

Location reference	Phase 8 - 1
Town	Addington
Ward	Downs & Mereworth
Road / Area	Mill House Lane, Trottiscliffe Road and Park Road
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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council 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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 35 properties. We received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	4	5	0	9

Analysis

There were a number of objections to the proposals, some issues were raised by more than one respondent;

- That the proposals would adversely affect the business of The Angel Inn.
- That the proposals would displace parking in to other areas, including to the private road alongside Addington Green.
- That the proposals should be reduced.
- affect the users of the Village Hall who park along Robin Hood Lane
- That there was no need for permit parking, as the existing spaces were not over-used.
- That the existing restriction works well, and if all-day parking was required it could be done in the long-stay car park.
- The restrictions (if marked) should be suitable for a conservation area

There were also calls from those in support of the proposals to extend the restrictions further. It is also worth noting that the Angel Inn already place their own "no waiting" cones across their frontage to prevent parking, an indication that this has already been an issue.

The proposals were originally requested by the Parish Council, who also requested that they be extended further westwards than the original proposal.

Formal Recommendation

It is felt that the proposals are a balanced engineering solution to the parking issues in the area, and would prevent parking around the junction and displacement further along the public highway.

Unfortunately it is not within our gift to address issues in private roads – this would be an issue for the landowners to address themselves.

However, there are a number of objections, and it is recommended that the views of the local Members are sought on whether to proceed or not. If the issue is to be abandoned, Kent County Council may wish to revisit this on safety-related grounds or if there are ongoing concerns about obstruction of the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

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

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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 31 properties. We received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	1	2	0	3

Analysis

Though there were more objections than supporting comments, the response was low. The objections raised several issues;

- **The proposals restrictions would reduce parking facility.**
This needs to be considered against the rights of access that the resident suffering from the access problems as, and the fact that maintaining access to the off-street parking would enable one or more vehicle to park off the road.
- **The resident that applied for the restriction is getting preferential treatment.**
The proposals are not intended to provide preferential treatment, but to maintain a right of access that already exists under the Highways Act, that is being prevented by obstructive parking. These rights do not exist for owners of properties that do not have vehicular access to the Highway, but it is not a “preferential treatment” of the individual.

Formal Recommendation

Whilst there were objections, these have to be considered against the rights of access and the obstruction problems, and the fact that this will enable vehicles to be parked off-street, it is recommended that the Board set the objections aside and agree the implementation of the proposals as drawn.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council 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
Responses	1	3	2	6

Informal 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)

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 25 properties, but also had one response from a resident of the wider Aylesford area. We received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	5	0	1	6

Analysis

The one "Don't know" related to a previous objection at the informal consultation stage, though this had been addressed in the revision to the proposals after the informal consultation responses.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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, the Council is not looking to extend restrictions further than the minimum necessary to address obstructive parking issues around the junction.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 18 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	2	1	0	3

Analysis

The level of response was low. The objection was primarily on the grounds that whilst the Council were addressing issues at the junction of The Avenue and The Hawthorns, the Council did not address issues of obstruction and pavement parking in The Hawthorns, and the proposals could displace parking that would exacerbate their access issues.

The proposals did get support from other residents, and emphasise the advice in the Highway Code about parking near junctions.

It may be that the obstruction and access issues reported by the objector would be better considered for action by Kent Police as these remain issues within their realm, or that additional restrictions may be necessary as part of a later Phase of the Parking Action Plan if the potential displacement actually appears.

Formal Recommendation

Whilst there was objection, this was in effect about the lack of enforcement and the restriction not going far enough. It is recommended that the Board set the objection aside and agree the implementation of the proposals as drawn.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 4 properties. However we received no responses.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 4 properties. However we received no responses.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 19 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

There were a number of objections to the proposals, some issues were raised by more than one respondent;

- That the proposals would affect the users of the Village Hall who park along Robin Hood Lane
- That there was no need for permit parking, as the existing spaces were not over-used.
- That the existing restriction works well, and if all-day parking was required it could be done in the long-stay car park.

Formal Recommendation

In light of the objections to the proposals (including one that was from the property that had initially requested the changes) it is recommended that the Board uphold the objections and the proposals be abandoned.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to 30 properties and received responses from 6 properties.

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation as drawn.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 30 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	5	0	0	5

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council 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
Responses	8	2	1	11

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 91 properties (though 2 were returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	4	2	1	7

Analysis

There were comments in favour and against the proposals;

- There were two objections to the proposal for a new disabled parking bay outside the shops, as this would reduce the already limited parking opportunities, and this would discriminate against non-disabled customers.**

The Council have to consider the needs of those in the community that have mobility issues, and providing facilities to those with disabilities is not discrimination.
- It was also discussed that the disabled bay may not now be required as the Post Office has now moved.**
- Another objection was that the proposals for new double yellow lines would prevent loading and unloading to a business in the area.**

Loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines, so the business should not be affected.

One comment was that vehicle speeds had increased along Western Road since the construction of the new mini-roundabout, accompanied by a request for improved speed limit signing – though this is outside of the Borough's remit and would be for Kent County Council to consider.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the views of the local Members are sought relating to the provision of the disabled parking bay outside the shops, as the change in shop use may have changed the need for disabled facilities, and the objections relating to this issue be set aside or upheld and the changes be introduced or abandoned accordingly.

As the objection relating to the yellow lines was on the grounds that loading and unloading would be affected, but loading and unloading is permitted on yellow lines, the objection should be set aside and the proposals be implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

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

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.

