considering double yellow lines in Amber Lane, and that approach should be used as a yard-stick.

Houses (in Phase 2 at least) were sold with the guidance that Liberty did not enforce the parking restrictions in the covenants, and that parking on streets was acceptable. In addition, parking areas have been REMOVED since houses were occupied. In addition, the restrictions on the supermarket parking areas were introduced subsequent to occupation of Phase 2. Thus, comments that residents knew what they were buying are not true.

There are no practicable alternatives to car use, with buses having limited coverage.

The layout and existing cabling of Phase 2 will mean that some residents could be effectively excluded from running electric cars if the proposals are implemented.

Detailed safety issues raised in the consultation have been ignored, with a blanket statement of ignoring objections.

Successful social events, such as at the cricket club, will be seriously affected.

The proposals appear to essentially avoid the areas highlighted in Crashmap where accidents have been reported over the last ten recorded years.

More needs to be done on driver education, for example leafleting badly parked cars, ensuring speeding is reduced, and ensuring that antisocial behaviour by drivers is reduced.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 367

I object to the proposals

Yellow lines will cause so many problems. Phase 2 was built without enough parking, if you give people even less parking the problem will just move to the next closest road.

The answer is to cut out parking bays into the grass verges on all the roads possible. This will solve the problem rather than moving it on.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 368

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 369

I support the proposals

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

Emergency access is currently frequently restricted.

Visibility at junctions is severely compromised.

'Disabled access pavements' is blocked.

Insufficient room for two-way traffic causing vehicles to mount the pavement, sometimes dangerously.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 370

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 371

I support the proposals

There is absolutely terrible parking around Kings Hill with no consideration of the Highway Code, such as parking on roundabouts, and people effectively blocking roads to emergency vehicles. It is remarkable there haven't been more accidents or worse, and it is time action is taken. I hope this proceeds and is then

appropriately enforced as otherwise those that already break the law will no doubt continue to ignore yellow lines, whilst others follow the rules. At the same time TMBC planning need to ensure new houses are built with adequate, appropriate parking facilities for residents and their guests. I would add that some garages of houses we looked at buying in 2012 could not fit a modern car; unless the driver clambered through the boot. Again, that comes back to your team, but some moderation may be required to ensure no detriment to those residents this action might otherwise impact. Equally, if this pushes vehicles away from main to side roads, consideration of those that live in the subsequently affected roads may also be required; perhaps resident parking might then assist.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 372

I support the proposals

Too much dangerous parking in Kings Hill including on roundabouts and dangerous corners. We need more restrictions.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 373

I object to the proposals

I understand that there are parking issues in kings hill but putting double yellow lines will only force the cars to park elsewhere as there just isn't enough parking for people anywhere

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 374

I object to the proposals

By implementing such a large amount of double yellow lines, you will only displace the vehicles to other roads, and less roads at that, meaning they will become hazardous and cramped.

The value of our homes will decrease due to the lack of parking for visitors and guests. Some houses were built with very little parking to facilitate large families and will therefore need the additional road parking.

Rather than yellow lines, I would instead suggest enforcing fines for only dangerously parked vehicles.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 375

I object to the proposals

The proposals are far too wide spread. The cars will be pushed into smaller side roads instead. Kings Hill as a development just does not have enough parking spaces per house for residents & visitors to stop on street parking.

Yellow lines should just be around junctions & roundabouts where cars are causing unsafe driving conditions.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 376

I support the proposals

It is really dangerous how some people park on the main routes, particularly people who park on roundabouts or overhang joining roads. Numerous times I've had children run out, or cars pull out while I'm driving down discovery or along beacon and I've almost hit them because vision is obscured. They can't see me and I can't see them. I drive really slowly now as a result, but most other people do not drive slowly so I feel it's a matter of time before someone gets fatally injured. I know there is an issue with limited parking though so I would suggest parking bays where it is safe to park and double yellows where they should not be parking. Perhaps that would fix the issue by telling people where is safe to park, because people are obviously not able to park safely otherwise.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 377

I support the proposals

There should not be any parking in Discovery Drive behind Rougemont. It is swapping one side to the other. No Improvement. All the house in DD (Discovery Drive) have double garages & large drives & can easily accommodate multiple cars.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 378

