

### Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-01
Town	Aylesford
Ward	Aylesford South
Road / Area	Pratling Street / Beddow Way
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/01

#### Summary

New double yellow lines

#### Issue

Residents report that parking to the west of the Beddow Way junction causes problems.

#### Initial investigation

Double yellow lines could be installed on the north side to move any parking further from the residential properties, however, the location is on the boundary with Maidstone Borough and any changes should be promoted with the agreement of our neighbouring authority.

#### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 24 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
6 (25%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)

#### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was average for this sort of proposal, with the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

#### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the positive nature of the responses, it is recommended that the Joint Transportation Board agree that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

#### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

#### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 24 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (29.1%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-04
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Brockway / Normanhurst Road and Mountfield
Requested by	Fairseat Residents Association
Plan reference:	DD/589/04

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

The Fairseat Residents Association has asked for new restrictions to prevent obstructive parking and to improve access and visibility at junctions.

### Initial investigation

Junction protection double yellow lines would assist traffic movements, but due to the restricted road widths the restrictions should be extended to cover the whole length of one side of the affected areas so parking only occurs on one side.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 70 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
35 (50%)	12 (34.3%)	23 (65.7%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a strong response rate to the informal consultation, with the majority of those who responded objecting to the proposals. This included responses from members of the Fairseat Residents Association, who could not specifically recall asking for parking controls, but commented that retaining on-street parking would assist in maintaining lower vehicle speeds

This strong level of response and objection to the proposals suggests that the proposals are not supported

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the comments of residents be noted by the Board and the proposals be abandoned.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposals have not been taken further.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-05
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Hunts Farm Close and Griggs Way
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/05

### Summary

New double yellow lines and permit parking area.

### Issue

Request for permit parking to deter non-resident parking and to prevent obstructive parking.

### Initial investigation

A new "permit holders past this point" restriction would deter non-resident parking in both parts of the cul-de-sac and new double yellow lines would assist preventing obstructive parking and parking at the junction.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 56 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
27 (48.2%)	16 (59.3%)	9 (33.3%)	2 (7.4%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a good level of response from residents, with the majority in favour, but a sizable number objected to the proposals.

Review of the responses compared to addresses shows that there was more support for permit parking by the residents of Hunts Farm Close, and more objection to the proposals from the residents in Griggs Way – which reflects the differing sizes of property and the level of off-street parking provision to each property.

There were also objections from residents that they would have to pay for parking permits.

There was also a suggestion that there should be additional double yellow lines at the top end of Hunts Farm Close to prevent obstruction of the access to the parking area.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

The consultation responses are varied, but it does suggest that there is a problem around the junction with Maidstone Road and in Hunts Farm Close. However, if restrictions were introduced just at these locations then the problem is likely to displace further in to each part of the cul-de-sac.

It is recommended that the Members of the Board review the consultation responses, and agree that the proposals should be amended (with additional double yellow lines at the top of Hunts Farm Close) and proceed to formal consultation, which may produce a clearer view.

Revised proposals are shown in plan ref DD/589/05A

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the amended proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 56 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
18 (32.1%)	11 (61.1%)	5 (27.8%)	2 (11.1%)

### **Analysis**

There was a good level of response to the proposals with the majority of response in favour. The objections covered a number of issues, including comments that some did not want to pay for parking permits and that to avoid parking permits there would be more parking pressure on the private car park.

However, more commented in favour of the proposals and some asked that they are extended further. Some qualified their support, that permits to residents ought to be free.

However, the proposals were designed to deter non-resident parking and parking where it would cause an obstruction but also maintain as much on-street parking as possible, and the restrictions reflect this

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the expressed views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than the “objection” which also wanted the restrictions. Accordingly the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-06
Town	Borough Green
Ward	Borough Green & Long Mill
Road / Area	Fairfield Road
Requested by	Parish Council
Plan reference:	DD/589/06

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

The Parish Council have asked for new double yellow lines near No's 74 & 76 to address parking concerns on the bend and associated safety issues.

### Initial investigation

New double yellow lines would assist in preventing parking on the bend but there may be displacement parking to other areas, and nearby accesses should also be protected to prevent obstruction.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 21 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
12 (57.1%)	9 (75%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a strong response rate to the informal consultation, with the majority of those who responded supporting the proposals. One indicated partial support, but wanted the restrictions on the south side of the road only.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 21 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals "on deposit" at the Council Offices and on the Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (33.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)

### **Analysis**

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals. There was one stated objection, which then went on to support the proposals, but commented that they did not go far enough and more were needed. The “don't know” also expressed a preference for restrictions but asked that they be extended further.

However, the proposals were designed to maintain as much on-street parking as possible, and this reflects the comments made at the informal consultation stage

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the expressed views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than the “objection” which also wanted the restrictions. Accordingly the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

### **Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary**

Location reference	11-08
Town	Ditton
Ward	Ditton
Road / Area	Fernleigh Rise
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	N/A

#### **Issue**

Report of obstructive and damaging verge parking, Residents have asked for a permit parking scheme to ration parking between residents.

#### **Initial investigation**

Obstructive parking has been addressed by KCC, introducing a number of bollards to protect verges from parking. This may have changed the parking habits in the area and it is recommended that the parking be monitored and if necessary be addressed in a following phase of the Parking Action Plan.

#### **Analysis**

Whilst residents may request a preferential parking scheme, it would not be appropriate for this sort of area. KCC's new bollards may resolve the parking to a tolerable level and this should be monitored and included in a future Phase if further intervention is required.

