

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 1
Town	Addington
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	Mill House Lane
File Ref	OSP-06
Requested by	Addington Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/1/A

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction and near accesses.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking around the junction causes traffic conflict, and residents of Park Road have reported problems with parking near accesses.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 35 properties, though 1 letter was returned as undeliverable, and we received responses from 12 properties. We also received 1 response from a member of the public who was not resident in the immediate area.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	8	2	1	11
Non-residents	1	0	0	1
All responses	9	2	1	12

**Analysis**

The responses are broadly in favour, agreeing that there is a problem, but there is discussion on whether the proposed restrictions extend too far, or do not go far enough.

The proposals have been designed to not only restrict parking where it occurs at the moment but to prevent displacement parking in to areas where it may not already occur, but may cause problems.

Though some have asked that the restrictions be extended further southwards, this is probably unnecessary at this time.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 2
Town	Aylesford
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Rochester Road (o/s No.29)
File Ref	OSP-07
Requested by	Local resident & Cllr Balcombe
Plan reference:	DD/577/2

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of access.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking around the access to No.29 causes problems for the residents.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 31 properties and we received responses from 6 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	1	1	6

**Analysis**

The objection to the proposal was against the loss of parking facility in Rochester Road, where parking is already limited.

However, parking at this location prevents a resident from using their off-street facility or from gaining access to the public highway. The “loss” of one space is not valid as the area in front of the access is not a place where parking should occur, and the proposed yellow line extension would maintain access, potentially allowing more vehicles to be parked off the road.

**Recommendation**

in light of the rights of access to the Highway, there is no option but to recommend that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 3
Town	Aylesford
Ward	Aylesford South
Road / Area	Hall Road and The Avenue
File Ref	OSP-07
Requested by	Cllr Smith
Plan reference:	DD/577/3

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junctions.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking around the junctions and parking associated with nearby sporting events.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 25 properties (though one letter was returned as undeliverable) and we received responses from 6 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	3	2	6

**Analysis**

Some of the responses against the proposals tended to suggest that there was an issue with parking for the rugby club, but that the residents would not like to see the loss of on-street parking facility. There was also suggestion that the rugby club ought to take responsibility for their own parking problems and provide more parking in their grounds.

There is also comment that the proposed double yellow lines should not be introduced outside the residential properties on the west side of the road near the rugby club.

One respondent also commented that it would be more appropriate to spend the money by re-surfacing Sedley Close. (This is outside of the remit of the Borough Council and would be an issue for KCC as the Highway Authority to consider)

**Recommendation**

In light of the comments, the proposals could be reduced to remove parking outside the residential properties that front on to the western side of Hall Road, which would retain residential parking, but also restrictions to prevent obstruction around the junctions and under the motorway over-bridge and the entrance to the rugby club. It is recommended that the reduced proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 4
Town	Aylesford
Ward	Aylesford South
Road / Area	The Hawthorns and The Avenue
File Ref	OSP-07
Requested by	Cllr Smith
Plan reference:	DD/577/4

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking around the junction causes traffic conflict.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 18 properties and we received responses from 10 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	6	4	0	10

**Analysis**

Whilst there was support for the proposals, there were also comments against, some suggesting that the proposed restrictions opposite The Hawthorns were not necessary. Also a resident commented that the proposals should not extend outside their house, to the south of the junction.

However, there were also comments from residents asking that the restrictions be extended further, to cover the bend to the south of the junction, and also for new restrictions around the junction of The Avenue and Greenacres, where there is parking near the dentists. (these issues were subject to proposals for restrictions in a previous phase of the local parking plan, but received significant levels of objections – with this in mind we are not proposing to take restrictions further southwards).

There were also comments to extend the restrictions further in to The Hawthorns and also northwards along The Avenue towards the shops, but given the prior history of objections to parking restrictions and the calls to reduce the proposals, we are not looking to extend restrictions further than the minimum necessary to address obstructive parking issues around the junction.

**Recommendation**

The proposals can be reduced on The Avenue in line with the comments, and it is recommended that the reduced proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 5
Town	Aylesford (Blue Bell Hill)
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Maidstone Road (adjustment to parking bays for new access)
File Ref	OSP-09
Requested by	Developer
Plan reference:	DD/577/5

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays and double yellow lines.

**Issue**

New property accesses require the adjustment of existing parking bays

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 4 properties, but received no responses.

**Recommendation**

As there were no responses, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 6
Town	Aylesford (Blue Bell Hill)
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Old Chatham Road (access to industrial estate)
File Ref	OSP-09
Requested by	Local landowner (Mr Sandford)
Plan reference:	DD/577/6

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junctions.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking is preventing access to the commercial premises on the industrial estate and also blocks emergency access / egress at the rear of the filling station.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 4 properties, but received no responses.

**Recommendation**

As there were no responses, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 7
Town	Aylesford (Blue Bell Hill)
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Robin Hood Lane - request from Cllr Sullivan to consider RPP local to 308
File Ref	OSP-09
Requested by	Cllr Sullivan
Plan reference:	DD/577/7

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays to allow all-day permit parking.

**Issue**

Local residents have asked for the facility to park all day on the road, using parking permits.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 19 properties and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	5	2	1	8

**Analysis**

The two comments against the proposals were both that their current arrangements work well, from residents that seem to have sufficient off-street car parking.

There were two comments that the parking bays ought to be altered to improve access to driveways opposite, and one that the existing white access protection lines should be upgraded to double yellow lines

There is also an outstanding request to change the existing single yellow line (in front of the green) to become double yellow lines.

As there is obviously a demand for on-street parking by residents it is not recommended to reduce the on-street bays, as access to properties opposite is possible.

**Recommendation**

The proposals to introduce permit parking arrangements should be taken forward to formal consultation, and the proposals should be widened to include new double yellow lines to replace the single yellow line in front of the green, and to replace the access protection lines.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 8
Town	Aylesford (Walderslade)
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Tunbury Avenue (parent parking and obstruction issues)
File Ref	OSP-09
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/8

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent bus route obstruction.

**Issue**

Local residents have reported problems with obstructive parking on Tunbury Avenue associated with school traffic that affects the bus route.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 30 properties (though one was returned as undeliverable) and we received responses from 6 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	0	2	6

**Analysis**

A number of the responses were in favour of the proposals, but suggesting that the restrictions be taken in to the side roads as well. However, this is outside of the scope of the original request.

There were also calls for traffic calming on Tunbury Avenue, though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation as drawn.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 9
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	A227 Western Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Cllr Taylor
Plan reference:	DD/577/9

**Summary**

Update of restrictions to prevent obstruction and new disabled bay.

**Issue**

There has been a request for a new disabled bay near the shops and the update of restrictions to prevent obstruction and ease traffic flow.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 91 properties, though 2 letters were returned as undeliverable, and we received responses from 11 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	8	2	1	11

**Analysis**

Two residents objected, but gave no grounds for their objection – though they were associated with two linked properties that have off-street parking via a rear access.

There was also requests for a one-way system, a box junction (at the entrance to the car park) and traffic calming to be introduced to Western Road, though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 10
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Fairfield Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/10

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction and new permit parking bays.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking is causing problems.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 43 properties, and we received responses from 7 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	6	1		7

**Analysis**

The objection to the proposals was concerned that non-resident parking could displace to the private car park of Roman Court.

However, the car park of Roman Court is outside our control, and should displacement parking occur, it would be for the managing agents of that area to address.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 11
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Fairfield Road 2
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/11

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction and making existing disabled parking bays enforceable.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking is causing problems, and residents would like the existing advisory disabled bays made enforceable.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 29 properties, and we received responses from 15 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	10	3	2	15

**Analysis**

The comments against the proposals were mainly concerned with the alterations to the disabled parking bays. It seems that the disabled bays were provided for residents that are now deceased, and that the bays are no longer required and could be removed, rather than made enforceable.

There were also calls for the proposed restrictions at the crossroads to be extended further northwards to cover neighbouring vehicle accesses.