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 379

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 380

I object to the proposals

Comments are in relation to Drawing DD/586/15

Objections on the following grounds

Potential displacement of parked cars from Discovery Drive into Rougemont. Additional parked cars will cause impediment to residents of Rougemont, Beachamwell Drive, Clemens Place and Avion Gardens due to the curvature of the road/limited visibility

Potential displacement of parked cars from Discovery Drive into Winston Avenue will cause impediment to residents of Winston Avenue and affect road accessibility

Potential displacement of parked cars from Discovery Drive into Melrose Avenue will cause impediment to residents of Melrose Avenue and affect road accessibility

It is proposed on the side of the road between 95 Discovery Drive and 107 Discovery Drive, a "No waiting at any time" (double yellow lines) is proposed, yet parking is proposed on the opposite 'Rougemont' side. This would increase the need for pedestrians to cross Discovery Drive fully on approaching or leaving parked vehicles

Winston Avenue and Discovery Drive: Double yellow lines would spoil the street scene.

Melrose Avenue and Discovery Drive: Double yellow lines would spoil the street scene.

There is insufficient consideration to the management of 'blue-badge users'. Accepted that that it is possible for those users to park on double yellow lines. This is time restricted.

There is insufficient consideration to account for visitor parking.

There has been insufficient consideration into the the fact that the pandemic has changed working and commuting habits.

There has been insufficient consideration into the cost to implement the proposals.

There has been insufficient information provided into how enforcement will take place.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 381

I support the proposals

Any improvement to the current situation would be brilliant, however will TMBC be monitoring that people are not ignoring the new yellow lines or even worse parking in someone else's road instead

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 382

I support the proposals

Crazy parking on the edge of roundabouts making it impossible to navigate safely

People are driving crazy to avoid sitting waiting for the traffic to pass so are driving faster to get

Through

I support this people are just being lazy park where you have a place round the back of you property

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 383

I support the proposals

Dangerous and inconsiderate parking in Discovery Drive. More people need to clear out garages and park in there.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 384

I support the proposals

The on road parking is horrendous around kings hill with certain roads and pavements blocked by inconsiderate parking a lot of the time. I have even seen emergency vehicles unable to get through roads due to poor parking. Every house on the hill has at least one parking space, or garage, people need to use them instead of using there garage for storage. There are also a lot of people who have multiple vehicles without enough parking spaces.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 385

I object to the proposals

I am in favour of some parking restrictions in areas which create problems both motorists and pedestrians but would only support the proposal IF alternate parking is provided for the cars that will be forced to move from the main roads onto the side roads, creating more problems.

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 386

I object to the proposals

I do not fully object to proposals re. Double yellows at roundabouts etc. but the proposed other yellow lines I do object to as this will just push cars to park in others areas of KH and just move the current issue to other areas. The number of cars currently on KH is not going to suddenly decrease and people will need to find somewhere to park.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 387

I object to the proposals

I live on Lancer Drive and believe if Regent Way has double yellows it will lead to more cars trying to park on all the side roads which are already busy. There is also the likliehood that cars/buses etc will increase their speeds if there are no parked cars and it's a very busy crossing during school times for many children walking too and from Discovery School.

In addition I'd just like to add that the parking issues should be flagged at the building stage. Many families buy on Kings Hill to start a family (or with young children). I did when I first moved here. My children are now 21 and 17 and although we have not outgrown our house, the parking becomes an issue as they both now have cars. This is going to happen in every single family once the children reach driving age.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 388

I object to the proposals

We live on a quiet side street and I've no doubt that placing yellow lines in some areas will force the problem into other roads and areas which will have a negative impact on residents

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 389

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 390

I support the proposals

Would recommend that lines are included at the entrance of Lancer Drive as parked vehicles cause a hazard to anyone entering or leaving the drive.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 391

I object to the proposals

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

No one is getting hurt with cars parked on the estate. Understand yellows opposite junctions etc but not in a road that can support parked cars.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 392

I object to the proposals

There is clearly an issue with parking in Kings Hill, however I don't believe blanket yellow lines is the way forward.

The people who do currently park considerately in their allocated spaces will be the ones affected. It's people parking out the front of their house to stop others doing so when they have perfectly good spaces at the back of their house. People who park dangerously obstructing view pulling out of roads (such as Langley way onto Beacon Avenue).