**This was agreed at the March 2019 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board and accordingly the proposals have progressed no further.**

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-09
Town	Ditton
Ward	Ditton
Road / Area	Brampton Field
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/09

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking, parking on bends and parking on pavements.

### Initial investigation

The design standards applied to the road by the developer encourages parking outside the terms of the Highway Code, and this causes problems to traffic movements and for pedestrians. Double yellow lines to emphasise the Highway Code would assist in maintaining access.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 106 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
35 (33%)	12 (34.3%)	23 (65.7%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, but with the majority of respondents not supporting the proposals.

There were several comments from residents who did not support the proposals who felt that some changes were warranted as parked cars caused problems, but that parking was in short supply and convenient parking was a higher priority.

Local Member Cllr Cooper also commented that the proposals should be reduced to cover the area from No's 1 to 28, with some parking swapped to the other side in front of No's 1-9.

Whilst they may seem excessive, the Borough's proposals support the requirements of the Highway Code and the parking pressures in the area are a reflection of the poor road design and the low levels of parking provision compared to the residential parking demand.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposals be reduced in line with Cllr Cooper's comments and proceed to formal consultation.

Revised proposals are shown in plan ref DD/589/09A

## Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 106 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
38 (35.8%)	18 (47.4%)	20 (52.6%)	0 (0%)

### Analysis

Again there was a good level of response, and this time the responses were more evenly split.

The objections covered a number of points (detailed in the responses) with the most frequent objection being that the proposals would displace parking further in to the estate and exacerbate the parking issues further in to Brampton Field. However, there was a common theme of support that current parking at the entrance to the estate was obstructive and caused problems.

The Parish Council also commented in favour of the proposals

It is evident that the parking pressures in the area are predominantly related to resident parking and are a function of the design of the estate roads and the style and location of parking provision. Whilst all properties have private parking provision, it is either insufficient to meet residents’ demands, or are detached from the property and residents are choosing not to use the facilities as highway parking is more convenient.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. As the proposals are intended to maintain access and prevent obstructive parking it is recommended that the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-10
Town	Ditton
Ward	Ditton
Road / Area	Firs Close
Requested by	Cllr Walker
Plan reference:	DD/589/10

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Request for double yellow lines in Firs Close to ease traffic movements in the narrow road

### Initial investigation

Firs Close is narrow, and would benefit from double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking, particularly on the bend.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 21 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (33.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, but the responses were mixed – there was support for introducing restrictions but the majority wished for the restrictions to be on the other side of the road.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposals be adjusted so that the restrictions are on the other side of the road and proceed to formal consultation.

Revised proposals are shown in plan ref DD/589/10A

### Other issue raised at informal consultation

One resident requested improved junction markings and a yellow box marking at the junction of Firs Close and The Avenue – though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in its role as the Highway Authority, and the Highway Authority are asked to note this request.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 21 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (33.3%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-11
Town	Ditton
Ward	Ditton
Road / Area	A20 London Road
Requested by	Cllr Thornewell
Plan reference:	DD/589/11

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Request for parking restrictions to deter all-day parking by vans opposite the former Kia garage site, where "white vans" associated with a local subcontracting courier park-up when not in use, and also parking issues at the entrance to Ditton Place.

### Initial investigation

The initial request related to vans parking on the A20 but these were not linked with the Kia garage. It would be a practical approach to introduce parking controls on the A20 between Larkfield Road and Bell Lane to help manage congestion and maintain capacity.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 84 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
8 (9.5%)	7 (87.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment, but few residential properties actually front on to the A20 at this location. Of those that commented, the proposals were generally supported.

It was commented that the proposals should be considered with Kent County Council's separate proposals for changes to the traffic management arrangements along the A20 which has also been the subject of public consultation.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 84 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
19 (22.6%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-12
Town	East Malling
Ward	East Malling
Road / Area	Bondfield Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/12

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have reported problems of obstructive parking around the junctions, in front of vehicle accesses and on the footways and verges.

### Initial investigation

The obstruction issues can be addressed with double yellow lines, but due to the numerous driveways to properties and the need to maintain access the proposal is likely to severely limit the available on-street parking capacity and there may be some displacement to other areas nearby.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 55 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (20%)	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment.

The objections related to the lack of existing parking facilities and the existing parking pressure in the area, and also commented that there would be no spaces left for visitors.

The “don't know” responded that they only wanted the double yellow lines down the non-residential side of Bondfield Road.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

The response was mixed, but with the majority suggesting that there was a parking problem in the area. The proposals have been designed to take in to consideration comments from residents who have experienced difficulties with vehicles parked close to and opposite their driveways, as the road is narrow and the driveways are narrow and are restricted by front walls or fences.

The proposals should assist in maintaining access to properties and reduce obstructive parking.

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### **Other issue raised at informal consultation**

One resident requested that Bondfield Road ought to be resurfaced, and that filling potholes does not work – though this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in it's role as the Highway Authority, and the Highway Authority are asked to note this request.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 55 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
12 (21.8%)	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The objections focussed on parking pressures in the area. Whilst one objector commented that they would have difficulties as a wheelchair user, they have an off-street parking facility.

Other objectors commented that the issues were mainly caused by a few residents who have a number of vehicles.

These comments present a mixed view from residents, with conflicting views of whether restrictions should be introduced or not.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but as the proposals are intended to prevent obstruction and maintain access it is recommended that the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-13
Town	East Malling
Ward	East Malling
Road / Area	Temple Way, Meridian Place and Carnation Crescent
Requested by	Cllr Roud
Plan reference:	DD/589/13

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have requested restrictions to deter parking around the new road junction with Meridian Place as large vans make visibility difficult.