Informal Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 43 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 29 properties. We received the following responses;

14th March 2016

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	7	0	0	7

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

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

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 16 properties. No responses were received.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

That the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 62 properties (though 2 were returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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.

Informal Recommendation

That the proposals be taken forward to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 26 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 allow the Borough Council to enforce against obstructive parking.

Informal consultation

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

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough’s website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 100 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	5	3	1	9

Analysis

There were comments in favour and against the proposals;

- One objection to the new yellow lines on Rock Road was that the objector did not feel that parking close to the entrance to the rear access to No's 17-31a (evens) was a problem, and that residents who had no off-street facility were being penalised for their lack of facility.**

There have been comments about obstructive parking that causes problems for vehicles accessing the off-street parking.
- Two objectors commented that proposed double yellow lines on Sevenoaks road would cause problems as it would prevent deliveries etc.**

Loading and unloading is still permitted on double yellow lines.
- Another comment was that double yellow lines would have an effect on the value of the properties on Sevenoaks Road.**

The value of properties should not be the over-arching concern when considering highway issues, as parking on the public highway is not a right; it is merely tolerated where it does not cause an obstruction. Parking on the A25 Sevenoaks Road can quickly lead to long queues and significant traffic delays, and the impact of these delays on the primary route network should be carefully considered.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals still are aimed at improving access to properties in Rock Road, and preventing obstruction and delays on the A25 Sevenoaks Road.

It is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and the proposals be implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 75 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	6	0	0	6

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 20 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 15 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 18 properties. The following responses were received;

14th March 2016

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

Analysis

The two objections commented that large vehicles seemed to either have no problem in turning at the end of the road, or that the drivers were prepared to reverse the length of the road. It should be noted that these objections were not from residents who would have restrictions directly outside their properties.

There were two comments strongly in favour of the proposals, from residents who would have the restrictions outside their properties.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the views of the local Members are sought on whether to proceed or not. If the issue is to be abandoned, Kent County Council may wish to revisit this on safety-related grounds or if there are ongoing concerns about obstruction of the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 13 properties, and received one response from a resident outside the immediate area. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 24
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Kingfisher Road, Swallow Road, Woodpecker Road & Lunsford Lane
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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

14th March 2016

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 29 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

The two objections related to the potential loss of parking provision, though the proposed yellow lines were not immediately outside their properties, and one had their own off-street parking facility, and the other was exploring with their housing association whether off-street parking could be provided.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals are intended as "junction protection" and are intended to improve visibility and traffic movements around the junctions and along the bus route, and emphasise the advice set out in the Highway Code about parking near to junctions. Accordingly it is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 88 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

The objections commented on the lack of alternative parking facility and that the proposals would increase the parking problems unless an alternative facility was provided (though the vast majority of properties have access to off road parking). Additionally;

- One commented that though they had space within their property for two vehicles, they had four vehicles, and regularly visiting family members bring another two.
- Another commented that parking on the grass verge does not hurt, it is not even as though parked cars do damage to the verge.
- One commented that if the cost of dropping kerbs (via KCC) was more affordable, more residents would have driveways laid which would alleviate the problem.

There was also a significant number of supporting comments.

Formal Recommendation

Parking on the Highway is not a right, and it is only tolerated where it does not cause problems. However there have been problems with damage to the verge, attributable to parked vehicles.

The proposals do not restrict parking on the road, nor prevent access to the private driveways, merely prevent parking on the verges and footways where it causes problems.

It is recommended that objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced. As the proposals were a request for assistance in the promotion of a restriction from Kent County Council, the implementation should be funded by them.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 14 properties. We received the following responses;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

We wrote directly to 5 properties. However we received no responses.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 28
Town	Leybourne
Ward	West Malling & Leybourne
Road / Area	Baywell & Highberry
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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to 20 properties and received responses from 16 properties. 1 response was received 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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 21 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	9	3	0	12

Analysis

There were significantly more comments in support of the proposal than objections, however, two of the objections tended to relate to the parking restrictions on the northeastern side of Baywell.

The other objection related to the potential parking displacement and the parking pressures in the area.

The comments of support included requests to extend the proposals further.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals should be altered to delete the proposal for double yellow lines on the northern side of Baywell (outside No's 11 & 13), and for the objections be set aside and the revised proposals be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 18 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

There were significantly more objections to the proposal than support, indicating that this was not popular with residents.

Formal Recommendation

Due to the number of objections it is recommended that the Board uphold the objections and the proposals be abandoned.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to 11 properties, and received responses from 6 properties.

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals are extended and proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 11 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 16 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents	1	3	0	4

Analysis

There were comments in favour and against the proposals;

- **The objections mainly related to the lack of alternative parking facility nearby.**

Formal Recommendation

It is felt that the proposals are a balanced engineering solution to the parking issues in the area, and would prevent parking across the island where visibility would be affected.

There are a number of objections, and it is recommended that the views of the local Members are sought on whether to proceed or not. If the issue is to be abandoned, Kent County Council may wish to revisit this on safety-related grounds or if there are ongoing concerns about obstruction of visibility on the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 20 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

There were comments in support of the proposal as well as objections.