Perhaps yellow lines around certain junctions & roundabouts but I believe you need to rethink your overall decision on blanket yellow lines.

All this will do is push the problem onto other roads not mentioned, causing conflict & will inevitably reduce house prices. Maybe allowing vehicles to park in Asda again & not restricting time limits might be a start.

Unless someone is actually going to enforce all these yellow lines it won't make a difference anyway.

My suggestion would be yellow lines at junctions/roundabouts if anything to stop dangerous parking.

TMBC Response

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

The management of the supermarket car parks is outside the control of the Borough Council - if the owners have had to introduce parking controls it indicates that there have been issues with non-customer parking.

However, the Management Company employed by Asda have arrangements in place that those wishing to use the car park on a long-term basis can obtain season tickets, so the parking is controlled.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 393

I object to the proposals

This will only displace parking into areas currently without issue. Unsightly. Lines will require policing. Bodies making decisions do not live in this area and will not be effected by it.

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within Kings Hill as the roads are not part of any conservation area.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 394

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 395

I object to the proposals

I am concerned that a number of the proposals, in particular those around Discovery Drive will push people to park in other streets. As a resident of Clarence Way we already face people speeding down the road, there is no raised pavement so pedestrians already have to navigate drivers that do not consider a change in brick to indicate a pavement. To then have more people parking down the road and impacting pavements would be a significant concern.

Parking is already a problem in kings hill and my view is that the council and management companies should be working to find solutions to accommodate vehicles - not push them to smaller roads.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highw

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 396

I object to the proposals

I live on a road that is likely to be affected by displaced cars as a result of the proposed yellow lines. Residents of this already have several cars parking on pavements and in dangerous positions on corners and junctions and this is likely to get worse with the number of locally displaced cars moving into Clarence way which has no parking restrictions and very limited visitor parking.

The road design in Clarence is also mixed use meaning the Road and path are not clearly delineated and as a result many residents are already forced to walk in the middle of the road by inappropriate parking.

Whilst there is clearly a need to find a resolution to poor parking in areas of Kings Hill, the knock on effect to other residents of the proposed yellow lines has not been considered and it feels as the this approach is only transferring the problem to other areas.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 397

I object to the proposals

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

Why is Discovery Drive, Regent Way and Gibson Way on this? There is no need for restrictions for these roads. Removing cars from these roads, will encourage speeding and move the cars to side roads which are already full of other cars and awkward to the pedestrians.

Why there is nothing about both ends of Holly Way? These junctions need restrictions but there's nothing proposed at all.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 398

I support the proposals

Restrictions are desperately needed to improve pedestrian and cyclist welfare

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 399

I object to the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 400

I object to the proposals

This proposal is too little too late and would only cause bigger problems for those who are currently unaffected. The issues stemmed from the lack of allocated parking from day 1 on Kings Hill. Rather than adding yellow lines, give people safe places to park like you should have in the first place. Remove grass verges giving parking for those households you never considered having 2 cars. Your current plan will send cars into the quiet back streets where residents don't want vans and cars in front of their lounge windows. These cars have to go somewhere to fix this issue first and you may well avoid having to put yellow lines anywhere.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 401

I support the proposals

It's currently very difficult to get around the streets of Kingshill with the level of parking on the roads. Sometimes double parking. Buses can't get through and coaches can't get through a lot of the time. So I am completely in favour of the proposals. Thank you

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 402

I object to the proposals

The blanket proposals to apply yellow lines is the wrong approach as there are already too many cars for the properties affected by these proposals and these cars cannot simply disappear by TMBC wishful thinking. I do support using the yellow lines selectively to enforce appropriate parking and stop selfish parking at junctions, corners, pedestrian crossing points, narrow roads and roundabouts. The imposition of the plan will lead to massive issues on unaffected roads which can only lead to TMBC implementing parking restrictions on all roads which will mean the houses are worthless and nobody will want to move onto Kings Hill and developers will drop plans to build here as the properties will not sell.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 403

I object to the proposals

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

It will increase cars looking for spaces in the area and make parking impossible

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 404

I object to the proposals

Parking is limited as it is with new residents moving into the new builds with multiple cars exceeding their garages, residents will have nowhere to park.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 405

I object to the proposals

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

To create the yellow lines throughout the area will cause absolute mayhem for the vast majority of households in the area. Detached homes for example are built with 2 private parking spaces which gives zero allowance for children when they come of driving age and there are only a small number of designated parking areas for residents to use so take away the ability to park on the road and you indirectly &

adversely create a problem which will negatively impact on property values (I run my own estate agency so consider myself qualified to make such a comment).