### Initial investigation

Parking occurs close to the new junction with Meridian Place and junction protection should have been considered when the road was constructed. Meridian Place remains unadopted. Its noted that similar issues occur at the other junction (with Carnation Crescent) and this should be addressed at the same time.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 46 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
5 (10.9%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was very low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment, but those that did were in favour of the proposals.

One respondent asked for parking bays to be marked on Temple Way, but this is outside the scope of the proposals and would not provide any additional parking.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 46 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on

the Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
4 (8.7%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-14
Town	East Peckham
Ward	Hadlow & East Peckham
Road / Area	Medway Meadows, Hale Street and Old Road
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/589/14

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Local residents have reported problems with cars associated with a nearby car sales garage that are regularly parked on-street, causing obstruction and inconvenience to residents.

### Initial investigation

New double yellow lines on the bend and as junction protection could be provided, but if so the Old Road junction opposite should also be protected to prevent displacement issues. Due to the road layout, the restrictions should be extended further than normal northwards on Hale Street.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 39 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
20 (51.3%)	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, with the majority supporting the proposals. A number of the comments (including those objecting) confirmed that there was parking associated with the nearby car sales garage that caused problems. Concern was raised by some respondents that the proposals may displace the parking further in to the cul-de-sacs.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Other issue raised at informal consultation

One resident requested the speed limit on Hale Street should be reduced from 40mph to 30mph as it is essentially a residential village road. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in its role as the Highway Authority, and the Highway Authority are asked to note this request.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections

to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 39 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
17 (43.6%)	11 (64.7%)	6 (35.3%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

Again the consultation produced a majority in favour of the proposals. The objections tended to relate to a lack of confidence that the proposals would address the problems, and that a solution that prevented the problems caused by the parking by the nearby car garage was needed – though a number of the points raised about the vehicles being parked were outside of the Borough Council’s ability to control with parking restrictions.

The Parish Council responded in favour of the proposals

Cllr Rogers responded in favour of the proposals

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. As the proposals are intended to prevent parking at the junctions it is recommended that the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-15
Town	East Peckham
Ward	Hadlow & East Peckham
Road / Area	Orchard Road & The Freehold
Requested by	Cllr Jill Anderson
Plan reference:	DD/589/15

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

The Parish Council have reported that there is obstructive parking and pavement parking which causes problems for residents.

### Initial investigation

New double yellow lines could be introduced to constrain parking to the east side of Orchard Road, and also to cover the corner with The Freehold.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 36 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
22 (61.1%)	3 (13.6%)	18 (81.8%)	1 (4.5%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was high, with a significant proportion against the proposals.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the strength of the residential response against the proposal, it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned.

### Other issue raised at informal consultation

There were several responses from those who objected to the proposals to remove the footway on one side of the road to create more parking places. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in it's role as the Highway Authority, and the Highway Authority are asked to note this request.

There was also discussion about making Orchard Road and The Freehold one-way, which is again outside of the Borough Council's remit and would be for the Highway Authority to consider.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposals have not been taken further.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-16
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	Brooklands Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/16

### Summary

Extend existing double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have reported problems with obstructive parking and lack of passing places against oncoming traffic in the narrow access road.

### Initial investigation

The road is narrow, but has accommodated parking on one side for many years. However, this has caused problems for passing traffic. The parking restrictions could be re-arranged to ease access, provide more parking and still maintain low speeds.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 9 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, but the consultation was limited to the few properties in the road.

One response in favour wanted the restrictions extended to the area in front of No.3 (opposite accesses to No's 101 & 103) to ease turning movements.

The response in opposition to the proposal also asked that the restrictions be extended.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal be adjusted in line with the residents comments to include new double yellow lines in the area opposite the accesses to No's 101 & 103, and to proceed to formal consultation.

Revised proposals are shown in DD/589/16A

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections

to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 9 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
2 (22.2%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-17
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	Papyrus Way
Requested by	Cllr Mike Parry-Waller (now ex-Councillor)
Plan reference:	DD/589/17

### Summary

New single yellow lines and lorry overnight parking ban

### Issue

Change restrictions to allow overnight parking by residents of the nearby Ashlin Quarter development, but to prevent overnight lorry parking and the anti-social behaviour issues that this brings.

### Initial investigation

There is a need to balance the desires for residential overnight parking and access for large vehicles, but with controls to prevent overnight lorry parking due to anti-social behaviour issues. Single yellow lines would allow car parking and an overnight lorry parking ban would prevent "tramping".

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 81 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
13 (16%)	7 (53.8%)	5 (38.5%)	1 (7.7%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was quite low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment.

The comments against the proposals varied, covering;

- problems within the private development that the developer could address, mainly due to residents who do not comply with the restrictive parking and vehicle ownership conditions of the development
- commercial vehicles parking or waiting on Papyrus Way with engines running
- lack of enforcement
- allowing parking would increase anti-social behaviour, noise, pollution and littering.

However, the proposals would provide a stronger opportunity for enforcement, a deterrent to parking by HGVs and relieve the nearby residential parking issues.

One resident suggested that the restriction times should be altered to 8am-5pm Monday to Friday rather than 8am-6pm, Monday to Saturday. However, the suggested times tie-in with other peak-time restrictions nearby and better reflect the need for HGV movements to and from the industrial units and the potential redevelopment of the Paper Mill site.