**Recommendation**

The disabled parking bays be deleted from the proposal, and the proposal further altered to extend the double yellow lines northwards to cover the nearby driveways, and be taken forward to formal consultation

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 12
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Griggs Way
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Cllr Taylor
Plan reference:	DD/577/12

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junctions.

**Issue**

There have been reports of obstructive parking around the junctions.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 16 properties, and we received responses from 3 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	1	1	3

**Analysis**

The objection raised the concern that the proposal could move any parking in to the neighbouring cul-de-sac.

**Recommendation**

As there was a low level of response, and the one objection even confirmed that there are parking issues in the area, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 13
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	High Street
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/13

**Summary**

Re-arrangement of existing disabled parking and bus stop to prevent obstruction.

**Issue**

There have been reports of problems exiting nearby properties, and buses have had problems accessing the bus stop, hence a re-arrangement of existing parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 62 properties, though 2 letters were returned as undeliverable, and we received responses from 11 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	2	0	5

**Analysis**

Of the two objections, one gave no grounds, and the other was a request for traffic calming on the High Street, and that all parking in the High Street be for buses, disabled drivers and residents only.

The request for traffic calming on the High Street is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

That the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 14
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Quarry Hill Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/14

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of access.

**Issue**

Update of parking restrictions to allow the Borough Council to enforce against obstructive parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 26 properties, and we received responses from 2 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	0	0	2

**Analysis**

One of the comments in favour of the proposals also asked about the provision of a weight restriction on Quarry Hill Road, and seemed to be under the impression that there had been a commitment to introducing one, linked with the adoption of the nearby Haul Road.

However, both the adoption of Haul Road and the introduction of a weight restriction to Quarry Hill Road are outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

That the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 15
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Quarry Hill Road, Rock Road and Sevenoaks Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/15

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of access.

**Issue**

Update of parking restrictions to to allow the Borough Council to enforce against obstructive parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 100 properties, and we received responses from 15 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	9	4	2	15

**Analysis**

The comments against the proposals mainly related to properties on Sevenoaks Road, who raised concerns about the inability to load and unload or have deliveries.

However, the proposed “no waiting at any time” restriction allows loading and unloading to take place.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 16
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Station Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/16

**Summary**

Update of restrictions to prevent obstruction and new disabled bay.

**Issue**

Residents at the top of Station Road have asked for new permit parking and limited waiting bays near to the Wrotham Road junction, and there is an existing disabled bay that is now redundant that could be removed.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 75 properties, (though one was returned as undeliverable) and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	5	2	1	8

**Analysis**

One of the objections was against the proposed double yellow lines in front of No's 87-89, even though this area is currently marked with an access protection marking, and the objector was not resident in those properties.

The other objection was from No.87, where there was concern that deliveries would not be able to take place on the double yellow lines.

However, the proposed double yellow lines would maintain the facility to load and unload.

There was a request for an additional short length of double yellow lines in front of the pedestrian gates to two properties to ease access.

The proposals are aimed at covering all the kerb-space in the road with restriction – this then allows the Council more options in how the restrictions are signed, as a zone-type restriction could be used.

There was also a request for a traffic mirror at the exit from Station Road on to the A25 to assist right-turning traffic, but this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.



There was also a request for a new kerb buildout either side of the access to No's 31-57a as this would prevent obstruction, but this again is outside the remit of the Borough.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should be altered to reflect the request for additional lines outside No's 11 & 13 to maintain their access, and should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 – 17
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	The Close
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/17

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent obstruction of accesses and residents permit parking.

**Issue**

Problems with non-resident parking causing an obstruction.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 8 properties, and we received responses from 5 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	3	0	5

**Analysis**

The objections to the proposals raised a number of points – that residents would be charged for permits, and that there ought to be a single yellow line for short daytime duration to deter commuters.

The restrictions have been designed to allow as much resident parking as possible and to be able to park all-day, whilst deterring non-residents. A single yellow line for a short duration would prevent all (including residents and their visitors) from parking for the times of operation.

Permit parking is in place in other roads in Borough Green, with a charge to residents and we would not look at introducing a precedent for different treatment to residents of The Close. Permit parking arrangements allow visitors to park by use of visitor's vouchers that act as one-day permits.

**Recommendation**

Given the objections to the proposals it is recommended that the proposals are abandoned.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 19
Town	East Malling
Ward	East Malling
Road / Area	Twisden Road (disabled bay)
File Ref	OSP-14
Requested by	Parish Council and local businesses
Plan reference:	DD/577/19

**Summary**

New disabled parking bay.

**Issue**

There has been a request for a disabled parking bay near the shops to improving disabled access to local facilities.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 20 properties, and we received responses from 3 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	0	0	3

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 20
Town	East Peckham
Ward	Hadlow & East Peckham
Road / Area	Chidley Cross Road, Pound Lane and Church Lane
File Ref	OSP-15
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/20

**Summary**

New double yellow lines and bus stop markings to prevent school access problems.

**Issue**

There have been reports of parent parking problems at school times that cause obstruction near the school, on the bend and at the junctions.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 15 properties, and we received responses from 9 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	8	1	0	9

**Analysis**

The one objection related to the loss of parking facility directly outside a resident's property, even though the proposals did not include restrictions at that location – probably associated with displacement parking preventing the resident from parking there, even though there is no established right to park on the highway, and no expectation of parking directly outside a property.

**Recommendation**

As the proposals are intended to improve safety and visibility at the junctions and around the school, and there is a strong level of support, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 21
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	Lunsford Lane (south of Leybourne Way)
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/21

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking near the bus stops.

**Issue**

A local resident has asked for restrictions to prevent parking by coach commuters near to the bus stops.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 19 properties, (though one was returned as undeliverable), and we received responses from 15 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	6	9	0	15

**Recommendation**

There was a significant level of responses against the proposal, and though there was some support, it is recommended that the proposals be abandoned.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 22
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Briar Close - DYL in turning area at northern end
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Councillor Oakley
Plan reference:	DD/577/22

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to protect turning area for large vehicles.

**Issue**

There have been reports that large vehicles are unable to turn at the end of the road due to parked cars and have to reverse out towards Laburnum Drive.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 18 properties, and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	5	3	0	8

**Analysis**

Some of the comments raised concerns about parking displacement leading to increased parking pressure in the unrestricted areas, and that parking in Briar Close is sometimes occupied by residents from New Hythe Lane.

There was also a call for the road to become residents parking only, though all of the properties have their own off-street parking, most for more than one vehicle.

**Recommendation**

Given the concerns about movements of large vehicles and the lack of turning, along with the availability of off-street parking, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 23
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Kingfisher Road and Heron Road
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/23

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have requested restrictions around the junctions along Kingfisher Road to prevent parking around the junctions.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 13 properties, and we received responses from 5 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	2	0	5

**Analysis**

Both of the objections related to the lack of parking for those residential properties with no off-street facility, and the management of the “social” housing parking stock by Russet Homes, however there is no automatic right to have a parking place, and the lack of parking facility should not be reason for parking against the advice of the Highway Code.

**Recommendation**

Given the safety concerns raised by the Parish Council, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 24
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Kingfisher Road, Swallow Road and Woodpecker Road
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Parish Council, local residents and Councillor Oakley
Plan reference:	DD/577/24

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junctions.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have requested restrictions around the junctions along Kingfisher Road to prevent parking around the junctions, and local residents have asked for restrictions in Woodpecker Road to ease traffic movements around the junction.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 19 properties, and we received responses from 7 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	3	0	7

**Analysis**

One of the objections related to the lack of parking facilities and increasing car ownership and parking pressures in the area. Another commented that additional yellow lines will lead to more people parking in the unrestricted areas and causing an obstruction.

There were also comments about parking on the footways on the approach to Lunsford Lane, and a request for restrictions at the mini-roundabout

There was also a call to change the grass verges along Kingfisher Road in to parking spaces (lay-bys), but this is outside of the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider. There was also a request for a 20mph speed limit in the area, but again, this would be an issue for KCC.