- Some of the objections commented that the proposals would be ineffective, or might displace parking further along the road.
- Another commented that there was a central island further along the road that could assist pedestrians crossing.
- The response from the Parish Council was that they did not believe that the proposals were necessary.
- Other responses (including those in favour of the proposals) suggested that vehicle speed along the A20 London Road was an issue, making it difficult for vehicles emerging from accesses, and there were calls for a reduction in the speed limit from 50mph to 40.

Formal Recommendation

The responses were mixed, but the comments against suggested that the proposals were unnecessary as the objectors did not feel there was an issue. Those that responded in favour indicated that they were experiencing difficulties and that the restrictions would assist – even with a request to extend them further.

It is recommended that the views of the local Members are sought on whether to proceed or not. If the issue is to be abandoned, Kent County Council may wish to revisit this on safety-related grounds or if there are ongoing concerns about visibility or speed management on the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

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

14th March 2016

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 59 properties. The following responses were received;

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

The Town Council also commented in support of the proposals.

Analysis

There were comments in support of the proposal as well as objections.

- One objector commented that the existing yellow lines in Cantium Place were not enforceable, as they had been advised this by Pinnacle (the service charge company).**
However, this is incorrect. The private parking areas and common areas may be managed by Pinnacle, but the road in to Cantium Place has now been adopted by Kent County Council and the restrictions are covered by the Borough's Traffic Regulation Orders, and parking enforcement takes place.
- One objector commented that the parking issues were caused by staff working at Birling House who can't be bothered to open their gate rather than residents.**
However, Birling House have reported problems with their access being blocked, and turning movements in and out of their gate are affected by parking opposite.

Cantium Place was developed with private parking facilities provided in accordance with the parking standards that applied at the time, but residents have chosen to park on the access road which is public Highway, even though this causes obstruction problems and issues close to the traffic calming chicanes.

The parking issues in the area are being further exacerbated by the introduction of improved train services from Snodland station, and commuter cars are now parking in the entrance to the road.

Formal Recommendation

Some of the parking issues in Cantium Place are as a result of the improved train service from Snodland, but most issues relate to the parking standards that applied when the development was constructed, and the narrowness of the access road.

The proposals are intended to address the obstruction issues around the accesses, to enable residents and those working in Cantium Place to access their off-street parking more effectively.

It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals be implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 86 properties. We received the following responses;

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

The Town Council also commented in support of the proposals.

Analysis

There were comments in support of the proposal as well as objections.

- One objector commented that the proposed yellow lines at the level crossing should be shorter, as this is where they currently park.**

Parking with 10m of a level crossing is not condoned, as it can cause obstruction and large vehicles to tail-back in to the crossing area.
- There were also comments about non-resident parking by commuters using the improved train service from Snodland station, requesting a residents permit parking scheme be introduced.**

This is outside the scope of this proposal, but may be subject to a wider review once the station car park has been constructed and the regular use of the station has been determined.
- There were comments about the lack of parking facility for residents in May Street, as the road is narrow and residents tend to have more than one vehicle.**

Unfortunately the properties were constructed at a time when car ownership and use was not prevalent and we cannot increase capacity. In light of this we have looked to apply the minimum restriction lengths that would be supported by Kent Police.
- Several objectors commented that the raised beds in the parking area at the southern end of May Street should be removed to create more parking.**

This area is not part of the public Highway – we believe this is part of the Smurfit Kappa site, and any changes would be within their gift, rather than that of the Borough or County Councils.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 47 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	12	4	1	17

The Town Council also commented in support of the proposals.

Analysis

There were comments in support of the proposal as well as objections.

- One objector commented that the proposals on the northern side of the road were unnecessary as there would be nowhere for visitors to park.**
Birling Road is a bus route and parking on the bend at this location causes problems.
- One suggested an alternative, that single yellow lines (operating from 9am-9pm) should be used.**
This would not prevent parking on the bends, at junctions and in the narrow areas at night, and parking at these locations is against the Highway Code at any time.
- One resident commented that residents had a "right to park"**
There is no right to park on the public highway – the highway is intended to facilitate travel, not for the storage of vehicles – though it is tolerated where it does not cause a problem.
- Several objections (linked to the same property) asked that the footways be reduced in width and the road widened to allow more parking, and pavement parking be allowed.**
This would not be within the gift of the Borough Council – widening the road and reducing footways would be an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority, as would condoning footway parking, as any buried cables, utilities and services in the footway would need protection.
- The owner of one property commented in objection to the proposals as they were not aware that Birling Road was a bus or coach route, and that introducing restrictions would reduce the value of their property, and their tenant commented that the proposals would mean that they might have to park further away.**
The proposals did not introduce parking restrictions directly outside the property in question.
- One resident commented that the proposals were not warranted as the coaches that they had seen using the road had not had problems.**
- There were also comments about HGVs using Birling Road, and that properties shake when HGVs go past – and an associated request for an HGV ban or a weight limit.**

HGV bans and weight limits are outside the Borough Council's remit, and would be for the County Council to consider.

- **Three objections raised little issue with the proposals themselves, but wanted changes and additional parking in the Bramley Road / Recreation Avenue area as the proposals might make parking pressures worse in those roads.**

Of those that supported the proposals there was confirmation of problems for buses trying to get past vehicles parked on the bends and in the narrow areas, and also of problems with obstruction of the footway by parked vehicles.

There was also a request to extend restrictions further.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 10 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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. 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 92 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

Two objections were that the proposals would restrict parking, and that residents only had one allocated parking place, and most have more than one vehicle.