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 406

I object to the proposals

Putting yellow lines on certain roads will force cars to in other nearby roads and create a problem we don't currently have.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 407

I object to the proposals

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

I have seen little need for parking restrictions while driving, cycling and walking around Kings Hill and these proposed restrictions would force parking into currently quiet areas. I suggest that current traffic obstruction laws are used instead.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 408

I object to the proposals

Safety - increased speeding around the area. Displaced parking in other areas - just moving the problem somewhere else. Other solutions need to be explored

TMBC 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.

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 409

I object to the proposals

If this plan is agreed where will all the displaced parking go? This plan will encourage drivers to park further into Kings Hill in the more residential areas and roads making residents lives a misery, parking over house entry pathways and encroaching on drive ways. We have already experienced this before Covid when there was a shortage of business parking and it migrated to residential roads and forced residents to complain direct to the businesses (Cabot etc). You need to do more research to find out "who" is parking in the affected areas and why? Are there "prime/busy" times for this parking? Why is this such a problem now, I know that Kings Hill has grown considerably over the years, but a lot of these roads and immediate areas haven't, so where is all this excess (inconsiderate) parking coming from? I have lived on Kings Hill for 23 years. Thank You.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 410

I object to the proposals

If these proposals go through the parking will be moved to the side roads. There are a few problem places but don't use a sledge hammer to crack a nut. Stop building new homes with narrow roads.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 411

I support the proposals

Parking on the roads is now not just inconvenient, but dangerous!

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 412

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 413

I support the proposals

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

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

This has been answered on the original response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 414

I support the proposals

It's sometimes very difficult driving down some of the proposed roads because of inconsiderate parking. Also I not good if emergency vehicles need to get access quickly.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 415

I object to the proposals

Excessive yellow lines where there is no need. I agree to yellow lines being placed at junctions, roundabouts and other parking areas that are dangerous, but not to this blanket coverage as it is unnecessary. TMBC should stop allowing developers to make profits over providing residents with required parking spaces for modern day living. The council are prioritising corporate profits over the needs of residents and looking for profit over their duty to local people.shameful.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 416

I support the proposals

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

Too many cars parked on roundabouts and near junctions making it dangerous to drive round Kingshill, I support double lines on the bus routes and the main roads, however feel the smaller residential roads don't need them

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 417

I object to the proposals

TMBC should work with developers to ensure realistic parking options, currently too greedy and following an unrealistic agenda

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 418

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 419

I object to the proposals

I have a child at discovery - but I live 1.5 miles from it and work. Where am I meant to park to pick him up? Also, blanket double lining will not solve the parking issue merry move it to other streets. Maybe try building homes with garages and driveways and building more car parks for people to park in and then residents would parks appropriately

TMBC 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.

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 420

I object to the proposals

Most of these proposals are for areas where there are no issues, in fact parking serves as a restriction to speeding. At most, a pause of a few seconds to allow oncoming traffic is the most that occurs and that is reasonable for a populated area. The areas where there is a genuine problem, such as parking on roundabouts or near junctions, is a contravention of existing laws and highway code. They can be dealt with already without yellow lines, it's just laziness on TMBC's not to.

What will change if there are yellow lines? Will the rules that already exist suddenly start to be enforced just because there are yellow lines or, as suspected, people will return to parking on yellows knowing that nothing will happen, especially in the evenings when most of the roundabout parking occurs and the non-existent traffic wardens would be tucked up in bed anyway.

In short, don't waste money and annoy people in areas where there aren't problems. Enforce the problems based on existing laws that don't need yellow lines.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 421

I object to the proposals

Worried about where existing cars will park if not allowed to on double yellow lines. The cars won't magically disappear. And how will it be enforced- we already have many covenants and other parking restrictions that aren't enforced all around Kings Hill.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 422

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 423

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 424

I object to the proposals

I agree that some roads Milton Avenue for example need the double yellow lines, but it's not really necessary for the other roads.