**Recommendation**

Given the safety concerns raised by the Parish Council, the proposals should be extended to Lunsford Lane and proceed to formal consultation.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 25
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Lunsford Lane (verge)
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	County Councillor Dean
Plan reference:	DD/577/25

**Summary**

New verge and footway parking restriction.

**Issue**

There have been reported problems of damage to the KCC grass verge, and KCC would like to prevent parking on the verge and footway.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 88 properties, and we received responses from 25 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	18	4	3	25

**Analysis**

Residents have raised concerns that any restriction could lead to more parking pressures on-street.

There was also suggestion from some residents that the verge parking was not a regular occurrence and that the parking was “overspill”.

There was also a request from residents that part of the verge could be converted to parking places to relieve parking pressure on the road, but this is outside of the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

There was also a call that KCC should make the price of dropped kerb cheaper, which would help reduce the problem, but again this is not an issue for the Borough.

**Recommendation**

Given that this was an issue raised by the Highway Authority, who have the responsibility for maintaining the verge, the proposal should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 26
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Martin Square
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/26

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have requested restrictions around the junction of Kingfisher Road and Martin Square to prevent parking around the junction.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 14 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	0	0	4

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 27
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Willow Road and Lunsford Lane
File Ref	OSP-20
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/27

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have requested restrictions around the junction of Lunsford Lane and Willow Road.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 5 properties, and we received responses from 3 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	0	0	3

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 28
Town	Leybourne
Ward	West Malling & Leybourne
Road / Area	Baywell
File Ref	OSP-21
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/28

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction and bend.

**Issue**

There has been a request via the Parish Council for restrictions on Baywell to prevent parking on the bend and junction around Highberry.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 20 properties, though 1 letter was returned as undeliverable, and we received responses from 16 properties. We also received 1 response from a member of the public who was not resident in the immediate area.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	10	5	1	16
Non-residents	1	0	0	1
All responses	11	5	1	17

**Analysis**

There was a strong response to the consultation, with a majority in favour of the proposals, though there were some who objected.

The objections related to concerns about increased vehicle speeds and the lack supporting accident record, but mainly represented those that live on Baywell.

Though there is not the accident record to support restrictions, the on-street situation has changed since the estate was developed, with increasing car ownership leading to more vehicle movements.

There were also comments that the proposal for yellow lines would be excessive in a semi-rural area.

Those in support were mainly resident in Highberry, giving strength to the reports that parking on the bends causes problems for those emerging from the junction.

There were also calls for similar restrictions to be considered at the Redbank junction further along Highberry.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 29
Town	Mereworth
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	Butcher's Lane (Herne Pound)
File Ref	OSP-22
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/29

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

Residents have asked for restrictions to prevent parking on the junction by Holly Cottage

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 18 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	2	0	4

**Analysis**

The objections commented on the lack of available parking, and also that any parking restrictions would lead to the urbanisation of the area.

There were also calls for Beech Road's speed limit to be reduced to 20mph, and Butchers Lane's speed limit reduce to 10mph, however this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

Whilst residents' concerns about lack of parking and the urbanisation of the area have to be considered, there is no right to park on the public highway, and it should be prevented where it causes a hazard.

With this in mind it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 30
Town	Platt
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	A25 Maidstone Road and Grange Road
File Ref	OSP-24
Requested by	Cllr Murray
Plan reference:	DD/577/30

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

There have been reports of obstructive parking around the junction.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 11 properties, (though 1 was returned as undeliverable) and we received responses from 6 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	1	1	6

**Analysis**

The objection was from residents of Whatcote Cottages on the other side of Maidstone Road, objecting to the reduction of parking.

Residents of Grange Road commented, asking that the restrictions on the east side of the road be extended further south to allow better access to properties and visibility.

**Recommendation**

The proposals are extended and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 31
Town	Platt
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Grange Road and Long Mill Lane
File Ref	OSP-24
Requested by	Local resident and Cllr Murray
Plan reference:	DD/577/31

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

Residents have reported problems with parking close to the narrow section of road, where pedestrians are forced in to the vegetation.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 25 properties, and we received responses from 12 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	11	0	12

**Analysis**

Whilst there may be merit to the request, the overwhelming objections to the proposals give a clear indication.

**Recommendation**

The proposals are abandoned.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 32
Town	Platt
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Wrotham Heath
File Ref	OSP-24
Requested by	Cllr Murray
Plan reference:	DD/577/32

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around island at junction.

**Issue**

Parking on the large island between carriageways affects visibility for traffic at the junction.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 16 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	2	1	4

**Analysis**

The objections relate to the lack of convenient alternative parking.

However, this has to be considered against the forward visibility for vehicles on the westbound A25 slip road of vehicles from the traffic lights, which can be compromised by parking on the island, not only by resident but by vehicles bearing advertising hoardings for local businesses and cars offered for sale.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 33
Town	Ryarsh
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	A20 London Road South side
File Ref	OSP-26
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/33

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around top of footpath.

**Issue**

Parking near to the footpath causes visibility issues.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 20 properties, and we received responses from 9 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	7	2	0	9

**Analysis**

The objections related to residents of two properties who did not consider there to be a problem, and that yellow lines were unnecessary, however this has to be considered against the seven properties that recognized an issue and were in favour.

There were also comments about inappropriate speeding on the A20, and a request for the speed limit to be lowered. However this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 34
Town	Snodland
Ward	Snodland East & Ham Hill
Road / Area	Cantium Place
File Ref	OSP-28
Requested by	Local resident and care home
Plan reference:	DD/577/34

**Summary**

Adjustments and new double yellow lines around accesses.

**Issue**

Residents have asked that the current parking restrictions be adjusted, and The Mortimer Society have asked for additional restrictions opposite their vehicle access.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 59 properties, and we received responses from 12 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	8	3	1	12

**Analysis**

Two of the objections were commenting on the private parking arrangements introduced by the developers of Cantium Place, in relation to the design standards that were applicable to the development (and the perceived shortfall of residents parking), rather than with specific comments about the proposed on-street changes.

Another objection related to the extent of the proposed and existing double yellow lines which they thought excessive, though the existing and proposed restrictions are to national standards to maintain access, when considering the turning movements of vehicles and the road width.

Others commented that the parking issues were due to some residents having significantly more vehicles than the number of private allocated spaces to their properties. A further issue that was raised was of commuters starting to use Cantium Place as parking for the upgraded high-speed rail link to London.

One resident asked that the existing restrictions be slightly extended to help maintain access to their off-street parking.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should be changed to protect the resident's access, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 35
Town	Snodland
Ward	Snodland East & Ham Hill
Road / Area	High Street and May Street, Disabled bay (o/s No.14) and junctions
File Ref	OSP-28
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/35

**Summary**

Making an existing disabled parking bay enforceable and new double yellow lines around junctions.

**Issue**

Residents have asked that the disabled bay on May Street be made enforceable, and there are problems in the area with vehicles parking on junctions and close to the level crossing.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 86 properties, and we received responses from 18 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	6	11	1	18

**Analysis**

There was a strong response against the proposals, mainly relating to the loss of parking and the potential increased parking pressures in High Street and May Street.

However, there were comments in favour as well, about improving access to Mill Lane, and also about preventing parking on the bend towards Rocfort Road – there was also a request to extend restrictions towards the Rocfort Road junction from the Town Council.

There were a number of requests from residents of May Street for the planters in the off-street parking area to be removed, but this area is private and is outside of the remit of the Borough Council.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should be reduced, omitting the proposal for restrictions around the Bay Street . Brook Road junction (if this is still a concern then it would be for KCC as the Highway Authority to consider) altered.

The proposed changes to disabled parking bays are still justified, as the discussion about parking pressures in the area highlights the parking difficulties and this can be more relevant to people with mobility issues.

There was also a request from Cllr Lettington to extend restrictions towards the Rocfort Road junction should be included, though increase restriction in the area, it is in a place where parking would cause obstruction to large vehicles and impede traffic movements.