One commented that the proposals needed to be extended, and two commented that the proposed yellow lines be extended all the way around Howard Drive.

Formal Recommendation

The development of Howard Drive was based on the parking standards in place at the time, which are partly intended to control car ownership and usage.

The proposal are intended to be the minimum necessary to maintain access, to prevent parking where the Highway Code states it should not occur, and to protect access to off-street spaces.

It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals be introduced.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 – 67a
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Cage Green
Road / Area	Cage Green Road
File Ref	OSP-30-36
Requested by	Local Residents
Plan reference:	DD/577/67a

Summary

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking near junctions and driveways..

Issue

As part of Phase 7 of the Parking Action Plan, the Borough Council carried out informal consultation on potential changes in Cage Green Road. These attracted some objections and were then held in abeyance at the request of the local Councillor for further consideration.

The issue was then included within Phase 8 of the Parking Action Plan for formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 12 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	6	1	0	7

Analysis

The objection related to the loss of facility for tradesmen to park in front of a resident's driveway, as there is no other space in the road.

The proposals do not restrict all of the road space and parking should be available – either for the residents vehicle (allowing visitors and tradesmen to use the driveway) or for the trades themselves.

Formal Recommendation

The objection should be set aside as the problem would be infrequent and there is an easy solution to the resident's concerns, and the proposals should be implemented.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 41
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Yardley Park Road
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, and amendments to existing parking bays

Issue

There have been reports of obstructive parking at junctions and bends, and changes to parking bays are required following the construction of new vehicle accesses on Yardley Park Road.

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions in Cheviot Close, Chiltern Way and Yardley Park Road, from 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Discussed at the Joint Transportation Board

The proposals for Cheviot Close and Chiltern Way were abandoned, but the proposals for Yardley Park Road were to be taken forward.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 12 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

- **The objection was received from a resident several streets away, complaining about the lack of parking facilities in their road, and the need to be able to park overnight.**

The proposals are to amend the parking bays and yellow lines to reflect changes to vehicle accesses that have already been given permission by Kent County Council and have been installed by the householders.

The "don't know" response related to the refurbishment of existing white "access protection" markings, but these are provided and maintained by Kent County Council.

Formal Recommendation

As permissions have already been given and the accesses already installed, there is little option but to proceed with the changes.

It is recommended that the objection be set aside and the proposals be implemented.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 42
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Haydens Mews & Yardley Park Road junction with The Haydens
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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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.

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation 2

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

Discussion at the Joint Transportation Board and Member Decision

At the meeting of the Board on 30 November 2015, one of the local Members for the area spoke to the issue, and the Board decided that Informal Recommendation 1 be altered, so that the proposals for Haydens Mews (including the junction with The Haydens) proceed, but for the wide restrictions in The Haydens to be abandoned.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 36 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Residents of Haydens Mews	23	1	0	24
Residents of The Haydens	2	5	0	7

Analysis

- **The objection from the resident of Haydens Mews gave no grounds for the objection.**
- **The objections from resident of The Haydens were concerned that the introduction of parking restrictions to Haydens Mews would displace parking to The Haydens.**

We had previously proposed restrictions to address this in The Haydens as part of the informal consultation, but that element of the proposals attracted strong objections from the residents of The Haydens and was dropped from the proposals.

However, the proposals are to amend the parking bays and yellow lines to reflect changes to vehicle accesses that have already been given permission by Kent County Council and have been installed by the householders.

Formal Recommendation

The prior consultations determined that the residents of The Haydens did not want parking controls, and this element of the proposal was withdrawn.

Given the high level of support from the residents of Haydens Mews it is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

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

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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 30 properties (2 returned by Royal Mail), and received a number of responses from nearby properties that were not immediate frontagers. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	6	20	0	26

Analysis

- **The large number of objections were from residents of Uridge Road and Uridge Crescent, commenting that the proposal were either unnecessary and would place additional parking pressure on Uridge Road and Crescent, or that the proposals should be significantly reduced.**
- **Similar comments were received from residents in Shipbourne Road, Dernier Road and Beaulieu Road.**

There were comments of support from a number of residents of Welland Road.

Formal Recommendation

The level of objection to the proposal is significant, and it is recommended that the proposals be abandoned.

However, if safety concerns remain, it may be that Kent County Council might revisit the issue under their remit for addressing safety issues on the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 12 properties. We received the following responses;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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. 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 49 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	3	3	0	6

Analysis

- **One objection (copied 6 times amongst staff) was that the staff and pharmacists working in the pharmacy were not local, and would have to look for spaces to park in, which would mean there were times when the pharmacy would not be able to issue prescriptions which would be inconvenient and anger customers.**

The proposals are intended to make parking more available to customers, and are not intended to provide long-stay parking immediately outside the commercial premises. There are unrestricted streets nearby where all-day parking can be tolerated.

- **One objection from a resident was that there was not enough room to park in the private parking area around the back of the shops.**

This would be an issue for the tenants to raise with the landowner about the private parking facilities.

- **One objection was from a resident who wanted to put in a private driveway, but could not afford to do so, and the restrictions would prevent parking outside their house.**

The existing restrictions prevent daytime parking, but there are still complaints about obstruction, hence the proposal to make the restrictions "at any time".

The proposals do not restrict all road space in the area and there would still be the facility to park on-street, though this may be further away, in an area where it does not cause an obstruction.