### **Recommendation after informal consultation**

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### **Other issue raised at informal consultation**

One respondent asked for speed limit signs, speed humps and a speed camera on Papyrus Way. However, these are outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in its role as the Highway Authority, and the Highway Authority are asked to note this request.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 81 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
10 (12.3%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The response rate was again fairly low, with responses split evenly between those supporting changes and those objecting.

The main elements of support for the proposals related the parking pressures on the Leybourne Park development, whereas the objections tended to comment that overnight parking would add to noise and pollution, and would also attract joy rides and anti-social behaviour.

There needs to be a balanced view of parking – the main reasons for parking is either residential cars (by those living on the Leybourne Park development) or commercial vehicles (laying-over near the industrial estate).

The proposals should remove the large commercial vehicle parking, maintain access and create additional residential parking. Noise could be an issue close to residential properties, but the properties should be designed to manage this as there are other car parking areas adjacent to the buildings in Leybourne Park.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

**Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. Given the responses are evenly split it would be for the Board to **decide** whether to set aside the objections and to **implement** the proposals or not, based on the responses and to **abandon** the proposals

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-18
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	Marlowe Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/18

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Concerns about emergency vehicle access due to parking junctions and on the bend near No.83, where vehicles have to mount the verge.

### Initial investigation

Normal junction protection and access double yellow lines should be applied, which should also cover the entrances to the shared parking areas to encourage off-street parking usage.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 51 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
17 (33.3%)	5 (29.4%)	11 (64.7%)	1 (5.9%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a good level of response to the consultation, with the majority of residents commenting against the proposals, most citing the lack of parking in the area.

Some commented that the proposals should be extended, either to include the area opposite the junction on Chaucer Way, or to go deeper in to Marlowe Road, but the most frequent comments were that there was no real issue and the proposals would reduce parking or displace it further in to the estate.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the strength of the residential response against the proposal, it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposals have not been taken further.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-19
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	The Lakes
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/19

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

A resident has complained of obstructive parking on the bend and pavement near to No.61, and preventing access and egress from the garage areas.

### Initial investigation

New double yellow lines would address the issue, covering both sides of the road on the bend, and extending to the nearby garage accesses.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 43 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16 (37.2%)	15 (93.8%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, and the majority of respondents supported the proposal, though some wished for the restrictions to be taken further.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

Whilst some wanted extended restrictions, the proposals have been aimed at preventing obstruction but maintaining as much parking as possible.

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 43 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (25.6%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-20
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield North
Road / Area	Chaucer Way
Requested by	Cllr Parry-Waller (now ex-Councillor)
Plan reference:	DD/589/20

### Summary

New double and single yellow lines (Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm)

### Issue

All-day parking on Chaucer Way (particularly by courier vans) causes problems for passing traffic and buses - investigate restrictions prevent obstruction, and to allow overnight parking but not daytime.

### Initial investigation

Daytime parking on the south side affects traffic near the bus stops, and daytime restrictions should assist to prevent this. Double yellow lines would be required on the north side to prevent displacement to the other side. However, removing parking altogether may have an adverse effect on speed.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 40 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
5 (12.5%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment.

The response against the proposal related to the lack of parking in Coleridge Close and that residents of other roads parked in the area.

One who was in favour commented that the restrictions should apply at all times to prevent overnight parking.

However, the proposals are designed to allow overnight parking to help alleviate local parking pressures and to assist in speed management, but to operate day-time to ease traffic movements and would also deter the long-term storage of commercial vehicles.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

## Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 40 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (27.5%)	8 (72.7%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)

### Analysis

There was a good level of response to the consultation, with the majority in favour of the proposals. The objections related to potential displacement in to nearby residential roads and also that removing parking may result in an increase in vehicle speeds.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. The proposals are intended to remove day-time parking but to retain overnight parking as this would assist daytime accessibility but help constrain speeds when traffic levels are lighter.

It is recommended that the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-21
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Woodpecker Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/21

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have complained about parking in front of the accesses to No's 29-41, and on the bend.

### Initial investigation

The accesses on the northeast side can be protected with new double yellow lines, and the bend and accesses on the opposite side should also be protected with double yellow lines to deter inappropriate displacement.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 39 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16 (41%)	11 (68.8%)	5 (31.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a good level of response to the consultation, with most who responded in favour of the changes.

The objections covered a number of issues;

existing parking pressures in the area

that some properties did not have driveways (though one that commented in this light had rear pedestrian access to a garage parking area)

the proposals would displace parking to other roads nearby

However, the proposals are designed to re-enforce the requirements of the Highway Code, and residents have alternative parking in garage areas.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 39 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
8 (20.5%)	7 (87.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)

### Analysis

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals. The one objection was from a mid-terrace resident who objected that the changes would impact parking availability as they have no off-street parking.

It is often the case that a mid-terrace property may not have off-street parking, but we understand that off-street parking is available to this property via their garage, accessed from the rear of the property.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than objection. As the proposals are intended to improve access to off-street parking they should benefit a number of residents and help relieve on-street parking on the bend.

Accordingly the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-22
Town	Larkfield
Ward	Larkfield South
Road / Area	Maple Close (Laburnum Drive to Pine Close)
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/22

### Summary

New double yellow lines and junction protection

### Issue

Residents have reported that parking causes problems for passing traffic.

### Initial investigation

Any parking on a road could be seen as problematic as the Highway is not intended to provide parking. Maple Close is not unduly narrow and other roads in the area seem to manage to accommodate parking without significant concern and help manage speeds. However, double yellow lines could be considered to deter parking, though may not get wider resident support.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 20 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (55%)	8 (72.7%)	3 (27.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good. The responses were generally in favour, with some wanting the restrictions extended further but objections covered the potential parking displacement to other nearby sections.

