

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A – Location Summaries

Road / Area	Gibson Drive
Plan reference:	DD/586/07

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 19 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
1 (5.3%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals, but would like a Bus stop clearway outside Borough Council offices.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Do not see any existing issues	1	Parking is starting to occur on Gibson Drive and the proposals should help maintain the free flow of traffic on to the estate and facilitate bus movements.
People should follow the rules and agreements for KH and plan ahead	1	
Would like Bus stop clearway outside Borough Council offices	1	The proposals include bus stop clearways outside the Borough Council offices

Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low for this sort of proposal, reflective of the few residential properties in the immediate area.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the positive responses received, and no comments against the proposals, it is recommended that the proposals **proceed** to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Crispin Way
Plan reference:	DD/586/08

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

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

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to extend the double yellow lines from Discovery Drive to 45 Alexander Grove.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Nowhere for visitors to park/permit to park in Crispins	2	Crispin Way is not intended to provide parking for residents, but as an access road to the school. The car park is outside of the Borough's remit and would be for the owner to consider allowing resident parking or not.
More parking provision in Kings Hill generally	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Who will enforce parking restrictions? (if implemented)	1	The Borough Council's Parking Enforcement team would arrange patrolling by our Civil Enforcement Officers.
Far too many cars blocking view for children crossing and cars navigating between parked cars	1	The proposals are intended to improve safety, visibility and access around the school.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
In favour - but would like to extend double yellows from DD to No 45 Alexander Grove (<i>from plan 09 this appears to be proposed</i>)	1	This is part of the proposals

Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was low for this sort of proposal. The residents that commented against the proposals did so on the base of parking pressure in the area and lack of facilities, but the parking pressure in the area is the lead cause of the concerns about parking near the school.

The parking pressures in the area are a consequence of the private parking provision to the national planning design standards that prevailed at the time the development was constructed, which do not adequately meet the demand for parking from residents themselves, and this cannot be resolved by the Borough Council.

There seems to be a general reluctance from residents to use private parking spaces or garages that may be out of direct view from properties or located in parking areas accessed through narrow driveways. This leads to parking on the residential roads through the estate, and often to parking half-on, half-off pavements that causes significant problems for those with mobility issues.

What we can assist with is easing access to those parking areas and preventing obstructive parking, which may encourage more effective use of the private parking areas.

It should be noted that the proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, not to park on bends, junctions or where it would cause an obstruction or safety issue.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals **proceed** to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Alexander Grove, Discovery Drive and Alton Ave
Plan reference:	DD/586/09

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

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

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
10 (21.3%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals, but made no specific comments.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16 (56.3%)	9	7 (43.8%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Nowhere for visitors to park/permit to park in Crispins	1	Crispin Way is not intended to provide parking for residents, but as an access road to the school. The car park is outside of the Borough's remit and would be for the owner to consider allowing resident parking or not.
More parking provision in Kings Hill generally	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	5	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Proposals will address inconsiderate parking	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Proposals will protect vulnerable pedestrians	1	The aim is to provide a safe and suitable environment.

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Parking restrictions need to be enforced (if implemented)	2	The Borough Council's Parking Enforcement team would arrange patrolling by our Civil Enforcement Officers.
White Vans/Commercial vehicles in Alexander Grove	6	Whilst not desirable, there is an increase in the use of commercial vans, and provided they are legal to be on the public highway they are as entitled to use the road space as any other road user. It is likely that the vans are associated with residents that live in the area.
Taking away parking from outside our property as stated in the covenant	2	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
No parking for visitors, including grandparents and friends - feeling trapped and stressed - considering moving	2	Like any other parking, visitor parking cannot be taken for granted on the public highway.
Lack of parking outside property devalues by 5%	1	Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted. The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.
Residents Parking scheme would be welcomed	2	A residents' parking scheme is unlikely to resolve parking issues as the parking in the area is predominantly from residents themselves. Any permit parking scheme has annual permit cost and is unlikely to resolve the parking issues.
Don't criminalise parents	1	Every driver needs to be aware of the requirements of the public highway to drive and park lawfully.
Workers from shops businesses are using these roads for parking	2	The public highway is for all to use, but the majority of parking (outside of school times) seems to relate to residents.
Parents at school drop off pick up are inconsiderate	1	Every driver needs to be aware of the requirements of the public highway to drive and park lawfully.
Visitors and others are using Alexander Grove for parking	2	The public highway is for all to use, but the majority of parking (outside of school times) seems to relate to residents.
Parking not a problem until KH property and ASDA made changes to rules	2	Parking in private parking facilities cannot be taken for granted and can be controlled by the owner of that facility. However, this does not mean that safety