It is recommended that the proposals be altered, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 36
Town	Snodland
Ward	Snodland West & Holborough Lakes
Road / Area	Birling Road (between Roberts Road and Recreation Avenue)
File Ref	OSP-28
Requested by	Local residents, Cllr Balfour and Cllr Moloney
Plan reference:	DD/577/36

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junctions and bend on bus route.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking on the junctions and bends of the bus route between Roberts Road and Recreation Avenue.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 47 properties, and we received responses from 20 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	13	7	0	20

**Analysis**

The main comments against the proposal relate to those properties with no or limited off-street parking. Some residents comment that they park in the area, but they don't think that this would cause a problem.

One objection was from a resident that doesn't drive.

One objection was that if the buses find the road difficult to negotiate due to parking, then the bus should use a different route, and that the existing wide pavements should be removed or reduced to provide more parking. (Both these points are outside the remit of the Borough Council – the bus routing is an issue for the bus companies and alterations to the footway would be for Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority, to consider).

One resident (at the end of a proposed restriction) asked that the restrictions not pass in front of their access to allow them to park in front of their own access.

There was also a request to extend the restrictions to cover No's 98 & 100, but given the parking pressures in the area we would like to maintain as much on-street parking as possible in areas where it does not affect traffic movements.

**Recommendation**

The restrictions should be reduced slightly and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 37
Town	Snodland
Ward	Snodland West & Holborough Lakes
Road / Area	Charles Close
File Ref	OSP-28
Requested by	Local resident (Mr Rogers)
Plan reference:	DD/577/37

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of access.

**Issue**

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 10 properties, and we received responses from 3 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	0	0	3

**Analysis**

Some of the responses asked for further restrictions, but the proposals are the minimum necessary to maintain access, whilst retaining the most on-street parking.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 38
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Cage Green
Road / Area	Howard Drive and Norwich Avenue
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Kelly Webb - Community Safety
Plan reference:	DD/577/38

**Summary**

New double yellow lines on junctions, corners and narrowings.

**Issue**

There have been reports of problems with pavement parking and obstruction of accesses, junctions and the narrowing.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 92 properties, and we received responses from 18 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	11	5	2	18

**Analysis**

One of the responses against the proposals was concerned with the extent of the restrictions , though if residents used their off-street parking places rather than the road, the situation would be much better.

Another commented that parking in the area was already “a nightmare” and residents should be left to get on with it themselves.

Another commented that there was simply not enough parking for the number of properties (though the development seems to exceed the minimum design standards).

There was also a suggestion that there should be a permit scheme for the “private residents” only, and only for cars. However, this is not possible on the public highway as it is for all to use.

There was also comment that the proposals should not be taken southwards down Norwich Avenue, but the restrictions are necessary to deter obstructive displacement and to maintain visibility to the traffic calming chicane.

One resident was in support of the proposals but suggested that the restrictions should be taken further, particularly as another property was to be built in the area.

There was also a request for a disabled parking bay to be introduced for a disabled resident.

**Recommendation**

The request for a disabled parking bay would need to be considered separately as there is an established process and qualifying criteria for a disabled parking bay. The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 39
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Cage Green
Road / Area	Salisbury Close and Salisbury Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/39

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

Residents have reported obstructive parking around the junction causes traffic conflict.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 14 properties, and we received responses from 7 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	5	0	7

**Analysis**

One of the responses suggested that parking restrictions around the junction were not what was required, and that it would be more appropriate to change the road humps (speed cushions) in the area to sleeping policemen (road humps).

Others commented that any restrictions would displace parking further along Salisbury Road and in to Salisbury Close.

**Recommendation**

Given the objections, it is recommended that the proposals are abandoned. Should there still be safety concerns, it would be for Kent County Council to consider.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 40
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Ashburnham Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Cllr Branson
Plan reference:	DD/577/40

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to protect turning area.

**Issue**

There are problems turning at the end of the road and residents have problems with parking in front of and opposite accesses.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 31 properties, and we received responses from 21 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	17	1	21

**Recommendation**

Given the high level of response against the proposal, it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned. If the access and turning issues remain a concern then it would be for Kent County Council to consider.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 41
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Chiltern Way & Cheviot Close
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/41

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays, new double yellow lines around junctions and bends.

**Issue**

There have been reports of obstructive parking at junctions and bends.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 14 properties, and we received responses from 10 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	5	1	10

**Analysis**

Some objectors commented that the proposals were not necessary and would affect visitors, and that the advice in the Highway Code was sufficient to control parking.

Residents also suggested that a permit parking scheme be introduced.

Another comment suggested that the proposed restrictions on Yardley Park Road should be extended further eastwards.

**Recommendation**

Given the objections to the proposals, most of which do not recognise a problem, it is recommended that the proposals be abandoned. If an issue remains then it would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 42
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	The Haydens, Haydens Mews & Yardley Park Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/42

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around accesses, junctions and bends.

**Issue**

There have been reports of obstructive parking in front of and opposite accesses and on the bends and junctions, and residents have requested changes to parking bays to accommodate new accesses.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 94 properties, and we received responses from 59 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	34	21	4	59

**Analysis**

Some responses asked that the restrictions be taken much further, to prevent parking on the roads, whilst others suggested that the gaps should be covered by daytime single yellow lines to prevent parking by non-residents.

However, other comments suggested that there was no issue, the parking that occurs does not cause a problem and should be tolerated.

Another commented that any yellow lines in the area would spoil the appearance.

One suggested that the proposals to the south of Elm Lane should be “residents only”

Other comments suggested that the proposed restrictions on Yardley Park Road should be extended further eastwards.

There were also concerns that should the proposals be introduced, any parking would displace to the other parts of The Haydens, and that the area should become a “residents only” parking area.

Another comment requested a 10mph speed limit throughout The Haydens – though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority, to consider.

**Recommendation 1**

There is no consensus to residents' comments relating to The Haydens and Haydens Mews– some wish for restrictions, others do not. Some want the proposals as drawn (designed to maintain access and protect bends and junctions) and others want a restrictions to cover all parts of the road, whilst others wish to maintain the status-quo.

It is recommended that those proposals be withdrawn at this time, for further consideration and discussion with the local members and the residents association, and possible inclusion in a later Phase of the Local Parking Plan.

**Recommendation 2**

The proposals for changes to Yardley Park Road should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 43
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Welland Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/43

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around accesses, junctions and brow of hill.

**Issue**

There have been reports that parking on the brow of the hill and on both sides at the same time causes traffic problems.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 30 properties, and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	5	3	0	8

**Analysis**

Two of the objections suggested that the parking on Welland Road was useful to cope with vehicles from Shipbourne Road.

However, this is not prevented by the proposals, only constrained to areas where it does not cause a problem.

Another commented that the proposals would displace parking further down Welland Road.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 44
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Higham
Road / Area	Hunt Road (disabled bay alterations)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/44

**Summary**

Removal of a disabled bay.

**Issue**

Removal of redundant disabled bay.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 12 properties, and we received responses from 3 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	1	1	3

**Recommendation**

As the proposal is to free-up parking and remove a redundant restriction, it is recommended that the change proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 45
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Higham
Road / Area	Martin Hardie Way
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident and Cllr Edmonston-Lowe
Plan reference:	DD/577/45

**Summary**

Updating single yellow lines to double yellow lines and new time restrictions at shopping parade.

**Issue**

Residents have reported that parking on the single yellow lines causes obstruction and time limits on parking would assist parking turn-over for the local shops.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 49 properties, and we received responses from 10 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	7	1	2	10

**Analysis**

One comment (from a local hairdresser) was that the proposed 2 hour restriction would not be long enough for customers having perms, etc.

There were also concerns about lack of enforcement of the existing restrictions and that any new restrictions would need to be effectively patrolled.

Two residents commented that shoppers were already using the car park and that there ought to be a "residents only" restriction. The car park is private, and so would be outside of the Borough's control.