The council need to work with housing developers to ensure that adequate parking is provided at the start of the houses being built so it doesn't get to this stage. Some large 4/5 houses have 1 parking space, that will never be sufficient and no one parks in their garage as again unless it's a double garage it's not big enough for a car and the council are allowing more and more people to turn their garage or car barn into another room or storage anyway.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 425

I object to the proposals

Without a clear plan for where all these cars will go I must currently object the proposal. The lack of forethought of where these extra vehicles will go will cause chaos and dangerous driving conditions on the unadopted adjacent roads. Thereby just creating the same issue elsewhere. Once a resolution has been arranged with nearby business for out of hours parking etc I would likely be more inclined to support. In conclusion without a reasonable solution to the displacement of all the residents cars I strongly object the proposals.

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 426

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 427

I support the proposals

Parking is terrible on these roads and needs to be addressed

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 428

I support the proposals

I am disabled blue badge holder and I park in Melrose Avenue.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 429

I object to the proposals

There is no need to yellow line the junction of Braeburn and Melrose as this is not used for parking and therefore currently isn't a problem.

Tower View and Melrose junction does get busy however if it were to get yellow lines however valid it will push the current parking further up Melrose and therefore just moving the problem and causing ourselves significant inconvenience as will no doubt find the cars from the flats outside our property permanently. The problem on Melrose is created by the Tower View properties not using their parking spaces or having more cars than spaces. This won't change with yellow lines.

I see little point in installing yellow lines as I can't realistically see it being policed by wardens and therefore making them futile.

TMBC 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.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 430

I object to the proposals

If we have yellow lines all the cars + trucks + large vans that park at the end of road will park outside our house, there is not enough parking as small road and people from around do not live here park in Melrose. Please do not do it. How come large transit vans and trucks can now park in our roads. Large Transit dumped here we had to deal with getting rid of it.

TMBC 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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 431

I object to the proposals

At the moment vehicles only park one side of the road if your proposals are carried out people will park further up our road and even on both sides making it more difficult and dangerous to drive through also nobody parks on the junctions anyway and there's never been an incident also we use our driveway and it would nice for family and visitors to be able to park outside but it's not always available your proposal will make it even difficult

Regards Anthony Pruce

TMBC 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.

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce p

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 432

I object to the proposals

Putting double yellow lines everywhere does not fix any issues, it simply moves the problem. All the cars will just be parked in the roads without these lines, causing even more chaos and issues. It also means residents will be taking up space on roads they don't even live on, making it harder for those who live on those roads to park. All this is doing is pushing the problem away from these roads and making bigger problems for the other smaller roads. There needs to be more car spots for people, more free parking lots,

more driveways when new builds are built. Not only this, kings hill has a specific look that attracts people, from say London. London is covered in yellow lines and the issues have not resolved and all it does it make the community look unappealing. If I had seen yellow lines all over kings hill, I would have not moved here. They are unattractive and do not keep with the look of kings hill. No one wants these yellow lines. That is a fact.

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within Kings Hill as the roads are not part of any conservation area.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 433

I support the proposals

Happy with yellow lines around junctions and roundabouts to make the estate safer for all

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 434

I object to the proposals

There are regularly cars parked on Bovarde Ave and don't cause any problems even in the morning with buses there are rarely issues if anything they slow the traffic which is a good thing with all the school children getting on and off buses. With the new restrictions these cars will be forced to park on the side roads like Alfriston and cause way more issues. KCC should use this money to police the bad parking on junctions rather than punish the whole of kings hill

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 435

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 436

I object to the proposals

This is farcical why would you think of doing this apart from obtaining more money even though we get persecuted by extra payments of council tax because we want to live somewhere nice. Parking is not a problem, it's the people who don't live here and use the location that have no care or sense towards parking restrictions.

TMBC 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.

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Where roads have not been adopted, there is a higher level of control available to prevent non-resident parking, but this would be for the owners of those areas to consider rather than for the Council, as we have no involvement in private roads.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 437

I object to the proposals

Introducing double yellow lines in the specified areas is useless if those areas are not going to be regulated by traffic wardens/police officers.