One objection also questioned whether there was any legal basis for introducing parking restrictions as there must be a lawful reason under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 prior to making a traffic regulation order.

However, Section 1 of the RTRA 1984 states;

“The traffic authority for a road outside Greater London may make an order under this section... ..where it appears to the authority making the order that it is expedient to make it—

- a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or

- d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or
- g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

As the proposal is intended to address residents' concerns about parking that causes problems for passing traffic then the proposals are appropriate under part C.

### **Recommendation after informal consultation**

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 20 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals "on deposit" at the Council Offices and on the Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
13 (65%)	7 (53.8%)	6 (46.2%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There was a strong response to the consultation, but with split views.

There was a strong division between those who felt there was an issue that needed to be addressed and those that felt that there was not. There was also concern that introducing restrictions would displace parking and create problems where currently it is manageable.

One objection was on the legal basis that the Council was taking forward parking controls, echoing a point that they had already raised at the informal stage (discussed earlier), and that they did not view the Council's reasons for introducing restrictions as lawful.

However, the reason raised (that residents have reported that parking causes problems for passing traffic) is an appropriate purpose for promoting a parking restriction. The objector's comment that "*parking in the southern section of the road does not cause a constant issue*"

*for passing traffic, in fact this rarely occurs here and is less of a problem area than in other areas of Maple close”* represents his view that is in opposition to others in the road and is not a valid reason for not considering the introduction of a parking restriction.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

**Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. Given the responses are evenly split it would be for the Board to **decide** whether to set aside the objections and to **implement** the proposals or not, based on the responses and to **abandon** the proposals

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-23
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Cage Green
Road / Area	The Ridgeway / Rochester Road
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/23

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

A resident has asked for restrictions to prevent parking close to the junction as it prevents incoming and exiting traffic from passing.

### Initial investigation

Suitable for junction protection restrictions to prevent parking at the junction.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 6 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (50%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

We did not receive many responses but the area affected contains few properties.

The objection was that the respondent did not feel that there was a problem and that the proposals were unnecessary.

However, 2 respondents replied, supporting the proposals and suggesting that they were needed.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 6 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals "on deposit" at the Council Offices and on the

Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
2 (33.3%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

Again there were few responses but there are few properties in the area.

One welcomed the changes as an improvement to safety, whereas the objection commented that the proposals did not address the problems of exiting Rochester Road and speeding on The Ridgeway.

The objection was in essence a request for traffic calming or other speed reduction measures on The Ridgeway rather than a comment against the proposals themselves.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. As the objector's comments related to other safety concerns that are outside of our remit (speed management and traffic calming rests with Kent County Council as the Highway Authority), it is recommended that the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

### Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-24
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Lansdowne Road junction with confirmed highway potentially linking to Annison Street
Requested by	Local business
Plan reference:	N/A

#### Summary

Double yellow lines junction protection

#### Issue

New road construction and adoption will have an effect on traffic movements in the area and the existing parking controls in the "Market Quarter" area, and new double yellow lines and permit parking restrictions should be introduced to prevent obstruction

#### Initial investigation

Being taken forward independently by KCC and the developer.

**This was agreed at the March 2019 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board and accordingly the proposals have progressed no further.**

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-25
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Castle
Road / Area	Dry Hill Park Crescent
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/25

### Summary

New permit parking bays and double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have asked to join existing permit parking scheme to deter non-resident and obstructive parking.

### Initial investigation

This area was part of the permit scheme when originally proposed, but residents opted out. If there has been a change in parking habit or residents now accept the benefit the road can be included, with permit bays and double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 14 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
4 (28.6%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low, but all those that responded were not in favour of the proposals.

One resident asked to for the permit parking element, but not for the associated double yellow lines that would prevent obstructive parking.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the strength of the residential response against the proposal, it is recommended that the proposal be abandoned.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposals have not been taken further.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-26
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Higham
Road / Area	Hunt Road (near Constable Road)
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/26

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

A resident has requested parking restrictions on Hunt Road between the two exits from Constable Road as the junctions are in her view, dangerous.

### Initial investigation

The junction arrangement is not typical, with a split entry arrangement, and would benefit from double yellow lines to deter parking that may affect visibility.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 30 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (36.7%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was good, and all those that responded were in favour of the proposals, though some suggested that they should go further,

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 30 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
6 (25%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

There were no objections to the proposal.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-27
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Shakespeare Road area
Requested by	Local residents petition
Plan reference:	DD/589/27

### Summary

New double and single yellow lines to prevent all-day parking, with short-stay limited waiting and a small "permit holders only" area.

### Issue

Residents report parking problems associated with student parking for the nearby college, parent pick-up and drop off for the schools and commuter parking.

### Initial investigation

New double and single yellow lines can help prevent all-day parking, but short-stay parking should be provided to allow shelter from the restrictions. A small permit holders only area should be introduced to address the worst college parking problem.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 143 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
35 (24.5%)	9 (25.7%)	25 (71.4%)	1 (2.9%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was typical for this sort of proposal in a residential area, with the majority of respondents indicating they were against the proposals.

On a geographic basis, most of the objecting responses were from properties along Shakespeare Road, where there is more parking capacity, and there was a cluster of responses in favour of the proposals from the cul-de-sac part of Burns Crescent where parking is a particular problem.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

The Council's initial proposal presented the best engineering solution to the complex issues in the area, but this does not have the support of residents.