One resident asked that the restrictions be extended further westwards, but this is beyond the scope of this proposal.

The comments relating to the hairdresser are of concern, and there is always a conflict between those businesses that operate on a short turn-around and those whose customers stay longer. However, the proposals do not exclude all long-stay parking from the area as most of the neighbouring roads are unrestricted and could be used by those needing to stay longer.

**Recommendation**

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 46
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Area D permit re-zoning and changes to Pay & Display parking
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/46

**Summary**

Subdivision of permit area D, extension of enforcement times and relocation of Pay & Display bays.

**Issue**

Local residents have reported increasing parking pressures at the eastern end of the current Area D.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 590 properties, and we received responses from 92 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	50	32	10	92

**Breakdown of comments received****Relating to business permits**

Issue	Popularity
Business permits to be able to use Zone 1, Avebury Avenue mainly and less residential roads	1
Business permits to be restricted to D3 along the north side of Barden Rd between Avebury Avenue and Barden Park Rd	1
Business permit holders should only be able to park in the Zone that the business is in	2
Before business permits are issued consider how many off road spaces are available	1
Reduce number of business permits issued, replace with car park permits	2
Lifestyle Ford should not have so many permits or be able to park customer cars in the road and in D1	3
Business permits should not be issued at all	2

**Relating to Pay & Display parking**

Issue	Popularity
In favour of removal of P&D in front of shops	2
In favour of removal of all P&D machines in Zone D so that residents only can park there	1
In favour of removal of P&D Holford St/Danvers Rd	2

P&D in Avebury Avenue to be removed as well	1
P&D Avebury Avenue should be 50p per 30 mins no return for 2 hours	1
P&D bays to also be north side of Barden Rd between Avebury Avenue and Barden Park Rd	1
P&D could also include D2 permit holders	1
P&D spaces in Avebury Avenue to be available to all zones	1
P&D outside the shops should not change	1
Not in favour of P&D machines outside shops	1
P&D bays to have a maximum stay time, long enough for shoppers but not long enough for commuters	1

### Relating to changing parking arrangements, zone coding and permits

Issue	Popularity
Holford St and Danvers Rd should have extended restriction times as per the rest of D1	1
Not in favour to extension of permit times	8
Restriction times should be 9-11am and 5-7pm	1
Restriction times should be 8am to 8pm	1
Do not agree with extra bays west side of 96-106 access to Avebury Avenue	2
Non-residents should only be able to park in zones D2 & D3	1
Permits should cost more for each subsequent permit	1
There should be an upper limit on how many permits can be purchased for a property	1
Permits should cost more for large vehicles e.g. vans that take up more than one space	2
D1 should have increased restriction times of 8am-6pm, the same as Holford St/Danvers Rd	3
Proposed time restrictions are OK except Holford St and Danvers Rd which should remain as is	1
D2 and D3 not to have time restrictions extended	1
Extending the hours is a good thing	1
D3 permit holders should not be able to park in both D2 and D3	1
DYLs need to be extended from 50 Barden Park Rd down to 38	1
DYL's to be reduced to 32 feet and not 39 feet	3
Permits should just be for 1 zone	1
D3 should also include north side of Barden Rd between Avebury Av and Barden Park Rd and Barden Park Rd and Nelson Av	1
D1 should be able to park in D3 as well	1
D1 should be able to park in all 3 areas	2
D1 should be able to park in D2	1
D1 should not be able to park in D3	1
D2 should be able to park in S2 and D3	1
D2 to also be able to park in D3	1
D3 should only be able to park in D3	1
D2 should be able to park in D3 along north side of Barden Rd	1
Boat owners in Jarvis Bay could have permits for D2 to allow them to park on both sides of Barden Rd as well	1

If D1 can park in D2, then D2 should be able to park in D1	2
Combine D2 and D3 into one area	1
Signs could be colour coded as could permits	1
Permits to be residents only	3
Not in favour of breaking Zone D into 3	4
In favour of Zone D being split into 3	1
Enterprise House residents must not be able to park in permit areas	2
Barden Rd between Avebury Avenue and Barden Park Rd could have also be for Permit Holders overnight parking and commercial type vehicles	1
Barden Rd between Avebury Ave and Barden Park Rd and along to the allotments should be either a separate area or in D3	1
Holford St, Danvers Rd and Barden Rd from the junction with Avebury Avenue and High St should be 24 hours residents only parking	1
A free annual visitor permit to be issued for every household, limited to a total of time e.g. 300 hrs. Ability for resident to activate and deactivate online or by text which counts down the time and is synched with the CEO handhelds	1
Residents pay for an annual visitor pass up front, visitors staying just 25 mins pay a minimum charge or full days charge	1
Cromer Street to be marked out in bays for a six month trial period	7
Extend the one way system from High Street along Barden Rd to Avebury Av junction	1
No right turn from Holford St into Barden Rd	1
Danvers Road to keep P&D or to be resident permit holders only	1
Consider angled parking as in Martin Hardie Way	1
There should be a reduction in fee for resident permit and visitor permit if cannot park in whole of Zone D	8
Nelson Avenue DYL's should only be across dropped kerbs	1
End of Nelson Avenue has large garden, could the council use this for more parking	1
Norfolk Road to have marked bays	1
There should be more enforcement	8

### Analysis

The consultation produced a slightly disappointing response - approximately 16% of properties that were contacted responded.

The responses are wide-ranging, and often comments from one resident are in opposition to others.

The responses to the Zone D consultation also have to be considered along with those that relate to specific proposals in the area, as the issues are inter-linked.

### Business permits (predominantly an issue at the eastern end of the Zone)

A number of the responses are in opposition to each other – that businesses should use Zone 1 (D1), and that businesses should be restricted to Zone D3, and that business permits should not be issued at all.

However we need to pick a balanced path through these comments – excluding business permits altogether could jeopardise the viability of local businesses, though the residents of the area should

not effectively subsidise the operation of commercial premises which then cause residents inconvenience.

The most relevant seems to be to allow business permits to park on the north side of Barden Road between Avebury Avenue and Barden Park Road, though this does constrain options.

### **Pay and Display parking**

There were comments both in favour of P&D parking and against, with support for removing the existing P&D arrangements in Holford Street and Danvers Road. There were suggestions that P&D should be extended, that P&D should be time limited (to prevent all-day parking) and that there should be no P&D at all.

Pay & Display parking has a valid parking management purpose, particularly in areas close to town centres and where there is a will to allow short-stay parking but deter long-stay, and to encourage the turn-over of spaces and provide effective enforcement.

The proposal to change the existing limited waiting bays in Avebury Avenue to short-stay P&D and to create new P&D spaces in River Lawn Road allow more parking opportunities, and attract better enforcement to maintain turn-over, and whilst this may not be to the wishes of all, it should provide the best service.

### **Parking arrangements, zone coding and permits**

There was discussion about changing the times of restrictions, but the times of restrictions has to align with when the Borough has resources available for enforcement. The existing 1hour enforcement windows in the mornings and afternoons are not long enough for the area to be effectively patrolled on foot, meaning that areas often get missed.

There was also discussion about dividing Zone D in to three separate sub-zones – D1, D2 & D3. However, the discussion does not take in to account the distribution of parking across the Zone D area. The eastern end (D1) is over-subscribed with residents permits (more residents have permits than there are spaces), the central area (D2) is finely balanced, with residents having just slightly more permits than on-street spaces, and area D3 is significantly under-subscribed (there are lots more spaces than resident permits)

This is partly due to the proximity of D1 to the town centre, but is mainly a function of the style and age of properties in the roads and the road widths.

The principle of dividing Zone D in to sub-zones allows the residents of the over-subscribed roads to radiate out to roads where there is less parking pressure, but does not allow those from further away to park in the roads where the parking pressures are highest.