TMBC Response

Without parking controls in place, the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers cannot carry out parking enforcement. Accordingly our enforcement resources are tasked to patrol the areas of the Borough where parking restrictions already exist.

If the new restrictions are introduced, the Council will then be able to carry out parking enforcement, aimed at encouraging drivers to park correctly.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 438

I object to the proposals

Stop building houses with no parking spaces is how you stop the awful parking. Not yellow lines, it's disgusting! All it will do is move the problem where there is no yellow lines.

TMBC 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.

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often prov

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 439

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 440

I support the proposals

I have some queries in relation to the decision to apply yellow lines to Fortune Way to the golf club. The roads on some plans such as Regent Way and Tiffen Way are showing as not adopted by KCC however they are adopted roads and the date of adoption was March 2021 for Tiffen Way and December 2020 for Regent Way. Why are these section of road plus Beacon Avenue not being included in this consultation to make the parking consistent throughout the development?

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 441

I object to the proposals

I feel better parking alternatives need to be put in place to support residents - not at an additional cost to anyone! The car parks at supermarkets should not have time penalties on so residents have alternative places to park their cars in busy areas.

Instead of selling land to developers like Bellway - make spaces for car parks. Also LOTS of street bay parking as well as enough room for 3 cars per household. The provision at the moment is woeful but yet the councils only response is to charge people more money and penalise them despite the council being VERY short sighted when allowing developers to build without thinking how many people need cars to get about - even more so now bus routes are getting cut and less accessible.

This should not be an opportunity for councils or developers to take from residents in a cost of living crisis. More children are having to stay living at home for longer and longer thereby more cars per household are occurring as a result. Developers should be footing the bill for any parking additions, and looking at better solutions rather than cramming in as many properties without looking and providing decent and proper parking provisions... by the way car ports are not the answer here either, but spacious plots with ample parking and ample street parking bays and ample car parks - FREE for KH residents to use! Stop trying to bleed residents dry financially! It's disgusting

TMBC 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.

The management of the supermarket car parks is outside the control of the Borough Council - if the owners have had to introduce parking controls it indicates that there have been issues with non-customer parking.

However, the Management Company employed by Asda have arrangements in place that those wishing to use the car park on a long-term basis can obtain season tickets, so the parking is controlled.

The introduction of parking restrictions does not make the Council money. Enforcement action involves the issuing of penalty charges, which assist in covering the costs of the provision of the Parking Service, and the maintenance of the parking road marki

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 442

I object to the proposals

The proposal offers huge new restrictions on parking in Kings Hill. The description of proposal provided in non user friendly manner. The map would do much better than a list of over 100 positions with meter based coordinates. I can not imagine amount of time required for resident of King's Hill to put it all on the map and see the real impact. In addition I do not see any offering of additional parking spaces for residents and guests replacing the restricted parking. As poor level of public transport connectivity making private cars the only option for residents and guests I have to conclude that proposal will bring chaos and harm normal live of residents.

TMBC Response

In 2018 Kings Hill Parish Council carried out a survey of residents across the Kings Hill development. The main concern identified by residents related to uncontrolled parking.

With this in mind the Parish Council asked the Borough Council to introduce parking controls to better manage parking and to maintain access.

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.

The Borough Council is not involved in the provision of public transport - this is a function for Kent County Council.

However, the proposals should maintain and improve accessibility for buses through the Kings Hill development.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 443

I object to the proposals

When placing double yellow lines where do we expect the cars to go?

I fully appreciate that dangerous parking needs to be addressed but there are no proposals to increase parking in any areas so where will cars park as the number of them will not reduce.

My fear is that with reducing the amount of space for people to park along the roads then people will park in side streets as alternatives. Winston Avenue where I live being an example. Parking will be pushed into areas behind houses etc.

Could resident permits be considered with house holds only having 2 permits or removing wide pavements along residential streets to create actual parking spaces along the roads.

I do agree with the one way proposal.

TMBC Response

The introduction of a new one-way street would be for Kent County Council to consider, as they are the Highway Authority and are responsible for these matters.

Kent County Council are already investigating the provision of new one way restrictions and until this is resolved, it is not possible to determine the correct parking arrangements for the road.