There was also a comment that the double yellow lines outside the Co-Op where loading and unloading takes place should be converted to parking places as it is too large for the delivery vehicles.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals are intended to prevent obstruction and to provide turn-over to the parking places in the shopping parade, which is vital to the development and support of the local community. It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	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

Informal 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.

The Council 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to all 590 properties in the Zone D area (though 2 were returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	36	13	2	51

These responses were distributed as follows;

Road	Properties in road	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Avebury Avenue	70	3	0	0	3
Barden Park Road	32	2	1	0	3
Barden Road	145	8	6	1	15
Caistor Road	23	2	2	0	4

Road	Properties in road	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Cromer Street	33	3	2	0	5
Danvers Road	40	2	0	0	2
Gladstone Road	37	7	0	0	7
High Street	1	0	0	0	0
Nelson Avenue	90	2	2	0	4
Norfolk Road	43	1	1	0	2
Northcote Road	23	1	1	0	2
Preston Road	28	4	0	0	4
Railway Approach	9	0	0	0	0
River Lawn Road	8	0	0	0	0
River Walk	2	0	0	0	0

Analysis

One objection was that the resident (of Barden Park Road) did not agree with splitting the area in to 2 zones.

One objection (from Barden Park Road) was against the change to the permit times, as they have regular visitors and would need to get more visitor permits.

The changes should increase parking availability during the restricted times.

One objection (from Barden Road) did not agree with splitting the area in to 2 zones, as this would restrict where they could park.

Dividing the zone would always reduce parking opportunities, but increasing the restriction times and more effective enforcement should free up spaces.

One (from Barden Road) asked whether area D1 could have the same permit times as the 8am-6pm restrictions that currently apply in Holford Street and Danvers Road.

This seems contrary to other views, that the restriction times should not be extended.

One (from Barden Road) objected, that D1 permits should not be allowed in the side roads of D2.

If there is not capacity in the side roads, it is unlikely that D1 permit holders would want to stray in to the D2 side roads often.

One (from Barden Road) did not think it necessary to extend the permit hours in D2.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

One (from Barden Road) objected, that D1 would be allowed to park in D2, but not the other way around.

There are more parking pressures in area D1 than D2.

One (from Barden Road) objected, that the extended restriction times should not apply to D2.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

One (from Barden Road) objected that they did not see any problem with the existing arrangements.

There has been a significant call from residents to the local Members and on Social Media to address the parking problems in the area.

One (from Barden Road) objected, but gave no reason.

One (from Barden Road) objected to changes, commenting that this was being driven by the residents closer to the town who had parking problems, and ought to consider moving elsewhere, and that the increased restriction times would affect accessibility by visitors and require more visitors vouchers.

Residents who have significant parking issues should consider whether living elsewhere would be more suitable to their lifestyle and needs, but this is not always possible or practicable, and parking convenience is not always the primary consideration when choosing where to live.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

One (from Barden Road) thought the existing parking times were adequate, and did not agree with the split to areas D1 & D2.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

One (from Caistor Road) objected that the extended times would make it more difficult for visitors.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

One (from Caistor Road) suggested;

- **that carers and healthcare workers needed parking close to their patients.**
We already offer carer permits
- **that residents permits only ought to be provided on provision of a vehicle log book or disability notification.**
We ask for proof of residency for resident permits.
- **that tradesmen working in empty properties should be able to access “guest” permits.**
If a building is unoccupied, then the builders can apply for limited visitor vouchers.

One (from Caistor Road) commented;

- **that there were often “commuters” from the western end of the parking zone to the town centre**
The division of the Zone D area into D1 and D2 should address this.
- **that a lot of the parking pressures were in the evenings, due to households with more than two cars.**
This is where the ultimate capacity of the area has been reached. We have tried to introduce more parking where possible, but there is little further we can do to increase capacity, and we cannot prevent resident car ownership.
- **that there ought to be different permit tariffs for cars and vans.**
This is something that may be considered as part of a wider review of fees and charges.

One (from Caistor Road) objected, that extra parking spaces could be created without dividing the zone in to two parts, and that little scientific evidence had been used to develop the plan.

Dividing parking bays in to individual spaces does not gain capacity, as we have to mark spaces for larger than the average vehicles, and if spaces are divided, we would probably have to issue penalties to those that squeeze in to small gaps that “span” two bays.

One (from Cromer Street) objected that the increased restriction times would affect visitors.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities for residents and visitors alike, though visitors may need to use visitor vouchers.

One (from Cromer Street) commented that the parking bays should be subdivided into individual spaces.

Dividing parking bays in to individual spaces does not gain capacity, as we have to mark spaces for larger than the average vehicles, and if spaces are divided, we would probably have to issue penalties to those that squeeze in to small gaps that “span” two bays.

One (from Cromer Street) objected, that non-residents should not have permits and the roads should be “residents only”.

The roads are effectively “permits only” during the restriction times, and the issue of permits to non-residents is controlled.

One (from Cromer Street) commented that the extension of the restriction times in the afternoon would affect trade to the Nelson Arms, and requested that Pay & Display could be introduced to allow afternoon customer parking.

It may be possible to withdraw the afternoon restriction time change over a limited part of Cromer Street and Nelson Avenue near to the Nelson Arms, to maintain the current times.

One (from Gladstone Road) supported the proposals in general but did not want the extension of the restriction times. They also commented that the main parking issues were overnight.

The increased times would enable more effective enforcement and should free-up spaces, giving more parking opportunities.