The Board and the local Members are asked to review the consultation responses, where residents of Shakespeare Road did not want the single yellow line proposals but there was suggested support for additional resident parking restrictions. These were not originally proposed as a number of properties have off-street parking facilities, and introducing residents parking controls could lead to the road space being significantly under-used and displace traffic further in to the estate.

The Board may wish to consider;

- proceeding with the proposals as drawn, to formal consultation
- abandoning the proposals in light of the responses received
- redrafting the proposals in light of the comments to explore the extension of the permit parking area. However, depending on the scope of the extension the proposals may need to slip from the current phase of the Parking Action Plan to the next phase as there may need to be further development.

**Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board considered the responses and decided that the proposals should be re-drafted for inclusion in a further phase of the Parking Action Plan.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-28
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Judd
Road / Area	Lower Haysden Lane
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/28

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Concerns about parking on the bend near Mission Hall House

### Initial investigation

The existing double yellow lines at the field entrance to Haysden Country Park could be extended to cover the bend at Mission Hall House and also the other side of the road to prevent obstructive parking.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 12 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (25%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The number of responses to the informal consultation was low, but the number of properties involved was also low.

The comment against the proposals was from a resident who thought the changes unnecessary, though this was in opposition to the two responses in favour, with one suggesting additional restrictions be introduced outside their property as they experience parking problems in that area.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal be adjusted in line with the residents comments to include new double yellow lines alongside Acorn House and Oak House and to proceed to formal consultation.

Revised proposals are shown in DD/589/28A

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 12 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (25%)	2 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)

### **Analysis**

The “don’t know” response supported the proposals but wanted the restrictions on the northern side to be reduced to the extent of the layby – however, this is already the case.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

As the Council received no objections during the statutory consultation process there are no objections to consider. Accordingly the Board should note that the proposals are to be **implemented**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-29 & 30
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Morley Road and Vale Road area and Morley Road (near entrance to Pyser SGI, 17-19 Morley Road)
Requested by	Local business
Plan reference:	DD/589/29

### Summary

New double yellow lines and new permit and phone payment long-stay parking bays

### Issues

Request for double yellow lines opposite the Ton100 site entrance to improve access and safety.

Obstructive parking near car park entrance. Also reports of long term on-road car storage and cars being offered for sale from the public highway.

### Initial investigation

The recent change of businesses on the Ton100 site has increased traffic movements to the site and removing parking opposite the access would assist. There is also long-term parking on-street and car sales from the road that reduce the opportunities to park, and this could be regulated with phone and permit parking.

Access to the Pyser car park is compromised by close parking and would benefit from double yellow lines. There is also long-term parking on-street and car sales from the road that reduce the opportunities to park, and this could be regulated with phone and permit parking, which would benefit nearby residents in Area N.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 89 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
13 (14.6%)	11 (84.6%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low, but this is often the case where commercial properties are involved.

Of those that responded, the majority were in favour of the proposals.

One of the objections was that on-street parking controls would push parking in to the private parking areas of the industrial estates.

One commented in relation to the suggested resident parking changes and thought that residents should have free parking as they already pay council tax.

### **Recommendation after informal consultation**

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### **Other issue raised at informal consultation**

One respondent suggested that the end of the one way section of Vale Road should have a “left turn only” restriction as this would prevent rat-tunning traffic using the residential part of Vale Road. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in it’s role as the Highway Authority.

Accordingly, the Highway Authority are asked to note these concerns.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 89 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16 (17.9%)	8 (50%)	8 (50%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The objections covered a number of issues, with the most prevalent objections coming from Royal Mail workers who wanted free places to park. Other objections were that the proposals would push parking in to the private parking at the industrial units and the TMBC is profiteering.

However, there were also comments in support of the proposals and even requests for the restrictions to be taken further, and for the proposed charge to be higher.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. The proposals are aimed at deterring all-day parking, preventing obstruction and preventing the long-stay storage of vehicles on the road.

It is recommended that the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-32
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Lyons Crescent and High Street
Requested by	TMBC & Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/589/32

### Summary

Re-arrange existing parking spaces to new P&D parking, disabled parking and permit parking to segregate and manage short stay parking and resident bays.

### Issue

Residents have reported problems with non-resident short and long-stay parking that reduces opportunities for parking. Also blue badge holders have asked for more disabled parking near the High Street. There have also been reports of continuing long-stay parking in the High Street bays.

### Initial investigation

Parking in Lyons Crescent would benefit from being segregated into permits, short-stay and disabled, and the best way to do this is with P&D short-stay as this allows effective enforcement. The short stay bays in the High Street would also benefit from P&D as the abuse of the time limits would be reduced.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 227 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
6 (2.6%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was very low, suggesting that most residents were not concerned enough to comment, but there were a number of commercial premises included in the consultation.

Residents seem to be in favour of proposals that allow more opportunities for residents to park and the segregation of non-resident parking in Lyons Crescent, though one resident commented that the reduction in resident permit parking bays would be an issue (though the bays would not have the non-resident parking that currently reduces availability), and asked that all the bays be residents only – though this does not recognize the need for parking for visitors and shoppers to businesses in the northern end of the High Street.

One commented that the current availability of free parking for all in Lyons Crescent created problems for residents as it was seen as free parking close to the High Street and parking was not available to residents.

One commented against the proposals for the lay-bys in the High Street, suggesting that they should change from parking to bus stops and delivery bays – though there are already these facilities in the area.

### **Recommendation after informal consultation**

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 227 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
15 (6.7%)	6 (40%)	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)

### **Analysis**

The objections covered a number of issues – that the current arrangements worked, that the changes would displace parking and that there should be more opportunity for residents to park.