There was suggestion that if the permit parking areas that are available are reduced, then there should be a reduction in the permit price to residents. We should not take this forward, as the resident permit price should be the same across the Borough. The changes should make parking within the Zone D area easier, but cannot guarantee a parking place outside the resident's home, or even in the same street, but this was always the case.

The proposals for individual areas are intended to create as many additional parking places as possible (within the appropriate design standards) to alleviate the parking pressures, but this is unlikely to be enough to address the shortfall in D1.

There was also discussion about extending the permit times to 24hr. However, this has to be considered against the basis for the permit scheme – it is not intended to ration parking amongst residents or to deal with issues of over-capacity by residents (if there are too many residents' cars for the roads there is little anyone can do, other than manage the own parking expectations more rationally), a permit parking scheme is intended to address problems of daytime non-resident parking.

There was a suggestion that residents that want additional parking permits should pay more for each additional permit, as this would prevent proliferation. This is something that could be considered, not just for the Zone D area, but across the Borough, but would not be part of this proposal at this time.

There was a request that permits for large vehicles should cost more than those for cars. The issue of permits is already controlled to prevent larger classes of commercial vehicles from getting permits, but unfortunately, vans are normally included in the same category as cars.

D1 also has the highest proportion of business permits issued, which adds to the pressure. This could be addressed by either controlling the issue of business permits more tightly (though this could affect the viability of businesses) or look to control where those business permits allow parking.

As D3 has significant spare capacity, it is recommended that businesses are restricted to either one or two permits for the D1 area, and any additional permits should be for the D3 area, and could be further restricted to defined roads where there is spare capacity.

#### **Planning issues – new developments**

There was discussion about the new housing development on the site of Enterprise House (off Avebury Avenue), and that the new residents of that development should not be allowed to buy residents parking permits.

This is in line with the current practise, where significant new developments are not allowed to join existing permit parking schemes, as the design standards that apply should provide a specified level of private parking. If residents of new developments need additional parking over and above the parking provided by the development itself they would need to make their own arrangements for private parking or consider using the public car parks.

#### **Issues that cannot be taken forward**

It was suggested that we consider introducing angled parking bays, similar to those in Martin Hardie Way. Unfortunately we cannot do this, as it requires greater road widths than available, and would probably reduce parking capacity.

It was suggested that we subdivide parking bays in to individual spaces. Technically this could be done, but as we would have to mark spaces for larger than the average car, we would lose parking capacity. We would also have to issue parking tickets for vehicles that strayed across two spaces, which would probably be a common occurrence, and we don't want to do this.



It was suggested that we could try changes (including sub-dividing spaces) for a trial period of 6 months. This is not practical, as the legal arrangements and the costs of physical works would prevent this from being a viable option.

There was a suggestion that a free annual visitor permit to be issued for every household, limited to a total of time e.g. 300 hrs, along with the ability for resident to activate and de-activate online or by text which counts down the time and is synchronised with the CEO handhelds. However, we already have a viable method of allowing visitors, by use of visitors' vouchers, and our enforcement infrastructure does not allow for this sort of enforcement.

#### **Issues that are not within the control of the Borough**

There were calls for other changes that are not within the Borough's gift;

A request for the one-way section of Barden Road to be extended back to the Avebury Avenue junction. This would be an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

A request that the permit signs could be colour-coded. The design of permit parking signs is tightly controlled by national regulations and we cannot deviate from this.

Introduce a "No right turn" from Holford Street in to Barden Road. This would be an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

#### **Recommendation**

The discussion has drawn-out a number of issues, but the majority of these would not provide a balanced solution to the parking problems, or are not within our gift.

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation as drawn, taking in to consideration the location specific changes discussed elsewhere in this parking review.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 – 47
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Avebury Avenue (western end)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/47

**Summary**

Changing existing double yellow lines to new parking places.

**Issue**

Due to the one-way nature of Avebury Avenue, some additional parking can be created, and residents have reported an increase in parking demand.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 24 properties, and we received a response from 1 property.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	0	0	1

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, the proposal should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 48
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Avebury Avenue and River Lawn Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Parking Team
Plan reference:	DD/577/48

**Summary**

Creation of new Pay & Display spaces and changing existing short-stay parking to Pay & Display.

**Issue**

The existing short-stay parking is abused. Introducing P&D parking would assist enforcement. We have also identified some additional parking that would assist relieve parking pressure in the area.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 30 properties, and we received responses from 2 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	1	0	2

**Analysis**

There was a low response, suggestive of acceptance of the proposal.

The one objection was on the basis that the change from 30minute parking to 2hour parking would reduce the turn-over of parking places, impinging on business. However, the introduction of a charge to parking would help maintain parking turn-over, and the proposals significantly increase the amount of short-stay parking in the area.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 49
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Barden Park Road and Nelson Avenue
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/49

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays and new double yellow lines.

**Issue**

Existing parking bays require adjustments as a number are in front of vehicle accesses. We have also indentified an area where additional parking can be created.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 62 properties, and we received responses from 12 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	7	2	12

**Analysis**

One objection was that there was no need to change the current arrangements. Another was that a resident did not want to lose the facility to park directly outside their property (even though this was causing visibility problems on a bend, and adjacent parking was available).

There were comments that providing restrictions in front of driveways would not alleviate lack of parking facility (though this would assist enforcement should obstruction occur and ease traffic movements)

There was a comment that area D3 should not have the same fee (for permits?) and limited parking as areas D1 and D2.

There were also calls for a one-way system around Barden Road, Nelson Avenue and Barden Park Road. However, this is outside of the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

There were calls for double yellow lines to be omitted in front of driveways, as residents like to use the spaces in front as additional parking.

However, there are problems with the current parking arrangements in Nelson Avenue and Barden Park Road, where there are driveways that emerge in to parking bays – which should not occur and

render the restrictions unenforceable. This needs to be resolved, and the most effective way to resolve this is to remove the parking bays in front of driveways in favour of double yellow lines.

The proposals also cover all the kerbspace in the area with restrictions, which enables more efficient and effective signing of the restrictions by use of zone signs rather than individual signs per parking bay.

**Recommendation**

Whilst residents have indicated their lack of support, the responses were still relatively low, and there are significant engineering and enforcement advantages to the proposals. It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 50
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Barden Road - near Norfolk Road (changes due to redevelopment)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Developer
Plan reference:	DD/577/50

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays and double yellow lines.

**Issue**

Nearby property redevelopment and the associated vehicle accesses has meant changes to the existing parking bay arrangements.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 26 properties, and we received responses from 7 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	4	0	7

**Analysis**

There were comments that the proposals would reduce parking, and that the existing parking restrictions were not enforced. There were also comments against “the proposed one-way system”, though there was no proposal for such.

However, permission for the new vehicle accesses was granted by Kent County Council, and the right of access to the highway supercedes the wish to maintain parking facilities.

The comments about enforcement problems can be addressed by the increase in time of restrictions – which would allow foot patrols to cover a wider area within the restriction times.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 51
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Barden Road - near Northcote Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/51

**Summary**

Removal of a permit parking bay.

**Issue**

Residents have reported problems with parking opposite the junction, which causes problems for large vehicles and turning traffic.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 16 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	2	0	4

**Analysis**

One response was that the parking bay on Barden Road did not cause a problem – it was parking on the nearby double yellow lines that was the issue.

Another response suggested keeping the bay, but relocating the disabled parking bay from Northcote Road to there, as this would free-up more space in Northcote Road.

Another suggested that the parking place on Barden Road was not a problem and that proficient drivers should be able to get out easily.

However, these comments do not take into consideration the mobility issues with disabled drivers, nor the different vehicle dynamics of large commercial vehicles (such as refuse freighters)

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 52
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Cromer Street (alter parking bays)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/52

**Summary**

Creation of new permit parking bays.

**Issue**

Following recent property redevelopments that have removed some accesses, additional parking places can now be created.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 27 properties, and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	0	5	3	8

**Analysis**

There were no residents in favour of the proposals, even though the proposal to extend the parking bays came from residents themselves.

There was an objection to the new stretch of double yellow lines to the rear of No.93 Barden Road.