The Council's proposal is to prevent parking where it cannot be allowed, not to deter parking by non-residents.

There is no specific priority for residents of a road (that is public highway) to have have preferential parking as all are entitled to use th

Where roads have not been adopted, there is a higher level of control available to prevent non-resident parking, but this would be for the owners of those areas to consider rather than for the Council, as we have no involvement in private roads.

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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 444

I support the proposals

I live in the corner house at the junction of Winston Avenue and Tower View and can understand the need for double yellow lines to prevent people from parking too close to the junction. The remaining proposals will have little effect on me.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 445

I support the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 446

I object to the proposals

It does not solve the problem, you are just restricting parking and pushing people to park elsewhere , I.e moving the problem instead of solving it

TMBC Response

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 447

I object to the proposals

No comments supplied.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your response

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 448

I support the proposals

Whilst beautifully designed, green and people centric... kings hill is abused by car drivers parking everywhere causing hazards and delays on the road... enforcement is supported.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 449

I object to the proposals

I look after my grandson who lives at 58 Discovery Drive. While my daughter works. I'm disabled and can not walk far so would be an inconvenience for me if I have to park far away.

TMBC Response

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 450

I object to the proposals

Although I don't live on Kings Hill I am a cleaner and do ironing.. all of my work is there.. I have to carry equipment to carry out my job.. where am I to park for my work purposes if there are restrictions everywhere.

Also you're not solving the issue just pushing cars onto other roads causing more problems!

Greedy developers not providing sufficient spaces.. for example a 4 bedroom house will most likely eventually have 4 cars!!! But some only have parking for 1 or 2! Ridiculous

TMBC Response

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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions does not prevent continuous loading and unloading - this is already allowed.

There are options for contractors that are working at properties - either they can use any off-street facility at the house, or they can apply to TMBC for a waiver that allows them to park nearby.

Disabled drivers also have exemptions from yellow line parking restrictions under the terms of the blue badge scheme.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 451

I object to the proposals

My children go to Discovery school, we have to drive from our home. I do not park on the school road as it's too busy for me and I prefer to park further away and chat to the children as we walk in however spaces are already limited and will only worsen with this proposal.

Thanks,

Chloe

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 452

I object to the proposals

The parking changes will make dropping off and collecting my son even more difficult. At school times unless you get to school for 8:10am we struggle to park. If the restrictions come in along discovery drive near discovery school it will be impossible to park.

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 453

I object to the proposals

Parking for the discovery school is hard enough to find without adding in more restrictions. This kind of restriction will just add to the problems around the area and put more pressure on the school who often have to Marshall parking in the drop off zone as it is

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 454

I object to the proposals

Where will people park when collecting children from Discovery school? Surely you can't put yellow lines until you have an alternative solution?

TMBC Response

Parking around schools has always been contentious, and ideally there would be encouragement from the schools to car share or walk, though this does not always fit with modern lifestyles

The aim is to maintain a safe environment outside schools, with deterrent parking restrictions so that drivers can see pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.

There is still likely to be some demand for parent parking, but the further this is away from the school the more dilute the issue becomes.

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.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 455

I support the proposals

I am in agreement with the proposals apart from double yellow lines on the corner of Richmond avenue. This area is useful for when there are visitors as it allows for more parking spaces. I also think speed bumps would be a good addition to a one way system in Fortune Way as drivers do speed.

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 456

I object to the proposals

We are not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for Regent Way for the reasons set out previously and below. We have reviewed the Online Consultation Responses and note that the vast majority overwhelmingly object to the proposals. It is incredulous that such number and strength of responses appear to have been completely disregarded. It is also frustrating that some sensible suggestions and compromises have been put forward but have also been ignored. Most concerning is the fact that one of the principal concerns has not been addressed. Where are cars going to park? Your letter states that the intention is to tackle parking problems. The proposals will simply make the situation far worse and displace vehicles to other residential roads. There is already inadequate parking on Kings Hill with insufficient provision for modern sized vehicles and growing families. The proposals make absolutely no alternative provision for either existing vehicles which will have nowhere to park or additional vehicles as families naturally grow. Surely it would be far more prudent to spend our money putting in place measures to help alleviate any parking issues rather than adopt a blanket approach which will only make matters far worse. If the current proposals are adopted, this will undoubtedly have an impact on the desirability of Kings Hill and consequently, the house prices. We urge to please reconsider the current proposals.