However, the proposals should make permit holder parking easier as it segregates the short-stay parking and improves the enforceability of the parking restrictions.

The “don’t know” response indicated in favour of the proposals but requested additional information.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted. As the proposals are intended to improve the accessibility for shoppers and residents and also to improve enforcement, it is recommended that the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-33
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Fairfield Crescent
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/33

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Request for double yellow lines on one side and in the turning area to ease access and prevent obstruction

### Initial investigation

Due to the road width, parking restrictions would assist in preventing obstruction and ease access.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 9 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
6 (66.7%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The number of responses to the informal consultation was low, but there were few properties in the area. Of those, there was a good level of response but the responses were split between those who supported and those against the proposals.

Of those against, there were comments that there did not seem to be a problem, and that the proposals would reduce parking capacity.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

The Council's initial proposal presented the best engineering solution to the issues presented, reflecting the requirements of the Highway Code. However there is no clear support or objection from residents.

The Board and the local Members are asked to review the consultation responses, where some suggest there is an issue and others suggest not, and that all the residential properties in Fairfield Crescent have off-street parking facilities.

The Board may wish to consider;

- proceeding with the proposals as drawn, to formal consultation
- abandoning the proposals in light of the responses received.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

#### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 9 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
9 (100%)	2 (22.2%)	7 (77.8%)	0 (0%)

#### **Analysis**

There was a strong level of objection to the proposals, mainly on the grounds that any restrictions would encourage displacement parking.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

#### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the Board note the objections and the residents’ concerns and that the proposals should be **abandoned**.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-34
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Somerhill Road and Gorham Drive
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/34

### Summary

Request for a permit parking scheme and double yellow lines.

### Issue

All-day parking by staff at nearby Royal Mail causes problems for residents, and would like a resident parking scheme and restrictions to prevent obstructive parking

### Initial investigation

Due to the layout of the road, the area would be suitable for a "permit holders past this point" area and junction protection restrictions.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 80 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
15 (18.8%)	10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (6.7%)

### Informal consultation responses

The majority of the consultation respondents were in favour of the proposals, and some asked for restrictions to be extended in to Dudley Keen Court (though this is not adopted highway).

There were also comments that the parking restrictions either side of the lay-by in Gorham Drive should be extended to prevent parking from sticking out in ot the road.

However;

Two asked why the restrictions applied for most of the day (or should be for shorter periods) and on Saturdays.

One commented that the problems in the area were that the postal workers have no place for staff cars, and that an alternative private facility should be provided for them, removing the need for residents to have the costs of a permit parking scheme.

One commented that any resident parking proposals may displace the Royal Mail staff to other nearby roads.

There was also comment that residents parking proposals would incur costs for visitors.

One commented that introducing permit parking restrictions would require them to buy a permit to park on-street, where those with driverways that are unused could rent out their driveways.

### **Recommendation after informal consultation**

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal be adjusted in line with the residents comments relating to the lay-by in Gorham Road, and also be adjusted so the resident permit restrictions operate 10am – 2pm, Monday to Friday and to proceed to formal consultation.

Revised proposals are shown in DD/589/34A

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 80 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
35 (43.7%)	26 (74.3%)	7 (20%)	2 (5.7%)

### **Analysis**

The objections focussed on issues in Gorham Drive and the potential for displacement parking – with some requests for restrictions to be taken further.

The local Councillors for the area, Cllrs Boughton, Lark and Botten supported the proposals, but only if they are extended to Gorham Drive too, and that the residents of Lodge Oak Lane should be included in the new permit parking area.

Extending the permit parking scheme further along Gorham Drive needs careful carefully considered – the properties in Somerhill Road and Lodge Oak Lane are significantly different in character to those in Gorham Drive, with the newer Gorham Drive properties having off-street parking provision, compared to the older properties in Somerhill Road and Lodge Oak Lane.

Extending a permit parking area in to roads where properties have off-street parking is counter-productive as residents are reluctant to buy parking permits and often do not see the need for permit parking controls.

It may be appropriate to look at some form of parking controls in Gorham Drive to prevent obstructive parking at junctions and on bends, and there may be scope for daytime single

yellow line restrictions to prevent commuter parking, but this would need to be a separate proposal.

The existing Area P permit holders (including those on Lodge Oak Lane would be able to park within the permit parking area.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

The views of the objectors and the local members should be noted, and the Board should consider a number of options;

The Board may wish to consider;

- **proceeding** with the proposals as drawn, and implement the proposals, with Gorham Drive added to the list of locations for consideration in a further phase of the Parking Action Plan
- **abandoning** the proposals in light of the responses received
- **redrafting** the proposals in light of the comments to explore the extension of the permit parking area in to Gorham Drive - however, this would mean the current proposals would slip from the current phase of the Parking Action Plan to the next phase as there may need to be further development.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-35
Town	Tonbridge
Ward	Medway
Road / Area	Swanmead Way
Requested by	TMBC & Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/589/35

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Re-development of local store to Aldi has increased all-day on-street parking and increased traffic movements. Swanmead Way is now reported as adopted by Kent County Council.

### Initial investigation

New double yellow lines would assist in maintaining access to and from the stores, the waste site and the sportsground, and would help reduce congestion and improve visibility at the junction.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 16 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
2 (12.5%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was very low, reflecting the non-residential nature of the area, but those that responded were in favour of the proposal.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 16 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
5 (31.2%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals, including responses from the Borough Members for the area. Some of the supporting responses asked for more restrictions, but this was in opposition to the one objection, which said that not all the yellow lines were needed.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than objection. Accordingly the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-37
Town	Walderslade
Ward	Aylesford North & Walderslade
Road / Area	Taddington Wood Lane
Requested by	Local resident
Plan reference:	DD/589/37

### Summary

New double yellow lines and bus stop protection.