The overnight parking issues are indicative that the ultimate parking capacity has been reached, and there is little that the Council can do to address this, as we cannot control the level of vehicle ownership.

One (from Norfolk Road) objected, but gave no reasons.

One (from Preston Road) supported the proposal but wanted the parking bays marked to individual spaces.

Dividing parking bays in to individual spaces does not gain capacity, as we have to mark spaces for larger than the average vehicles, and if spaces are divided, we would probably have to issue penalties to those that squeeze in to small gaps that “span” two bays.

One (from Preston Road) supported the proposals but wanted facilities for tradesmen working at properties to park without getting a ticket – but without the householder having to buy permits.

This is not possible – tradesmen can access properties using visitor vouchers, but at a small cost to the resident

One (from Preston Road) supported the proposals, but made 11 comments or observations;

- 1. Some people who have moved out of the area retain their permits.**
The Council ask for proof of residency when renewing permits, especially when it is known that properties have been re-occupied.
- 2. Lifestyle Ford customers cars should not be parked in Zone D, and should use the spare capacity in the station car park, and charge their customers.**
The operation of the station car park is outside our control, as are the actions of Lifestyle Ford and how they manage their customers.
- 3. The Council proposals to relocate the Council Offices from the Castle to the Library will put more parking pressure on Zone D**
This is not part of the parking proposals, but these proposals should improve access in Avebury Avenue to the library for those with disabilities.
- 4. Have 3 different types of permit – 1. Residents, 2. Official workers permits 3. Visitor parking**
This over-complicates the parking situation and is not necessary.
- 5. Barden Park council car park could be converted in part to residents parking only, and remainder Pay & Display.**
This is not the intention, though the Barden Park car park charges are subject to review.
- 6. The time restrictions in Zone D1 & D2 to remain unchanged.**
The existing permit times are difficult to patrol effectively and there are frequent comments of abuse.
- 7. Exemptions for D2 permit holders to park in the Barden Park Council car park.**
This is not the intention.
- 8. Zone D1 permit holders to have exemptions to park in the station car park.**
As in point 2, the operation of the station car park is outside our control.
- 9. Support for the proposals, providing it does not result in the closure of the Tourist Information Centre, Library and Adult Education Centre, nor the selling of the Castle Offices for development as exclusive flats – or English Heritage?**
The parking changes result from requests from residents of the area and are proposed for the management of the parking and the highway, and should not be linked to other external conditions.
- 10. If 2 homes in D1 & D2, residents permits for official residence only.**
The Council only allow residents permits to the property people are resident in, and this is confirmed by checking vehicle documents and council tax records.
- 11. Free visitor passes (10 a year?) for registered disabled, as disabled often need nurses, carers etc. and might use more visitor passes than others.**
Carers permits are already available, and we issue 10 free visitors vouchers with each permit.

Though there are a number of comments and objections (several that are repeated across the area), there were significantly more respondents in favour of the proposal than against.

Some of the objections are in direct opposition to each other (as is often the case when considering a complex scheme).

Councillor comments

Councillor Bolt (speaking for Councillor Cure as well) asked that the proposal to allow D1 permits to park in D2, but D2 not be allowed to D1 be removed, and that D1 and D2 should effectively be 2 separate areas.

This was not the original intention of the proposal, as D1 has higher parking pressures than D2, but can be accommodated by a minor amendment to the proposal.

Amendments to the proposal

At the formal consultation stage there are few opportunities to amend a proposal, as restrictions cannot be extended or new restrictions introduced.

There are three changes that could be accommodated.

The changes to parking restriction times in Holford Street and Danvers Road could be abandoned, retaining the 8am-6pm times rather than 9:30-11:30am and 4-6pm, though the bays would still change to permit holders only.

The D1 and D2 areas could be treated as two separate areas, with no parking for D1 permit holders in the D2 area and vice-versa.

The proposed change to the time restriction in the bays on the northeast side of Nelson Avenue (between Cromer Street and Caistor Road) could only be applied to the mornings, retaining the existing afternoon time limits, as this would assist the trade at the Nelson Arms.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals should be amended as discussed above, the objections set aside, and the amended proposals introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 24 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	2	1	0	3

Analysis

The one objection was that the proposed parking places could affect the turning movements of large or long vehicles attempting to turn left in to Barden Road.

The proposals have been circulated to the Police, the Freight transport Association, the Road Haulage Association and the bus companies that operate in the area. There have been no responses from the statutory consultees, save for the Police, who raised no objection.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 30 properties. We received the following responses;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	0	3	1	4

Analysis

Both objections were not from residents of the area.

All three objections were that changing the 30 minute short-stay free parking to 2 hour pay and display parking would be to the detriment of those who wanted to park for only short durations, and this could be detrimental to the local shops.

It has been shown that very short duration parking is not particularly productive to retail establishments as the “dwell time” is not sufficient. The proposals still allow very short-stay parking if required, but allow the longer, more productive short-stay parking. Additionally we are proposing additional parking places to help increase parking opportunity.

The parking bay restrictions do not apply in to the evenings so local restaurant and take-away trade should not be affected.

The “don’t know” comment was from the local night-club that asked for other alterations;

- **that the parking bays on River Lawn Road be suspended (presumably to become “No waiting”) between 10pm and 4am**

This is not part of the current proposal but could be considered as part of a later review.