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		on the public highway should be compromised.
Double yellow lines will mean parking away from outside house on Alexander Grove - challenging for wife with baby and shopping especially at night	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
No allocated parking for residents	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Roads are narrow and difficult to drive down	1	The proposals are intended to reduce obstructive parking and ease access.
Parking issues with school over 1 hour a day - will affect householder 24 hours a day	3	The public highway is for all to use, but the majority of parking (outside of school times) seems to relate to residents.
Sometimes cars are left for weeks in Alexander Grove	1	The public highway is for all to use, but the majority of parking (outside of school times) seems to relate to residents. Any vehicles that are abandoned on the public highway can be reported to the Borough Council's Waste Services team on waste.services@tmbc.gov.uk
Have you considered other solutions - designated parking bays for residents, widening road, making it one way, commercial solution for vans and lorries	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Parking Manager may achieve his goals (for the free flow of traffic) but this will not help residents	1	Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted. The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.
Considering legal action to enforce covenants or against fellow residents with camper vans/commercial vehicles	1	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
Proposal to extend parking available to outside No 39 Alexander Grove	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Informal consultation responses

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

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceede](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Discovery Drive (East of Alexander Grove)
Plan reference:	DD/586/10

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 48 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
13 (27.1%)	9 (69.2%)	3 (23.1%)	1 (7.7%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to see the double yellow lines meet up at the entrance just past Rubin Place.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16	11 (68.8%)	4 (25%)	1 (6.3%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
White Vans/Commercial vehicles in Alexander Grove	3	Whilst not desirable, there is an increase in the use of commercial vans, and provided they are legal to be on the public highway they are as entitled to use the road space as any other road user. It is likely that the vans are associated with residents that live in the area.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Additional Traffic Calming measures required	1	The provision of traffic calming is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Assist with rubbish/garage clearances	1	Residents are responsible for their own property, and the disposal of rubbish and large items that are not within the scope of normal household rubbish.

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		However, the Council can assist with its Bulky Waste collection scheme, though there is a charge for this.
Thanks to TMBC for constructive action	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Additional wooden parking bollards in Milton Lane required	1	The provision of wooden bollards is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Do not consider there to be a parking problem on Discovery Drive	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Double yellow lines will encourage more people to park on the road	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Current parking restrictions need to be enforced	1	Currently there are very few enforceable parking restrictions in the area, so little enforcement takes place. This would be revised if the new restrictions are introduced.
More parking provision in Kings Hill generally	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Yellow lines affect the character of the road	1	It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and this should be an expected part of any streetscene.
Suggestion - marked parking spaces on DD (<i>Discovery Drive</i>) replacing the existing grass verge	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
In favour - although action to address parking issues for parents of school children required e.g. spare land at side of community hall	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Emergency access is often obstructed by parked vehicles - and there is an increase in commercial vehicles parked overnight	1	Whilst not desirable, there is an increase in the use of commercial vans, and provided they are legal to be on the public highway they are as entitled to use the road space as any other road user. It is likely that the vans are associated with residents that live in the area.
In favour - but would like double yellows to meet up at the entrance just past Rubin Place	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible, but could be extended in line with the Parish's comments

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 comments received, it is recommended that the proposals be amended on Discovery Drive (near Rubin Place) and **proceede** to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section)
Plan reference:	DD/586/11