TMBC 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.

The introduction of yellow line parking restrictions on the public highway is prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations & Directions 2016, and where in a defined conservation area, narrower lines can be used.

However, this would not be applicable within

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 457

I support the proposals

Dear tmbc the placing of yellow lines where they are shown are needed and I'm glad you will finally be able to do them - re Fortune Way it's à excellent idea to make it one way that road is a nightmare and I'm very grateful I don't live on it - additional problems occur when driving down Winston Ave towards Tower View at the mini junction in the middle people often park too close to it and you really struggle to get through there and if a fire engine or Ambulance ie something bigger than a normal size car needed to get through they would have to take the car parked there with them in à emergency situation so yellow lines should t there on either side - I hope this all works out as I love our estate and it's a great place to live especially when you have come from far less salubrious areas I don't think some people realise how lucky they are to be living on Kings Hill

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 458

I support the proposals

We are in favour of the councils proposals for on street parking for Bovarde Avenue & Alfriston Grove, Kings Hill, shown on plan DD/586/17/B

TMBC Response

Thank you for your comments

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 459

I object to the proposals

I am a resident of regent way and do not agree with the yellow lines The road is wide and can have parking bays the whole length of the road with no one's space being affected There are about 25 cars that park in regent way due to the greed of the builders not supplying enough spaces to park The 25 car that park in regent way will just move to the side roads causing an emergency services problem also the people that park in those road will be forced to park in other roads This is going to come back and bite the brainless so call experts in the arse Let's hope they are named and shamed

TMBC Response

The developments on Kings Hill have had to follow the national Planning guidance that was applicable at the time - some phases of Kings Hill have generous levels of parking provision, with garages and driveways, and others have limited parking, often provided using "car barns" and parking remote from properties.

We cannot unwind the Planning decisions of previous years, and moving forward, the newer developments have a more appropriate level of parking provision, but the lack of convenient parking is not a valid reason to allow problem parking on the public Highway.

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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 460

I object to the proposals

The introduction of these measures will have few positive impacts on the affected roads. It will simply act to push the problem of parking onto other roads - Kendall Avenue, Pearl Way, Ruby Walk and Sunrise Way. The issue with the current parking on Regent Way is that it can lead to blocked access to those roads that feed onto it. In particular Ruby Walk and Pearl Way. The suggestion to leave a parking bay opposite Ruby Walk will not solve the problem - it will simply make the problem worse with cars only allowed to park opposite the junction. The solutions proposed seem arbitrary and the installation of yellow lines seems unnecessary on the whole. However, given the number of objections raised to the previous consultation, we are not optimistic that any weight will be given to this fresh round. The sighting of the current proposed parking areas will lead to issues for cars coming on to and from the roundabout at the top of Regent Way where cars coming from Tower View, at speed, will meet cars coming around the cars parked at the top of Regent Way. The same problem will also exist at the round about at the junction with Sunrise Way and the second proposed car parking area. It seems to us that the better and more effective option would be to create parking bays within the grass verges. This would lead to more, not less parking, and less impact on accessibility for vehicles using the road during the day. We object to the current proposals.

TMBC Response

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.

The Borough Council cannot get involved in the conversion of verges to create new parking facilities - this would be a function for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

It also has to be considered that converting verges to parking does not gain many parking places as the same road length is used. However it can increase traffic movements by moving any parking in to any new lay-by facility, though this is often prohibiti

Speed management is one of the functions of Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority.

Kings Hill Parking Review – Consultation response reference 461

I object to the proposals

I do not blindly object to the use of yellow lines. However, the length of the propped yellow lines on the corner of Winston Ave and Tower View is disproportionate. People normally do not park on this corner. There is an obvious continuation of the pathway to the kerb. What is being proposed extends the restriction way beyond this point [effectively using a sledgehammer to crack a nut] and will exacerbate the parking issues - forcing drivers to park dangerously elsewhere. By all means have yellow lines - but may I suggest they stop after the obvious path/ramp point? That will allow access as well as clear line of sight for drivers turning in & out of Winston Avenue?

TMBC 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.