- **that the proposed disabled parking bays also be a night-time (10pm-4am) taxi facility be retained as this assists in dispersing customers**

This is not legally possible, as disabled parking bays cannot be used as taxi ranks at other times. Advice about demand and location of taxi ranks was taken from the Licensing Team prior to making the proposal to remove the existing under-used bay. However, the re-development of the High Street includes potential for additional taxi facilities.

- **that the Pay & Display parking should be free from 6pm**

This is already the proposal.

Formal Recommendation

It is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced.

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. An area has also been identified where additional parking can be created.

Informal consultation

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

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

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

Informal 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.

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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation we wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 62 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	3	0	0	1

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposals, It is recommended that the proposals be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Permission for the new vehicle accesses was granted by Kent County Council, and the right of access to the highway supersedes 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough’s website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 26 properties. No responses were received.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposals, It is recommended that the proposals be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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)

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 16 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	1	2	0	3

Analysis

The objections related to the parking pressures in the area that the loss of a parking place would exacerbate, and that the only vehicle that seems to have a problem is the refuse freighter, that now reverses in to Northcote Road.

Formal Recommendation

Given the parking pressure in the area, and the adaptation that the refuse freighters have adopted to reverse in to the road (where there no turning facilities at the other end anyway), the objections should be upheld and the proposals abandoned.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals can be amended to delete the double yellow lines, but given the wider concerns about non-permit-holder parking, the Council 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 22 properties at the northern end of Cromer Street. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

The "don't know" responses was from a resident who sent numerous pieces of correspondence about dividing the existing parking bays in to individual spaces, rather than commenting on the actual proposals.

The proposal to change the times of restriction in Holford Street and Danvers Road to similar to the other permit parking areas nearby would have presented a simple system for residents.

However, if residents want to retain the 8am-6pm restriction times this can be accommodated.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no relevant comments, the proposals should be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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. This is outside the remit of the Borough, and would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 87 properties (1 was returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	6	2	0	8

Analysis

Both objections related to the proposed change in times of the parking restrictions, that the existing 8am-6pm restriction times should be retained.

The proposal to change the times of restriction in Holford Street and Danvers Road to similar to the other permit parking areas nearby would have presented a simple system for residents.

However, if residents want to retain the 8am-6pm restriction times this can be accommodated.

Formal Recommendation

The proposal be amended to retain the 8am-6pm time restrictions, the objections set aside and the proposals be introduced.

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.

Informal Recommendation

The revised proposals proceed to formal consultation

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation notices were placed on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

However no responses were received.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 43 properties in the road. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

One response (generally in favour) was also an objection to the proposal for double yellow lines in front of the garage access to No. 38.

The proposal can be amended to delete the short stretch of double yellow lines.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals should be amended as discussed, and the objection set aside, and the amended proposals introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to 46 properties and responses were received from 12 properties.

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

14th March 2016

The Council wrote directly to 46 properties (5 were returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	7	0	0	7

Analysis

A number of the comments in favour made alternate suggestions, or asked that the proposals be strengthened even more, suggesting residents only parking at all times, or suggesting alternative restriction times (though this would not fit with the existing restrictions elsewhere).

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 25 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

The objection was received from the nearby Clinic, who commented that they may not have enough disabled parking places to be able to cater for the demand, and that they wished to retain the facility for blue badge holders to park on the double yellow lines.

There is a specific requirement associated with restrictions on loading and unloading, that should be considered. - if they attract objections then they must (if to be taken forward) be considered at a full public enquiry.

Formal Recommendation

As the proposal attracted an objection, it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned to avoid the need to hold a Public Enquiry for such a minor issue.

As the initial concerns related to obstructive parking, Kent County Council may wish to re-visit the issue or seek alternative solutions, as it is their remit to prevent obstruction of the public Highway.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 14 properties. The following responses were received.

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

Analysis

The objection was on the grounds that they did not think the change in times would make a lot of difference, and residents would not want to buy a permit.

Formal Recommendation

As there was an objection and no expressions of support, the proposal should be abandoned.
Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

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.

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 66 properties. The following responses were received.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	12	1	1	14

Analysis

The objection was that, though the proposals would improve visibility, when a vehicle larger than a car parks at that location all day it is impossible.

Formal Recommendation

The one objection actually suggests the proposal would improve visibility and is more a request for enforcement than an objection. Taken with the high level of response in favour of the proposal, the recommendation is that the objection is set aside and the proposals implemented.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 61
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Mill Lane and Mill Crescent
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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 87 properties. The following responses were received.

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	3	1	1	5

Analysis

The objection was from a resident of Shrublands Court (who are not eligible for parking permits), that when their car park is full, they would have less opportunity to park on-street due to the extended restriction times.

Parking within Shrublands Court is an issue for their management company to address – they have facility to require that residents make better use of their facilities and garages, rather than choosing to park out on-street.

There was also a comment that the first bay in Mill Lane should be retained as short-stay limited waiting, rather than become permit only at certain times, as this was a valuable resource to the local parade of shops.

Formal Recommendation

The proposal should be amended to delete any change to the first parking bay in Mill Lane, to maintain facility for the local businesses. The objection should be set aside, and the revised proposal be introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 10 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 86 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	3	1	0	4

Analysis

The objection related to the misuse of the visitors parking places within the private part of Whitefriars Wharf by visitors to the town, and when those spaces were occupied there was little option but to park on the double yellow lines.

The management of the parking arrangements within the private area of Whitefriars Wharf would be for the Management Company to address.

Formal Recommendation

The objection is set aside and the proposals be introduced.