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 72 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
23 (31.9%)	16 (69.6%)	6 (26.1%)	1 (4.3%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposal but would like to see continuous double yellow lines on both sides of Fortune Way.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
30	20 (66.7%)	9 (30%)	1 (3.3%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Thanks to TMBC for constructive, very welcome action/excellent idea	4	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
More parking provision in Kings Hill generally	4	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Proposals will address inconsiderate parking	5	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Proposals will protect vulnerable pedestrians	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Broadly favourable but not for part of Fortune Way giving access to golf course	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Access down Milton Lane for residents is very difficult	1	This could be considered as part of a future phase of the Kings Hill parking review

Joint Transportation Board - Parking Action Plan – Phase 11 Annex 1 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Free parking provision for commercial vehicles	1	Depending on size, commercial vehicles may be subject to other legislation, but are otherwise as entitled to use the public highway as any other vehicle.
Consider removal of traffic calming measures on corner of Anisa Close	1	The provision or removal of traffic calming features is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Houses with several adult drivers and only one or two allocated parking bays	3	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Fortune Way is not a bus route and doesn't need lines	1	There have been complaints about obstructive parking on Fortune Way.
Trades people will have to carry tools long distances	1	Convenience should not be at the expense of safety or maintaining traffic movements.
Parents won't be able to visit anymore	1	Like any other parking, visitor parking cannot be taken for granted on the public highway.
Parking restrictions need to be enforced (if implemented)	3	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.
Proposed parking restrictions on roundabout is exactly where I park	1	Parking on roundabouts is against the Highway Code. The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Where will cars currently parking in these areas be expected to park?	3	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Will address visibility /single lane use	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Provide Additional wooden parking bollards in Milton Lane	1	The provision of wooden bollards is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	4	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Make Fortune Way a one way street	3	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County

Joint Transportation Board - Parking Action Plan – Phase 11 Annex 1 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Put parking restrictions along one side of Milton Lane - issue of emergency vehicle access	1	This could be considered as part of a future phase of the Kings Hill parking review
All Milton Lane (or the start of it at least) should have yellow lines - to allow access for emergency vehicles	1	This could be considered as part of a future phase of the Kings Hill parking review
Both Milton Lane and Queen Street to become one way	1	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider, though only the eastern end of Queen Street is adopted as public highway.
Had an accident in Fortune Way recently - in favour of proposal	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code.
All bus routes should be parking free	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code.
Residents found parking when there was temporary parking restrictions	1	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement
Need to park outside my house - visitors have nowhere to park	1	Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted. The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.
Devaluing properties	1	Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted. The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.
Yellow lines in Fortune Way (south) are excessive given volume of traffic	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Extra provision for parking required - replacing grass verges	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Overall provision for parking on KH needs to be addressed by planners and developers	3	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Where will taxis be able to pick up residents?	1	Taxis have the facility to allow passengers to board or alight on yellow lines. However, pre-booked services should be arranged for pick-up from safe places.
In favour - but would like to see continuous yellow lines on both side of Fortune Way	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible, as this provides parking a capacity and useful traffic calming.
Proposal will negatively impact visitors, workmen and delivery vehicles	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Yellow lines in Fortune Way (south) will lead to extra parking in Cleeve Court	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

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 comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Fortune Way
Plan reference:	DD/586/12

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 68 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
19 (27.9%)	6 (31.6%)	11 (57.9%)	2 (10.5%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to see continuous double yellow lines on both sides of Fortune Way (covered in comments on location 11)