### Issue

Resident would like new double yellow lines to prevent all-day parking that residents feel causes a hazard on the bend and near the junctions, however, residents are also concerned about vehicle speeds and rat-running.

### Initial investigation

There needs to be a balance between visibility concerns, speed management and deterrent of rat-running, double yellow lines would prevent parking between Papion Grove and Hurst Hill, but may displace the problem towards Locksley Close and Robin Hood Lane, so any proposal should extend to cover this area.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 47 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
19 (40.4%)	11 (57.9%)	8 (42.1%)	0 (0%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a good response rate to the informal consultation, though the responses were mixed with some in support and some opposing.

Some of those supporting wished for the restrictions to be taken further, to deter displacement parking, and some opposed the proposals on the basis that parking might displace to the nearby residential areas.

One commented that in snowy weather they were unable to use their driveway and had to park on Taddington Wood Lane.

Some commented that the parking on Taddington Wood Lane helped slow down traffic.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Other issue raised at informal consultation

One respondent questioned the need for so many bus stops on Taddington Wood Lane. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council to consider in it's role as the Highway Authority.

There were also concerns about vehicle speeds on Taddington Wood Lane. Again this is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for KCC to consider.

One resident asked that Taddington Wood Lane be widened and a number of specific parking bays be created. However, changes to the physical layout of the public highway are outside of the Borough's remit and would be for KCC to consider.

Accordingly, the Highway Authority are asked to note these concerns.

### **Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019**

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### **Formal consultation**

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 47 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals "on deposit" at the Council Offices and on the Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
20 (42.6%)	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals. Of the objections there were conflicting views as to where the restrictions should end (opposite Robin Hood Lane).

However, the proposals should be appropriate and are in line with the Highway Code.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but that the proposals did receive significantly more support than objection. The proposals are intended to prevent parking around junctions and a number of respondents have commented about visibility issues. Accordingly the objections should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-38
Town	West Malling
Ward	West Malling & Leybourne
Road / Area	Old Parsonage Court
Requested by	KCC Cllr Trudy Dean
Plan reference:	DD/589/38

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Residents have reported obstructive parking near to No's 28 & 29, where parking restricts road space and prevents vulnerable pedestrians from using the footways.

### Initial investigation

Double yellow lines could be provided in the entrance to Old Parsonage Court to prevent obstructive parking and improve accessibility.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 31 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
17 (54.8%)	14 (82.4%)	2 (11.8%)	1 (5.9%)

### Informal consultation responses

There was a strong response rate to the informal consultation, with the majority of responses in favour of the proposals.

Some commented that they thought that Old Parsonage Court was private, but according to KCC's records the areas where restrictions are proposed were adopted as public highway by KCC.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 31 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals "on deposit" at the Council Offices and on

the Council's website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
10 (32.2%)	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals. The one objection was based on the belief that the road at that location was not adopted as public highway, but this is incorrect and all the proposals are for roads that are adopted.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than objection. Accordingly the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.

## Parking Plan – Phase 11 – Location Summary

Location reference	11-39
Town	Wrotham
Ward	Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted
Road / Area	Borough Green Road
Requested by	Local residents
Plan reference:	DD/589/39

### Summary

New double yellow lines

### Issue

Concerns about vehicles parking on Borough Green Road near the junction of St Mary's Road

### Initial investigation

Junction protection double yellow lines would assist in preventing parking around the junction, and to prevent displacement towards the A227, double yellow lines should also be considered at bend and southern end of the road.

### Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 28<sup>th</sup> June to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 9 properties, asking residents for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
4 (44.4%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)

### Informal consultation responses

The number of responses to the informal consultation was low, but this is due to the limited number of properties in the area. Of those, a good number responded, generally in favour.

The 1 “don't know” was from a resident who supported the proposals in general but did not feel they needed to extend so far in to St Mary's Road.

### Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the responses, it is recommended that the proposal proceed to formal consultation.

### Decision of Joint Transportation Board on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019

The Board agreed with the recommendation and the proposal proceeded to formal consultation.

### Formal consultation

Accordingly the Borough Council carried out formal consultation as an invitation of objections to the proposals in line with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales 1996) on the proposed parking restrictions from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

As part of the consultation we wrote directly to 9 properties (immediate frontagers and those who had previously commented at the informal consultation stage), placed notice on street and in the local press, placed the proposals “on deposit” at the Council Offices and on the

Council’s website. We also contacted the normal Statutory Consultees (local Councillors, Parish Councils, Emergency Services, bus companies and other interested road groups).

The responses to the formal consultation were as follows;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
6 (66.7%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)

### **Analysis**

The majority of response was in favour of the proposals. The one objection supported the main restrictions but wished to retain a small parking area opposite Stone Cottage.

However, this was contrary to the views of the residents opposite.

All of the responses have been redacted and form part of an Annex to the March 2020 Joint Transportation Board Report

### **Recommendation to the March 2020 meeting of the Joint Transportation Board after formal consultation**

It is recommended that the conflicting views be noted, but that the proposals did receive more support than objection. The proposals are intended to prevent parking around junctions and respondents have commented about visibility issues. Accordingly the objection should be set aside and the restrictions be **introduced** as proposed.