The additional parking bays would not create additional parking, but would enable enforcement of those spaces and would require vehicles to display a permit. This is in line with concerns that had been expressed by residents that there were a large number of non-permit-holders parking in the area.

There was also concern that extending the times of restriction would lead to an increase in permit price – but this is not the case.

There was also suggestion that the parking bays should be subdivided in to individual parking places, though experience has shown that this is unlikely to yield any additional spaces, and as spaces have to be marked for large vehicles (not the average) there is often a loss of space.

**Recommendation**

The proposals can be amended to delete the double yellow lines, but given the wider concerns about non-permit-holder parking, we should look to manage as much kerbspace as possible as



permit parking to ensure a fair opportunity to park. Accordingly it is recommended that the proposals are altered, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 53
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Holford Street and Danvers Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/53

**Summary**

Removal of Pay & Display parking from permit parking bays.

**Issue**

Residents have reported increasing parking pressures at the eastern end of Area D, and the existing P&D parking exacerbates this, and could be removed to ease pressure.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 87 properties, and we received responses from 14 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	10	4	0	14

**Analysis**

The comments against the proposals inferred they wanted the roads to be for residents only, and not to allow short-stay parking, though this would match the restrictions in the rest of the area.

There was also a suggestion that Holford Street should be made one-way as this could increase parking capacity. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough, and would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 54
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Lower Hayesden Lane - Country Park entrance
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Leisure Services
Plan reference:	DD/577/54

**Summary**

Extended double yellow lines around junction.

**Issue**

Parking at the entrance to the Park and on Lower Hayesden Lane causes problems.

**Informal consultation**

As there are no residents in the immediate vicinity of the Country Park entrance we did not carry out informal consultation. However, there was a request from the Borough's Leisure Services team for additional restrictions by the western access gate to the country park, where obstructive parking can occur.

**Recommendation**

The revised proposals proceed to formal consultation

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 55
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Nelson Avenue
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/55

**Summary**

Creation of new permit parking bays.

**Issue**

Additional parking bays can be created in an area where an access is no longer present, and additional spaces can be made close to the junction with Barden Road to help ease parking pressure.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 43 properties, and we received a response from 1 property.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	0	0	1

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 56
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Angel Lane (disabled and loading controls)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/56

**Summary**

New "No Loading At Any Time" restriction.

**Issue**

Disabled parking occurs in the turning area and narrowings, creating difficulties for commercial vehicles. Alternative disabled facilities exist close by on Angel Lane or in the car parks.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 10 properties, but received no responses.

**Recommendation**

As there were no responses, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 57
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Church Street - removal of Doctor and Disabled bays and extension of time of restrictions
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/57

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays and double yellow lines, and a change to parking bay times.

**Issue**

The existing disabled bay and doctor parking bays are now redundant and residents have asked for them to become permit parking. Residents also asked for the restrictions to operate for longer.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 46 properties, (though 2 letters were returned as undeliverable) and we received responses from 12 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	10	2	0	12

**Analysis**

There were several comments in favour of the changes, but wanted the restrictions to be more severe, and parking to be for residents only at all times, however, this has to be considered against the principles of the permit parking scheme –to regulate daytime parking rather than to provide allocated spaces to individuals or to make a the public highway in to a completely private parking area.

Another objection was against placing any restriction on the former Doctor and Disabled bays, as these spaces were useful for visitors.

**Recommendation**

There was strong support for the changes from residents, so it is recommended that the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 58
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	East Street -New loading ban outside Doctor's Surgery
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/58

**Summary**

New "No Loading At Any Time" restriction.

**Issue**

Obstructive parking occurs outside the Doctor's Surgery and Pharmacy, by both blue badge holders and deliveries despite the presence of the off-street car park and loading facilities.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 25 properties, and we received responses from 12 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	2	1	5

**Analysis**

One resident commented that they did not think that there was a problem, whereas others commented that the restrictions should be taken further.

There were three other issues raised – that something needs to be done to address speeding on East Street, that pedestrian barriers were needed outside the surgery and pharmacy (to prevent pull-up parking) and that the pavements (footways) were in poor condition and are difficult for the disabled to walk on. However, these issues are outside the remit of the Borough and would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider.

**Recommendation**

Due to the nature of the problem, and the current enforcement requirements to give an observation period, it is recommended that the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 59
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Lodge Oak Lane
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/59

**Summary**

Change to parking bay times.

**Issue**

There have been reports that the current parking restriction times do not operate for long enough and the restrictions are abused.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 14 properties, and we received a response from 1 property.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	0	0	1

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 60
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Medway Wharf Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/60

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of access.

**Issue**

Concerns that parking in front of the access to Holmes Court could obstruct the access and deter residents from using the car park.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 66 properties, and we received responses from 18 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	15	2	1	18

**Analysis**

Some objectors asked for all the parking on Medway Wharf Road to be removed as the road is getting busier and the parking affects visibility.

Others asked that the existing parking be reduced slightly.

However, there is also a strong demand for the parking places in Medway Wharf Road, though this has to be balanced against the concerns of residents.

**Recommendation**

The proposals are altered, with a slight reduction to the Medway Wharf Road parking bays to improve visibility, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 61
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Mill Lane and Mill Crescent (new property near No.1)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/61

**Summary**

Reduction in double yellow lines for a new parking bay, and change to parking bay times.

**Issue**

Changes to properties allow an additional parking place to be created, and extending the existing parking restriction times will enable more effective enforcement.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 87 properties, and we received responses from 20 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	11	8	1	20

**Analysis**

Some commented that the additional space was welcome, but the extended restriction times were not, as it would make difficulties for visitors etc. However, this would be covered by the availability of visitor's permits.

Another commented against the extension of time restrictions as they had received a parking ticket for incorrectly using an invalid permit, and that permits ought to be given for free.

Others suggested that the time restrictions should be extended further.

Some residents of flats on private grounds with private parking objected, that the proposals would impinge on their visitors, but their visitors could either park in the private areas, or use visitor vouchers which are available to the residents of the flats.

There is also an existing section of limited waiting in Mill Lane that allows parking for up to two hours.

**Recommendation**

The changes would not only increase parking availability for residents, it would enable more efficient and effective enforcement. As there is still a facility to park for up to two hours in Mill Lane, and

visitors vouchers are also available, this should not impinge in visitors. It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 62
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Mitre Court
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Cllr Elks
Plan reference:	DD/577/62

**Summary**

Formalising current unenforceable markings.

**Issue**

The existing markings are not enforceable, having never been formally introduced by Kent County Council when the road was adopted.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 10 properties, and we received responses from 5 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	4	1	0	5

**Analysis**

The one objection was that single yellow lines would suffice. However, this is from a resident of Hadlow Road rather than Mitre Court itself, whereas the residents of Mitre Court supported the proposals and asked for enforcement.

**Recommendation**

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 63
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Vale Rise
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Parking team
Plan reference:	DD/577/63

**Summary**

Reduction in double yellow lines for new parking bays.

**Issue**

The existing parking restrictions in the area could be relaxed slightly to allow more on-street parking, which would reduce parking pressure elsewhere.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 6 properties, and we received responses from 2 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	0	1	1	2

**Recommendation**

As there was no support, and the proposals received an objection, it is recommended that the proposals are abandoned.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 64
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Whitefriars Wharf
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/64

**Summary**

Formalising current unenforceable markings.

**Issue**

Parking enforcement is not currently available at the entrance to Whitefriars Wharf due to omissions during the development and adoption process by Kent County Council.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 86 properties, and we received responses from 10 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	9	0	1	10

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections, it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 – 64a
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Royal Avenue
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/64a

**Summary**

New double yellow lines.

**Issue**

New parking restrictions to prevent obstruction and deter all-day parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council has carried out two rounds of informal consultation as part of a previous phase of the Local Parking Plan, as the first round of consultation produced no consensus.