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
25	11 (44%)	12 (48%)	2 (8%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Parking restrictions very welcome	5	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Driving on Fortune needs to be one way	4	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	5	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Garages are not big enough/how did such a huge RAF site become so short of space	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Make Queen Street One way too	1	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		consider, though only the eastern end of Queen Street is adopted as public highway.
Double yellow lines on one side only -retain some parking to slow traffic	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Double yellow lines are unsightly	1	It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and this should be an expected part of any streetscene.
More parking provision in Kings Hill generally	3	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Access to parking bays is often obstructed	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Where are visitors going to park?	1	Like any other parking, visitor parking cannot be taken for granted on the public highway.
Hard to walk far as registered disabled	1	Kent County Council operate a “blue badge” scheme for disabled drivers that allows some exemptions from parking restrictions.
Additional Traffic Calming measures	1	The provision of traffic calming features is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Parking restrictions need to be enforced (if implemented)	1	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.
Make Queen Street and Milton Lane one way	2	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider, though only the eastern end of Queen Street is adopted as public highway.
Situation has been made worse by restrictions in supermarket/doctors - please go ahead	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Carers need to park close to apartment entrance	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Make Fortune a residents parking zone	1	A residents' parking scheme is unlikely to resolve parking issues as the parking in the area is predominantly from residents themselves. Any permit parking scheme has annual permit cost and is unlikely to resolve the parking issues.
How would a removal van park if there were double yellow lines?	1	There are exemptions that can apply when people are moving house.
Disabled access difficult in designated parking bays	1	This would be an issue for the property owner to address
Reduce double yellow lines and mark out parking bays	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Extend restrictions into Richmond Avenue	1	This could be considered as part of a future phase of the Kings Hill parking review
Restrict parking on outside of bend around Braeburn Way crossing rather than inside of bend	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Convert Fortune Way and Alexander Grove to one way increasing safety	1	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
In the interest of safety and will stop damage to parked cars in limited access roads	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - but must ensure problem isn't displaced into Milton	1	This could be considered as part of a future phase of the Kings Hill parking review.
Removing pavement and roadside parking must be replaced by key code or fob parking in central KH	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.

Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was average for this sort of proposal, with the responses broadly split between those in favour and those against.

However, a number of the points raised related to parking in other roads, or to issues that are outside the gift of the Borough Council.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Queen Street
Plan reference:	DD/586/13

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 69 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
14 (20.3%)	6 (42.9%)	8 (57.1%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

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

The Parish Council did not comment on the proposals but would like to see continuous double yellow lines on both sides of Fortune Way (covered in comments on location 11)

Overall the response was as follows

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

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
A one way approach is needed	1	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Make Queen St and Fortune Way one way (with double yellow lines on the right)	1	Introducing a “one way street” restriction is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider, though only the eastern end of Queen Street is adopted as public highway.
Extend the double yellow lines to include the drop kerb access between 86 Queen St and 10 Amos Way	1	This is a sensible alteration and we will adjust the proposals to accommodate this change.

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Greedy developers did not provide enough parking in the first place	1	<p>It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.</p>
Yellow lines affect the character of Kings Hill/devalue properties	2	<p>It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and this should be an expected part of any streetscene.</p> <p>Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted.</p> <p>The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.</p>
Will improve safety - consider further traffic calming measures where Braeburn Way crosses Fortune	1	<p>The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.</p>
Parking restrictions need to be enforced (if implemented)	1	<p>Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.</p>
Everyone signed a covenant not to park in the road	1	<p>Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.</p>
Please review speeding issues as well	1	<p>Speed management and traffic calming is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.</p>
Liberty needs to address parking across KH	1	<p>The Borough Council is looking at all the adopted roads in Kings Hill, but we are starting with the more major routes.</p>
Parking on Fortune caused by restrictions at ASDA and Waitrose makes access and sightlines dangerous	1	<p>Parking in private parking facilities cannot be taken for granted and can be controlled by the owner of that facility. However, this does not mean that safety on the public highway should be compromised.</p>
As soon as possible please!	1	<p>The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.</p>
Accident blackspot Queen St Fortune Way	1	<p>The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.</p>
Parking around roundabout Fortune/Alton/Discovery ought to be banned and enforced	1	<p>The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.</p>

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Removing vehicles will increase speeding and make it less safe for children	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Currently no parking or access issues in Queen St	1	There have been reports of parking problems in Queen Street
How will taxis pick up on Queen St and Fortune Way?	1	Taxis have the facility to allow passengers to board or alight on yellow lines. However, pre-booked services should be arranged for pick-up from safe places.

Informal consultation responses

The response rate to the informal consultation was split between those supporting and those against, though a number of the points against the proposals relate to issues outside of the control of the Borough Council.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals be adjusted to reflect the accesses on Queen Street and to **proceede** to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Avenue and Melrose Avenue
Plan reference:	DD/586/14

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 98 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
17 (17.3%)	11 (64.7%)	6 (35.3%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

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

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but made no specific comments.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
20	14 (70%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Complete waste of money/there is no parking problem in Braeburn Way!	1	The proposals are aimed at addressing the current parking concerns and also addressing any future parking issues, by reflecting the requirements of the Highway Code
There should be a seating area for the elderly	1	This would be outside the remit of the parking review
In favour but should have been addressed when planning consent was given	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour as very difficult to get out onto Tower View because of parked vehicles	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Extend yellow lines in Winston Avenue near chicane	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Developers should provide wider roads and more parking bays	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	4	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour but only to road crossing points in Braeburn and extend further from Tower View down Winston	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Contravention of the covenant - displacement of parking will interfere with the peaceful enjoyment and cause congestion in Monarch Terrace	1	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies. The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - long overdue - could be taken further where there are houses with garages and driveway parking	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - but please can you make cyclists use the cycle lane on Tower View and not the pavement	1	It would be for the Police to manage cycling issues
In favour - parked cars on Discovery might now park on Braeburn Way	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - Garages, driveways and parking bays not being utilised in many instances	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Parking restrictions in Melrose Avenue impact on Monarch Terrace	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation indicated the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	DD (Winston Ave to Melrose Ave area)
Plan reference:	DD/586/15

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 28 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (39.3%)	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but made no specific comments.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
14	9 (64.3%)	5 (35.7%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
In favour, but cannot see reason for leaving 'gaps' as it will constrict traffic flow	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Ensure new developments have sufficient parking	3	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Act on illegal parking, ensure all cars are legal -people follow the Highway Code	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Parked cars act as a road calming measure	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	4	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour, but would want double yellow lines all along this stretch of Discovery	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
In favour, but not on both sides of road between 97 and 107 Discovery - one side is enough to deter speeding	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Yellow lines outside 95 - 105 will force them to cross the road to their houses (after parking!)	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
No places for visitors or workmen to park	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Road is not busy enough for this amount of double yellows	1	The proposals are aimed at addressing the current parking concerns and also addressing any future parking issues, by reflecting the requirements of the Highway Code
Can it be single yellows with time limits to avoid rush hours	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Lay back' bus stop slightly to be opposite no 91	1	Any alterations to the road layout are outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority to consider
Garages and parking bays poorly designed so as not to be accessible and insufficient parking overall	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
In favour - but double yellows opposite bus stop between Melrose and Winston please	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - but new restrictions will need to be enforced	1	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.
In favour - but can restrictions be lifted for Easter, Christmas and bank holidays	1	Double yellow line restrictions emphasise the requirements of the Highway Code, and this means that they should apply at all times.
Double yellows will lead to speeding like on Tower Drive`	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Discovery Drive (Rougemont to Bovarde)
Plan reference:	DD/586/16

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

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

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
8 (20%)	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to extend the double yellow lines from Braeburn up Discovery Drive to just past Rougemont.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
12	10 (83.3%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Bus route - proposals will improve safety for all concerned	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour - would appreciate extending in front of No 4 Discovery Drive - for safety reasons	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Increase double yellow lines on section opposite Nos 115 - 123 to increase safety and improve traffic flow	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
If double yellow lines not consistent all along this section of Discovery Drive -then double yellows in adjacent roads such as Bovarde will increase congestion on Discovery Drive	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Parking restrictions need to be enforced (if implemented)	1	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.

