

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

### Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                       | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0378 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements |  |
| KH-0090 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                     | I support all the proposals. I think they still leave plenty of opportunity for on street parking but will prevent the 'silly' parking that currently draws so many complaints. As far as I can see the proposals stop people parking on junctions and try to ensure people only park to one side of key roads. Both should improve safety and traffic flow.   |
| KH-0193 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                     | My objection is a general one that applies to all of the proposals. One of your stated aims is to " address existing issues and to deter parking displacement to areas where it may cause a future problem."<br>There is nothing in your proposal for this area or any of the others that makes any attempt to meet this objective. All you are proposing us more double yellow lines.   |
| KH-0139 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary     | This village is turning into a town. The majority of drivers are extremely considerate and to spend time and money on this is a ridiculous waste for the council.<br><br>The aesthetics of the area are going to be ruined. We pay a lot of money to keep this area looking beautiful.   |
| KH-0206 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                     | The parking slows traffic down. Otherwise people drive so quickly it's even more dangerous.  |
| KH-0352 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary     | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking. |
| KH-0134 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary     | These proposals across the whole of kings hill are not necessary. These changes will force displaced vehicles onto side roads and visitor parking areas, which in turn will not only impact on parking issues already present on smaller roads but will potentially  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |                               |                  |                          | <p>cause an increase in service charges as these roads will then need to be policed. In addition, removing vehicles from the outer larger roads working kingshill will create the perfect race track, current low speeds will be increased, kings hill roads are currently in policed by the local police force and the borough council does not have the resources nor the legal ability to police these roads. These changes will displace hundreds of vehicles without a plan and create more dangerous roads.</p>  |
| KH-0278 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The changes will cause more problems than it resolves.</p> <p>Why Gibson Drive? No requirement for residential parking in area, hope TMBC provides adequate parking for council visitors.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p>   |
| KH-0094 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary |  |
| KH-0385 | DD/586/07A<br>Gibson Drive    | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>Currently, many new built homes have very high density and are poorly designed with no character and a lack of provisions for parking spaces, very small gardens. To many people in the UK, they are considered ugly and low quality. Such developments will create horrible neighbourhoods with very narrow streets where cars are parked on pavements. Residents have no place to even store their rubbish bins. Just imagine such living condition whereby people live in highly density and poorly designed houses. You can only see other houses when you look out of your small window and almost can't even see a patch of sky, where you will be stressed about parking spaces everyday, where people are forced to walk in the middle of streets due to pavement parking. Such development will create a community with rising conflict among neighbours, rising anti-social behaviour (e.g. vandalising cars etc.), and even a rise of violent crime. Such development will also destroy the communities and environments nearby. We are already seeing a rise of anti-social behaviour in Kings Hill. It is likely this deterioration is caused by over-development of this area, i.e. building those high density, poorly</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|         |                               |                  |   | <p>designed and soulless houses by those greedy developers.</p> <p>So, putting double yellow lines don't solve the problem. We need to stop building these high density houses and start building more off-street parking, e.g. multi-level car parks, and divert the cars parked outside people's doors to the car parks.</p>  |
| KH-0192 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Support          | The changes should improve access to and from properties                          | The sooner the better   |
| KH-0138 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety                                  | Absolutely agree  |
| KH-0244 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | <p>I support the proposals in general as increased double yellow lines around the school will help with reduced traffic and improved safety in theory.</p> <p>However I would like to know how the two bays on Crispin Way will be managed? Will they have time limits in them for drop off only and have markings in them to say this?. We use these bays as drop off zones currently and I would be concerned that with increased yellow lines these bays will be blocked with cars parking in them. If that happens then it will actually cause increased congestion and safety issues at drop off and pick up. (I am the HT at Kings Hill School)</p> |
| KH-0175 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Object           | I don't agree with the charges  |   |
| KH-0351 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---|
| KH-0279 | DD/586/08A Crispin Way        | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they solve and result in dangers for people in neighbouring streets.</p> <p>issues mainly due to school traffic No Loading restrictions ineffective - parents would use the available space restricting traffic to the parking areas, negating effectiveness of changes, but maximum negative impact on residents.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|---|--|