**Next step**

The responses to the second consultation have already been considered by members and the September 2015 Joint Transportation Board, and are to proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 65
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Trench
Road / Area	Medina Road (disabled bay)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/577/65

**Summary**

Making existing disabled parking bays enforceable.

**Issue**

Problems with non blue-badge holders parking in the disabled parking bays.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 27 properties, and we received responses from 7 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	3	3	1	7

**Analysis**

One objection was that the disabled spaces should be changed to residents' permits only.

However, other residents also comment that there are additional blue badge holders in the area that may want to use the bays, so altering the bays to residents' only would not be appropriate.

Another objection was that the change was unnecessary as the bays had never been abused.

There was also a request for additional disabled bays in the road, however, this is against the Kent County Council criteria for a maximum of 2 spaces (or 5% of road space) to be disabled parking.

**Recommendation**

The proposal proceeds to formal consultation.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 66
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Vauxhall
Road / Area	Deakin Leas
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/66

**Summary**

New double yellow lines near to the footpath at the southern end.

**Issue**

There have been reports that parking by non-residents near to the footpath at the southern end of the road causes obstruction problems.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 4 properties, and we received responses from 2 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	1	0	2

**Analysis**

One respondent asked that the proposed restrictions be extended.

Another commented that there ought to be a sign as the junction of Baltic Road to stop drivers thinking they can get to the A21 via the top of Deakin Lease. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough and would be an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider.

**Recommendation**

The proposals be extended, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 67
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Vauxhall
Road / Area	Hilltop (extend DYL in front of driveways at Baltic Road end) and Treetops
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents & Cllr M Heslop
Plan reference:	DD/577/67

**Summary**

New double yellow lines in front of accesses.

**Issue**

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking in front of accesses in Hilltop and Treetops.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 32 properties, and we received responses from 13 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	7	6	0	13

**Analysis**

One response was that parking in the turning head of Treetops does not (in their view) cause a problem, and any restriction would displace parking to other areas.

Others commented that in their view the restrictions in Treetops were unnecessary, and that the footway and verge could be removed from the side of the turning area in Treetops, to make additional parking, though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider.

Others commented that there was no need for the proposed double yellow lines on Hilltop.

Another commented that there was no need for the proposed double yellow lines on Hilltop in front of their driveway, though they did want them to either side.

**Recommendation**

The proposals for Hilltop seem to have little support, and could be removed from the proposal. The restrictions for Treetops have a mixed level of support, with those who are affected by obstructive parking supporting the issue, and those that park in the area against.

As there is a need to maintain access to the Highway it is recommended that the restrictions be altered, with the removal of the restrictions for Hilltop, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 68
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Vauxhall
Road / Area	The Drive (adjustments to parking bays to reflect new accesses and addition of an hour's restriction in the afternoon)
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/68

**Summary**

Changes to parking bays and double yellow lines, and a change to parking bay times.

**Issue**

New property accesses require the adjustment of existing parking bays, and residents have reported afternoon parking problems due to long-stay non-resident parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 103 properties, and we received responses from 40 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	28	9	3	40

**Analysis**

There seems to be a divide between those that want the proposed changes and those that do not, with those that do not tending to be at the southern (upper) end of The Drive – this seems to correlate with the problems being associated with non-residents parking.

However, if we were to make changes to the northern (lower) part of The Drive it may well displace parking to the upper end.

Some residents also asked for traffic calming measures to be installed, but this is outside the remit of the Borough, being for Kent County Council, as the Highway Authority, to consider.

There was also a request to reduce a parking bay outside No.49 as it apparently creates difficulties for the resident when turning in.

**Recommendation**

There is a strong response, from two polarised camps, but the majority are in favour of the proposals.

The minor adjustment to the parking bay can be accommodated, and the altered proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 69
Town	West Malling
Ward	West Malling & Leybourne
Road / Area	Parking Review area - Offham Road (North)
File Ref	OSP-39
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/69

**Summary**

New permit parking bays and new double yellow lines.

**Issue**

The West Malling Steering Group have asked that proposals be considered to deter non-resident parking and to assist traffic movements, and we are re-consulting on revised proposals.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November. The Parish Council also held an exhibition to give another opportunity for those interested to comment on the proposals.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 70 properties in the road, and we received responses from 35 properties in the road. We also received 17 responses from members of the public who were not resident in that part of Offham Road.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	21	13	1	35
Non-residents	6	7	4	17
All responses	27	20	5	52

**Analysis**

A number of the responses were duplicated, and some residents who provided multiple responses commented with responses that contradicted themselves.

There were also points raised by some residents that the Ordnance Survey mapping information used was out of date as some of the properties had amended or adjusted their parking bays. Whilst this may alter the precise location of bays, the amount of parking would not be altered.

However, there were also comments from residents of Offham Road (north) who responded that they (and their neighbours) were in the process of applying for a new vehicle access to two properties in the road, and though they were not against the provision of parking bays, the parking bays would need to be reduced to reflect their new accesses, but should be countered by the increase in off-street facility.

All of the responses were circulated to the West Malling Parking Review Steering Group for consideration.

**Recommendation**

The Steering Group decided that there were some comments suggesting minor amendments to the proposals, to reflect new vehicle accesses and changes to the streetscene, and that the proposals should be altered to reflect these changes, and to proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 70
Town	Wrotham
Ward	Wrotham, Ightham & Stansted
Road / Area	High Street
File Ref	OSP-42
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/70

**Summary**

Changes to existing parking bays.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have reported that the existing parking bays require updating to meet current need, and redundant Doctor bay needs removal to allow more parking.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 40 properties, and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	7	0	1	8

**Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 71
Town	Wrotham
Ward	Wrotham, Ightham & Stansted
Road / Area	Kemsing Road and Randall Hill Road
File Ref	OSP-42
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/71

**Summary**

New double yellow lines around junction and to prevent obstruction.

**Issue**

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking at the junction and on pavements.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 22 properties, and we received responses from 8 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	5	2	8

**Recommendation**

There was a strong response to the consultation against the proposal for parking restrictions. With this in mind it is recommended that the Borough Council's proposals are abandoned.

If residents still have concerns about safety and access then this would need to be considered and investigated by Kent County Council, as they hold the remit for managing safety on the public highway, and can apply different criteria than the Borough Council's amenity parking remit.



**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 72
Town	Wrotham
Ward	Wrotham, Ightham & Stansted
Road / Area	St Marys Road
File Ref	OSP-42
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/577/72

**Summary**

Relocation of an existing disabled bay.

**Issue**

The Parish Council have reported that the existing disabled bay could be relocated to the other side of the road to improve traffic movements and better meet the needs of the disabled resident.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 26 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	1	1	4

**Recommendation**

There was a low level of response, with only one commenting against the proposal, on the grounds that there would not be a gain to the disabled user and would lose a parking place for others.

However, we need to consider providing appropriate facilities for those with mobility issues, in line with current standards for the size of a disabled parking bay. As relocating the bay would also improve access along the road it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary**

Location reference	Phase 8 - 18
Town	Wrotham
Ward	Wrotham, Ightham & Stansted
Road / Area	Borough Green Road
File Ref	OSP-11
Requested by	Cllr Murray
Plan reference:	DD/577/18

**Summary**

New double yellow lines to prevent school access problems.

**Issue**

There have been reports of school parent parking problems that cause obstruction and safety concerns outside the school.

**Informal consultation**

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.

As part of the consultation we wrote to 14 properties, and we received responses from 4 properties.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	2	2	0	4

**Analysis**

The two comments against the proposals both commented that there was an issue, but were not convinced that double yellow lines would help. The main issue that was concerning residents was to provide a safe facility for dropping off children to the school, or to provide a safe crossing point from Potters Mede car park.

**Recommendation**

The proposals to restrict parking would assist enforcement against those that cause an obstruction, and help maintain traffic movements along the road, which would assist in dispersing school pick-up and drop-off parking, but would not provide the solution to the congestion and safety issues without other interventions.

AS the proposals would assist enforcement it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.