In favour, would suggest extending into Rougemont	2	Rougemont is not adopted as public highway, so any issues would need to be addressed by the landowner or manager for that area.
In favour, would welcome double yellows in Bancroft Lane up to and including mini roundabout	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour but would like double yellow lines opposite access to Rougemont	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Concerned parking restrictions will increase parking on Rougemont	1	Rougemont is not adopted as public highway, so any issues would need to be addressed by the landowner or manager for that area.
How will the scheme be policed?	1	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.
Action to remove commercial vehicles as per the covenants	1	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
Discovery Drive is a bus route should be free from all car parking and the current plan will involve buses weaving from side to side - dangerous to all	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Concerns over safety and security where parking zones are going to be created by the proposals	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Parking restrictions opposite 119 Discovery Drive better than outside 119 as sight lines affected by bend	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals **proceed** to formal consultation.

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summary

Road / Area	Bovarde Avenue
Plan reference:	DD/586/17

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

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

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
9 (20.9%)	6 (66.7%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

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

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to see a bus stop provision between Alfriston Grove and Discovery Drive.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
12	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
In favour for safety and aesthetic reasons	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	4	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Residents should use their allocated parking spaces	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Yellow lines are unsightly	1	It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and this should be an expected part of any streetscene.
Covenant precludes parking on the roads - why is it not being enforced?	1	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the

		road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
In favour, but further parking needed for residents and visitors needs to be created e.g. car parks either side of the cricket field, the community centre car park at the end of Amber Lane - drop kerbs for certain properties to allow more off street parking	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
In favour, but extend bus stop clearway to allow for two buses and restrict parking either side to allow buses to access easily	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour on Bovarde Ave especially when school buses are around as parking can get bad	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour, but only if you can ensure parking issue on Bovarde doesn't shift to Alfriston - or restrict parking on Bovarde between 6.00 am and 8.00 pm	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Not been a parking issue in this area for 19 years	1	The proposals are aimed at addressing the current parking concerns and also addressing any future parking issues, by reflecting the requirements of the Highway Code
The restrictions will lead to parking outside our home on the street against the covenants	1	Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
Tower View parking restrictions not being enforced	1	The parking restrictions are being patrolled, but some patrolling is on a reactive basis.
Better to address parking issues on Discovery Drive and Fortune Way	1	The Borough Council is looking at issues across these areas as well.
Bus stop provision between Alfriston Grove and Discovery Drive	1	The provision of new bus stops is for Kent County Council and the bus operating companies to consider.

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way)
Plan reference:	DD/586/18

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 42 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
16 (38.1%)	8 (50%)	8 (50%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

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

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to see double yellow lines all the way from Pearl Way to Bovarde Avenue.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
20	10 (50%)	10 (50%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
In favour but, make the stretch between Pearl and Regent Way postbox double yellow too.	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	7	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
No point unless it is enforced	2	Any new restrictions would be accompanied by increased enforcement.
Houses have very limited parking already and authorities should rethink provision urgently	6	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Allow access to Liberty Trust land on the Cricket ground	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Traffic calming measures would be welcomed	1	The provision of traffic calming is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Road tax entitles me to park on public roads	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour, People do not use their parking bays - and there are often 3 or more cars per house	2	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
In favour but - restrict parking opposite Kendall Ave and Ruby Walk according to Highway code	1	We can extend the double yellow lines opposite the junctions to ease turning movements.
In favour but please extend 18m between Pearl Way and Sunrise Way to give better sight lines for residents exiting Nos 4, 6 and 8	1	The proposed double yellow lines can be extended, as it also achieves the goal of preventing parking opposite the junction of Ruby Walk.
Visitors won't have anywhere to park	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Provide parking on green space between road and pavement on Regent Way	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Reduce double yellows to one side of Regent Way	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
In favour but, increase length of restriction across no 14 to improve sightlines	1	The proposed double yellow lines extend a sufficient distance to maintain sightlines and extending them further would reduce parking opportunities.
Improvements to parking around Discovery School needed	1	The Borough Council's proposals also cover this area.
Drawing is not representative of the actual build of the road	1	The base mapping for the drawings is provided from the Ordnance Survey and seems a detailed reflection of the road layout.
Allowing parking between Pearl Way and the roundabout will affect the sightlines of those exiting Pearl Way	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Repeatedly asked for vegetation to be cut back around the entrance to Pearl Way	1	Cutting back vegetation is outside the remit of the Borough Council and would be for the landowner or Kent County Council to consider
Unfortunate consequence of poor planning - better parking for residents and visitors must be considered if restrictions are applied	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway. The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Double yellow lines in Regent Way not the answer - ample space to create a parking 'indent'	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Extend double yellow lines between Pearl Way and Bovarde Ave	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible, along with any beneficial traffic calming effect.

Informal consultation responses

There was a split response rate to the informal consultation.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals on Regent Way be extended opposite Kendall Avenue and Ruby Walk, and to [proceede](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	DD (Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place)
Plan reference:	DD/586/19

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 29 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
13 (44.8%)	5 (38.5%)	8 (61.5%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but the parish council would like the proposed double yellow lines to extend along Discovery Drive into the entrance of 125 – 131 Discovery Drive. The Parish Council would also like to extend the double yellow lines into the entrance of 18, 20, 22 Discovery Drive. The Parish Council would also like to take the double yellow lines into Alderwick Grove as far as number 12.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
17	9 (52.9%)	8 (47.1%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Nowhere for visitors to park	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Much safer	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	5	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
residents having to park further from their homes	1	Parking on the public highway is not a right, it is tolerated where it does not create a problem, cannot be taken for granted. The purpose of the public highway is to assist travel, and whilst parking directly outside a property may be seen as a

Joint Transportation Board - Kings Hill Review Phase A - Annex 2 – Location Summaries

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		benefit, this is secondary to the needs of the travelling public.
Unsightly double yellow lines	1	It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and this should be an expected part of any streetscene.
In favour for safety reasons	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Looking forward to more parking restrictions on KH - especially large vans	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Parking may be displaced from Discovery into Alderwick Grove - and can it only go to second drain cover!	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Led to house purchaser pulling out	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Most cars parking on Quindell have allocated spaces/driveways/garages	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Not representative to send only to specific addresses - consider additional parking, residents permits, parking at specified times	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Makes KH a less desirable place to live	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Greedy developer reduced parking provision	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Parking on Discovery Drive acts as a natural traffic calming measure - removing this may lead to speeding	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Extend double yellow lines further into the entrance of 125 - 131 Discovery Drive and 18 -22 Discovery Drive. Also extend as far as No 12 in Alderwick Grove	1	The proposed double yellow lines already cover to the back edge of the public highway, and cannot be extended further into the private areas.
Yellow lines should stop level with the footpath to 12 Alderwick Grove (and the same on the opposite side)	1	Whilst this suggestion would provide more parking, it allows parking closer to the junction than is allowed through the Highway Code, so the suggested alteration would not be taken forward.
Lack of sufficient parking allocations forces residents and	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
visitors to park on streets - this will affect them		

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed a split response from residents, with concerns about where visitors would park.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.

Road / Area	DD Discovery Drive (Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way)
Plan reference:	DD/586/20

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 42 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
7 (16.7%)	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

In favour	Against	Don't Know
3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals but would like to see double yellow lines placed opposite McArthur Drive. The Parish Council would also like to see double yellow lines opposite Tiffen Way to ensure clear entry.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	6	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Proposal to have double yellow lines on just one side of DD	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Greed on developers part - not enough parking planned for properties	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Fully endorse but more parking needed in KH generally	1	It is not possible to create more parking places within the constraints of the public highway.
Very few issues currently	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Unsightly yellow lines	1	It is not unusual to introduce yellow line road markings to the public highway and