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.

The Council have proposed the option that best meets the needs of preventing obstruction along the road.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 63 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	17	11	1	29

Analysis**Two objections commented, that the proposals would prevent them from having visitors.**

The proposals do not prevent parking in any of the lengths of road, they are intended to prevent parking where it would cause an obstruction, or where it is against the advice within the Highway Code.

One objection was that there would be no parking for visitors, and that residents would create more parking in their front gardens.

The restrictions do not prevent parking in the road altogether, so parking for visitors would be possible.

One commented that parking in the cul-de-sac part of Royal Avenue (near No.4) was not possible due to the driveways, so the restrictions were unnecessary.

The proposals would enable us to deal with any obstructive parking that may occur, rather than have to defer to the police. If parking does not occur, then the restrictions should not matter.

There was also a request from several residents for a residents parking scheme.

This has previously been discussed with residents in a prior consultation and set aside, as all the properties have off-street parking facilities.

There was an objection that restrictions in the cul-de-sac end would prevent parking by residents outside their own house, and that they were unaware of any problems with parking in the turning area.

One commented that the parking restrictions should be swapped to the other side of the road outside No.7 as this would give more parking as there are fewer driveways.

Due to the road width at this location this would make access to the properties difficult and the gap is best left on the south side.

Some objectors commented that the problems were only during weekdays, and suggested that a single yellow line restriction during the day should be used, allowing parking at evenings and weekends.

This has previously been discussed with residents in a prior consultation and set aside, as the obstruction problems can happen at all times, and the proposals emphasise the advice with the Highway Code.

One objected, that the existing situation should be retained, with no restrictions, but with the school being required to park their cars within the school grounds.

This had previously been attempted, but had not been effective.

One resident asked that if there were to be double yellow lines outside their house, if the Council would extend their driveway to give room for 2 cars, free of charge.

This is not something the Council would consider.

One resident asked that the end-on lay-by opposite No.46 be designated as limited waiting.

This is not part of the proposals at this time.

Formal Recommendation

The proposals for restrictions in the cul-de-sac part of Royal Avenue should be deleted, as this seems to be what the residents of that area want, and this is not part of the “through route”,

The proposals on Goldsmid Road (opposite the Royal Avenue junction) should be deleted as residents wanted to maintain parking in this area and this does not affect the movement through the area.

The other objections should be set-aside as the proposals are intended to maintain access along the road, and all the properties have off-street parking, in many cases for more than one vehicle.

The amended proposals should be implemented.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

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

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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposal proceeds to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 27 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Analysis

One respondent asked that the proposed restrictions be extended.

Another commented that there ought to be a sign at 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.

Informal Recommendation

The proposals be extended, and proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 11 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

Parking Plan – Phase 8 – Location Summary

Location reference	Phase 8 - 67
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Vauxhall
Road / Area	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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 16 properties. The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	3	7	0	10

Analysis

There was a strong response against the proposals, including some comments from those who would use the driveways that would be covered by the restriction, mainly citing the loss of on-street parking, and that access was still possible.

Formal Recommendation

The objections should be upheld and the proposals abandoned.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

If changes are made 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 103 properties (though 1 was returned by Royal Mail). The following responses were received;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	14	4	0	18

Analysis

All four objections related to the introduction of an afternoon restriction, suggesting that there was not an afternoon parking problem, or if there was it was only at the bottom of the road.

The proposals is not for new parking bays and would not require new permits – it would only require visitors during the afternoon to use visitors vouchers (as they already do in the morning), but would deter the longer-stay parking that is already evident at the lower end of the road.

Formal Recommendation

The objections only related to the introduction of the additional afternoon restriction, and should be compared to the strong support for the proposal. Accordingly the objections should be set aside and the proposals introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal Recommendation

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

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

We Council wrote directly to 41 properties. The following responses were received;

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

The Parish Council also commented in favour of the proposal.

Formal Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposal, the Members note that the proposals should be implemented on the agreement of the Portfolio Holder.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

The Council needs 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 26 properties. The following responses were received;

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

The Parish Council also commented in favour of the proposal.

Analysis

- **One objection was that no reason was given for the relocation of the disabled bay, and that it would remove parking for the rest of the residents.**

The reason for the proposal is to provide a better facility for the disabled resident and to improve traffic movements.

- **One commented that the Ordnance Survey mapping had the house names on the wrong properties.**

This is outside our control as we do not carry out the mapping surveys, but does not change the proposal.

- **One commented that moving the bay would make little difference, and that a one-way system was required in St Marys Road, along with a width restriction.**

These issues are outside the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.

Formal Recommendation

The objections are not actually linked to the proposal – rather to resident not understanding why the proposal was being made, though this information was available.

It is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced.

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 12th October 2015 to 2nd of November.

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

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

Informal 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.

Informal 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.

Formal Consultation

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22nd January to 21st February 2016.

As part of the consultation the Council wrote to local residential properties, placed notices on-street, on the Borough's website and in the local newspaper.

The Council wrote directly to 14 properties. The following responses were received;

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

Analysis

- **The two objections were that there was no need for the restriction, as there had never been anyone park outside their house, and that the issues were about queuing school traffic waiting to get in to the school.**

The proposals are intended to assist any enforcement in the area and to reinforce the school access procedures.

The proposals were supported by the School.

Formal Recommendation

As these proposals are intended to assist the safe management of the environment outside the school, it is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced.