

Location reference	West Malling 1
Road / Area	Changes to permit parking areas
Plan reference:	N/A

### Formal Consultation

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

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

The Council directly to 748 properties, covering every street where permits are currently available, or could be associated with the other proposals in this review.

The Council received the following response;

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

### Analysis

The response was extremely low (2 of 748), suggesting that the majority support the proposals or are not concerned enough to object to the changes.

One objection was from a resident of King Street, objecting that;

- **King Street should not be included in the WM1 area**
- **That there are no proposals for parking controls in the unrestricted parts of King Street.**

The residential properties in King Street could be added to the WM1 area, but this could reduce the short-stay parking availability for the town. This has only been raised by one respondent.

**One resident of Police Station Road objected to the loss of facility for residents to park in the High Street, and did not feel the option to park in the other permit areas suitable.**

The changes allow the residents of Police Station Road to park in a number of other areas, but not in the WM1 part of the High Street during the day. Daytime parking availability in Police Station Road should be increased for residents as short-stay parking non-residents would be excluded.

### Formal Recommendation

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 2
Road / Area	Police Station Road, Meadowbank and Frog Lane
Plan reference:	DD/578/6a

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 110 properties, and we received the following response;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	7	3	1	11

The Council actually wrote to residents twice, as the original plan contained a drafting error, and once identified replacement plans were circulated to residents.

**Analysis**

**One objection was from a resident of Frog Lane, who agreed that the proposals ought to be "residents only" but wanted the restrictions extended to cover seven days a week, from 8am to 10pm.**

This would require residents who are normally away during the day to acquire permits, and would place additional onus on residents to use visitor vouchers during the evenings and on Sundays, which has been unpopular in other permit areas.

**One who supported the proposals asked that the restrictions be extended to the end of the road, by Meadowbank Mews**

This is already included within the proposal. All the parking bays in Police Station Road and Meadowbank would be subject to the same restriction.

**There was also a request to sub-divide the parking bays to individual spaces.**

This tends to reduce parking capacity, as the Council would have to mark spaces to cater for larger than the average car.

**One comment (from a resident of Police Station Road) was that Frog Lane should be a separate zone, and that permits only be issued to Frog Lane residents that have no off-street parking.**

We do not have the facility to restrict permits to those that have or have not got off-street spaces, and the limited spaces in Frog Lane may not meet the permit requirements of residents.

**One resident of Police Station Road commented that they thought they would not be able to park in any other permit areas and that the parking availability in Police Station Road was not enough.**

The proposed permit changes would allow residents for WM2 (Police Station Road and Frog Lane) to park in any other permit areas, save for the WM1 spaces in the High Street, though removing the

limited waiting parking in Police Station Road and Frog Lane should improve the opportunities for residents to park.

**One resident of Police Station Road commented that some element of short-stay parking will always be required, for workmen, carers etc.**

The existing visitor voucher scheme allows for visitors to resident parking schemes.

One objector commented that the plans were out of date (this had been identified and revised plans circulated, and it seems appropriate that his objection is discounted).

**One resident of Police Station Road objected to the loss of facility for residents to park in the High Street, and did not feel the option to park in the other permit areas suitable.**

This relates to the changing of the parking zone codes rather than the proposals for Police Station Road and has been assigned to that element of the consultation.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 3
Road / Area	Swan Street
Plan reference:	DD/578/7

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 114 properties and we received the following response;

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

**Analysis**

**One objection was received from a resident of Swan Street, but no reasons were given for the objection.**

**Formal Recommendation**

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 4
Road / Area	Town Hill
Plan reference:	DD/578/5

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 42 properties and we received the following response;

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

**Analysis**

**One objection was received from a resident of Town Hill, commenting that parking at the brow of Town Hill is dangerous and has caused many accidents. The resident then called for additional off-street parking and suggested a multi-storey car park at either of the two car parks, or a car park in the country park opposite Douces Manor. They also suggested a park and ride from the railway station with shuttle buses exclusively for West Malling.**

Unfortunately most of the issues are not achievable within the constraints of budget and land ownership.

The report of "many accidents" would be an issue for Kent County Council to investigate as it has the remit for safety on the public highway.

**One objection was that if there was no space to park in the WM4 area, there would be no nearby alternative for the residents of Town Hill.**

The proposals allow the residents of Town Hill access to the parking bays in Nevill Court (which have previously been unavailable) and this should assist.

**Formal Recommendation**

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 5
Road / Area	Offham Road (North of Fartherwell Avenue)
Plan reference:	DD/578/5

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 176 properties and we received the following response;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	21	19	2	42

A further analysis was undertaken on the distribution of responses by road.

Road	Houses consulted	Responses	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Undelivered
Churchfields	65	13	5	8	0	1
Fartherwell Avenue	6	2	1	1	0	0
Norman Road	9	0	0	0	0	0
Offham Road	71	24	14	8	2	0
Sandown Road	1	1	1	0	0	0
West Street	25	2	0	2	0	1

**Analysis**

The responses show an interesting distribution of responses;

The residents of Churchfields (who had previously opted out of involvement in the parking review process and did not want to be part of the parking scheme) have commented strongly against parking controls in Offham Road (north), mainly citing concerns about parking pressures in Churchfields and that parking controls in Offham Road (north) would exacerbate the situation.

**Details of the responses will be available at the meeting.**

The responses from the bottom of Fartherwell Avenue were split, with one supporting the proposals (and asking for more restrictions around the "island" of the Scared Crow), and one objecting to the proposals, but giving no reasons.

The responses from West Street were both objections, one that the proposed car park charges will push motorists to park on-street, where existing parking enforcement is not sufficient, and one whose comments actually related to the proposals for Norman Road.

The responses from Offham Road (north) were split, but with more in favour of the proposals than against.

A study of the distribution of the Offham Road (north) responses shows that most of the objections stemmed from properties on the southern side at the Norman Road end (where there were few off-street spaces) though there were a couple on the northern side near to the Scared Crow.

Most of the comments supporting the proposals were from properties between the two areas, where most have off-street parking, sometimes for more than one vehicle.

**Details of the responses will be available at the meeting.**

There are differing concerns amongst the residents – objections tend to cite the need for parking facilities, but those in favour tend to cite safety concerns about the current arrangements and access problems.

#### **Formal Recommendation**

The proposals are intended to provide as much parking as possible within the terms of national legislation, whilst maintaining access to properties and priority for residents to park, in preference to non-residents.

There are concerns about displacement parking to Churchfields, but in previous surveys there was a strong response from the residents that they did not want any parking controls.

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 6
Road / Area	Norman Road
Plan reference:	DD/578/4

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 169 properties and we received the following response;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	18	13	0	31

**Analysis**

The responses received were reasonably distributed along the road, but with more in favour of the proposals in the eastern end of the road (up to No. 47).

There were more objections from the western part of the road (west of No.47), where there was development only on one side of the road, but where a larger number of properties had no off-street parking.

There was also a cluster of responses (both in favour and against) around the Alma Road junction.

**Details of the responses will be available at the meeting.**

As in Offham Road, there are differing concerns amongst the residents – objections tend to cite the need for parking facilities, but those in favour tend to cite safety concerns about the current arrangements and access problems.

**Formal Recommendation**

The proposals are intended to provide as much parking as possible within the terms of national legislation, whilst maintaining access to properties and priority for residents to park, in preference to non-residents.

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



**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 7
Road / Area	Offham Road (South)
Plan reference:	DD/578/2

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 44 properties, and we received the following response;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	9	3	1	13

**Analysis****One objection was that this would affect the parking for staff at the sheltered housing at Meadowview .**

The Design and Access statement that supported the development of Meadowview stated that there was no requirement for residents parking at the site due to the extent of disabilities, and that parking was only required for staff and visitors, and this was taken forward as a condition of the development.

Parking in Offham Road is not being prevented, it is being controlled to the areas where it would not cause an obstruction or a safety issue, so there should still be some element of on-street parking available.

**One objection was that the proposals moved parking to the eastern side of the road, and this could affect visibility for drivers emerging from the properties on the eastern side.**

There are fewer properties on the eastern side, so less properties would be affected, and the driveways are much wider than those on the western side, improving visibility for traffic emerging.

**One response (recorded as an objection) raised questions as a "freedom of information" request. They questioned whether the bus stop on the eastern side had been considered for restrictions. They also raised the issue of potential speeding along Offham Road, as parking would be constrained to one side.**

**They also raised the issue that entering and emerging from driveways on the side where parking would be permitted could be a problem.**

**Another concern that was raised was about enforcement of parking and pavement parking that was a problem near to the Scared Crow.**

Bus stops do not automatically attract parking controls, and it would be for Kent County Council and the bus operators to discuss the level of facility or protection required to a bus stop.

Speeding on Offham Road (south) is of concern, and on-street parking would assist in managing

traffic speed, but removing obstruction and preventing parking on the bends and around the junctions are also a concern, but ultimately, safety issues on the public Highway are for Kent County Council to address.

The proposed parking restrictions would be enforced by the Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers, and where parking restrictions are in place they are also able to address pavement parking (otherwise it would be for Kent Police to address).

The FOI request has been dealt with separately.

**One objection was that parking in Offham Road (South) was not a problem, and that parking for staff at the sheltered accommodation would be affected.**

Parking issues had been raised as a concern to the Steering Group by the Parish Council and local residents.

**One (in favour of the proposals) commented that the yellow lines should be on the other side of the road, not the side where most residents live.**

The side where most residents live has the least capacity for parking, due to the higher number of driveways, and having the restrictions on the side with the most properties makes access and egress easier.

**One (in favour of the proposal) commented that they didn't have a dropped kerb to their driveway, and were looking to Russett Homes to address this.**

This is outside of our remit and would be for the residents Landlord and Kent County Council to resolve.

**One commented that they were concerned about parking displacement from the sheltered housing, which might require them to dig up their front garden to provide parking (in addition to their current 2 spaces) for any visitors they might have.**

This would be for the householder to consider, but on-street parking would still be maintained to some extent.

**One commented that parking could be maintained on the east side of the road in the layby next to Manor Farm Drive, as this would not be an inconvenience to residents.**

This is contrary to the complaints that had been previously reported – the "layby" is actually part of the visibility splay for the driveway.

**Formal Recommendation**

The proposals are intended to provide as much parking as possible within the terms of national legislation, whilst maintaining access to properties.

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 8
Road / Area	Fartherwell Avenue
Plan reference:	DD/578/3

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 70 properties, and we received the following response;

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

**Analysis**

**One objection (from Alma Road) was that West Malling is getting more like Croydon, with no room to move on the side streets, due to the volume of traffic generated by Kings Hill that has destroyed West Malling town.**

This is outside of the remit of the parking review, but is in effect a supporting reason for parking management.

**One objection was that the introduction of yellow lines would just move the problem up the road, which is no answer.**

The intention is to move parking from areas where the Highway Code says that parking should not occur to areas where it would cause less issue.

One commented, asking for traffic calming in Fartherwell Avenue – though this would be for Kent County Council to consider.

**Formal Recommendation**

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

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 9
Road / Area	High Street (Loading bay and taxi rank)
Plan reference:	DD/578/8

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 78 properties and we received the following response;

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

**Formal Recommendation**

As there were no objections to the proposal, the proposal should be introduced.

**Location Summary**

Location reference	West Malling 10
Road / Area	A20 London Road
Plan reference:	DD/578/9

**Formal Consultation**

The Borough Council carried out formal consultation in accordance with the statutory requirements, from 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 21<sup>st</sup> 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 54 properties and we received the following response;

	In favour	Against	Don't Know	Totals
Responses	5	5	0	10

**Analysis**

**The 5 objections were from residents of London Road (between Parkfoot Garage and Brickfields), whereas those in support were mainly from Brickfields.**

The objections related to loss of parking facilities in an area where there is little alternative.

Residents repeated their calls for permit parking arrangements on the footway (though this has been previously discussed and is not viable due to the buried services and highway drainage issues) and also commented that the proposed restrictions would place additional parking pressure on the already limited space.

There were also comments that the parking situation had deteriorated since the development of the Parkfoot Garage and the construction of new properties in Brickfields.

The comments in support tended to agree with protecting visibility when exiting Brickfields.

**Details of the responses will be available at the meeting.**

**Formal Recommendation**

There is a mixed response to the proposals, and there are three options for Members to consider:

1. The objections be set aside, and the proposals introduced as drawn.
2. The objections be upheld and the proposals be withdrawn in their entirety.
3. The objections be upheld and the proposals be amended, deleting the double yellow lines from the exit of the Parkfoot garage and outside No.267.