Issue	No. times raised	Response
		this should be an expected part of any streetscene.
Stop people converting garages and force them to use the spaces they already have	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Removing vehicles from Discovery Drive may increase speeding as parked cars slow traffic	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Eden Way is a narrow cul-de sac - already has overspill from Discovery Drive residents and visitors	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Use money to implement further speed reinforcement and traffic calming measures	1	The provision of traffic calming is outside of the gift of the Borough Council and would be for Kent County Council (as the Highway Authority) to consider.
Fully support - especially if covenant relating to commercial vehicles is adhered to	1	Whilst not desirable, there is an increase in the use of commercial vans, and provided they are legal to be on the public highway they are as entitled to use the road space as any other road user. Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
Cars parked inconsiderately cause poor sight lines for drivers and safety issues for parents and children from school	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Extend double yellows opposite McArthur Drive access and Tiffin Way access	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible, and to retain a positive traffic calming effect

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed a split view amongst residents, with concerns about parking displacement, though the proposals are intended to address the parking issues as part of a cohesive package of measures.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals **proceede** to formal consultation.

Road / Area	DD Discovery Drive (Tiffen Way to Holly Way)
Plan reference:	DD/586/21

Informal consultation

The Borough Council carried out informal consultation on the proposed parking restrictions, from 4th October to 17th November 2019.

As part of the informal consultation we wrote to 48 properties, asking frontagers for their views, and we received the following responses;

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
11 (22.9%)	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)	0 (0%)

We also received responses from residents of other parts of the Kings Hill development who chose to comment on this proposal.

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

The Parish Council commented in favour of the proposals. The parish council would like to urge adoption of Tiffen Way and Victory Drive and see double yellow lines between the zig zags outside Discovery School.

Overall the response was as follows

Response rate	In favour	Against	Don't Know
15	10 (66.7%)	5 (33.3%)	0 (0%)

Issues raised during the consultation

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Not all allocated parking bays/garages are used - all properties have a known amount of parking space	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Safety of residents should come first	3	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Developers should have planned for more parking spaces	1	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
Changes proposed will displace parking/therefore make matters worse	4	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Arguments and tactical parking will increase	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Parking restrictions around roundabouts are welcomed	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Will parking restrictions be 'policed'?	1	The Borough Council's Parking Enforcement team would arrange patrolling by our Civil Enforcement Officers.
In favour but, don't want parking allowed outside our flat (193 DD) on single yellow line	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Proposed single yellows outside school will not stop school drop off/pick up	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
No provision for school traffic has been made	2	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
Commercial vehicles parked here and elsewhere on KH	1	Whilst not desirable, there is an increase in the use of commercial vans, and provided they are legal to be on the public highway they are as entitled to use the road space as any other road user. Any covenants relating to parking on the road cease to have effect if the road is adopted as public highway, and national highway legislation applies.
Audience should have been wider than just frontagers	1	If the proposals are to be taken forward, the next round of consultation would be open to all to comment
Garages not big enough to fit an standard size car	2	The properties have been designed with a set amount of private parking provision and residents should use this wherever possible.
No provision made for commercial vehicles and visitors to properties affected	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.
What is the total cost of the works and ongoing enforcement?	1	The cost of any works associated with these proposals has not yet been considered.
Has the school got a Walking Bus?	1	Schools in Kent are encouraged to develop green travel plans and to explore alternatives to car use
Is the car park near the cricket ground used for school parking?	1	The car park by the cricket ground is not part of the public highway, so The Borough Council cannot comment on its availability for use – it would be an issue for the estate management company.
Will improve safety for school children	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Issue	No. times raised	Response
Adopt Tiffin Way and Victory Drive	1	The adoption of private roads to public highway is an issue for the landowner and the Highway Authority to consider
Double yellow lines between zig-zags outside Discovery School	1	The proposals echo the requirements of the Highway Code, but to retain as much safe parking as possible.

Informal consultation responses

The response to the informal consultation showed the majority of respondents in favour of the proposed changes.

Recommendation after informal consultation

In light of the comments received, it is recommended that the proposals [proceed](#) to formal consultation.