|         |   |                  |   | <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0381 | DD/586/08A<br>Crispin Way   | Object           | Other (please elaborate)  | Concerns for safety of school children at Kings Hill Primary School as the parking of cars on Crispin Way acts as traffic calming and reduces speeding. The cars tend to speed up right after the parked cars as it is and that is right by the school crossing. So please instead think of allowing cars to park and to introduce more traffic calming measures to keep the children safe. Thank you.   |
| KH-0040 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements                                      | I believe dangerous parking needs to be addressed. Planning must stop people converting garages into room unless parking it also part of the planning application. Inconsiderate parking is a real issue but those inconsiderate and lazy people will still park on the lines unless enforcement is consistent. Also we are concerned that the lines will displace the parking issues in some locations.   |
| KH-0037 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | I completely support restrictions to limit parking to one side of the street, thereby allowing unimpeded access for coaches to the school. However, if we are to avoid incremental parking issues I think consideration needs to be given to alternative solutions. I feel the area where parking is permitted to the West of Alexander Grove could be better utilised by reprofiling the green space to allow parking at 45 degrees in place of parallel parking, thereby increasing parking density to offset the parking opportunities lost. I feel that this can be achieved in a tasteful manner without adversely impacting the aesthetics of the area.  |
| KH-0145 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander   | Object           | The changes will reduce my  |  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | Grove, Discovery Drive and Alton Avenue                      |                  | options for parking                      |  |
| KH-0320 | DD/586/09A Alexander Grove, Discovery Drive and Alton Avenue | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I am not in favour for this plan to put double yellow lines down our road and across the whole of Kings Hill. I have a young baby and a toddler, and I would have to park away from our home. This would mean I would have to carry the baby back to the house with change bag, shopping, etc. As a teacher, I work long days, and this would be challenging especially in the dark nights of winter and having to crossroads far from our house. We have no resident allocated parking in our area of Alexander grove, Milton Lane, Lawton Way and Hawkridge grove. The roads are narrow and difficult to drive down - poor design. This introduction of double yellow lines will devalue the resale value of my property in the future. Having a lack of parking outside your property can reduce your house value by 5%. Are the council going to refund me this? The double yellow lines would stop me accessing my home - The changes will prevent me loading and unloading. You are removing all access to the front of my house. This will cause major disruption to my family 1. We would have to park our cars a distance from our house, and we will have to cross the road in traffic 2 transporting goods and food with be very difficult 3. workmen (plumber, window cleaner, electrician) have advised us that prices would increase, or they would decline the work. 4. Friends and especially relatives would find it hard to visit and the childcare drops /picks up will become a nightmare for our parents because there is no residential parking alternatives to the road. We do really need support of our family with a young child after Covid crisis. Unfair bias to how the assessment was performed: As your proposal states the yellow lines are aimed at improving safety near schools. The double yellow lines will not have the desired impact because it will push it into surround roads because you have reduced parking options for parents and there is insufficient parking at the school. Your original assessment was done at the school rush hours and things have changed following the pandemic. Increasingly numbers on residents' now work from home and more people are not using the car to get the kids to school. During the 1 hour period of school drop and pick up parents ignore the current traffic management lines on the road. Current traffic regulations state that you shouldn't park 10M from junctions or roundabouts or stop on</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>yellow lines. So far, the council do not use the power it has to enforced current traffic regulations especially at school pick up and drop off! Therefore, why are you covering Kings Hill in yellow lines when other options could be proposed / tried first - education programme, using current laws, etc.</p> <p>Negative impact on safety from the proposed yellow lines on Alexander Grove (45M) stretch: There has been a growing trend over the last 2 years that we are seeing an increase of cars speeding down Alexander Grove - this is when the roads are clear outside of school hours. The cars use this road as a cut through to Asda, Kings Hill Village or to beat traffic. If the park cars are removed completely, cars will increase speed and the chances of accidents (for pedestrians / child) will increase. The houses on the roadside of Alexander Grove like ours, would step straight on to the open road because the double yellow lines are on the proposed housing side whilst the schools side has grass verges. I have a two very young children, and this is a massive safety issue for me. A full safety review would be needed because you would increase danger to my family and not helping to reduce speed outside my front door. The two to three parking spaces outside the house act a traffic calming measure and a barrier to traffic.</p> <p>I am currently paying £3400 council tax and £700 to Kings Hill properties to maintenance. We have seen zero investment in residential parking or traffic calming for speed. Double yellow lines proposed by KCC is pointless because they don't control the investment budget for improving parking and traffic management - that TMBC/ Liberty. This is another case of shocking management and communication across the multiple organisations that say they aren't responsible for anything but keep taking our money - Parish Council, KCC, TMBC and Liberty! My anxiety is that our road will be seen as a cut through to shops and would increase with the building of the NEW Aldi at the bottom of Alexander Grove. Just to make things worse you are removing ALL my access to my property and stopping family, friends and others being able to access my property to perform cleaning and maintenance. As a teacher putting these double yellow lines outside my home with force me to move because I feel the local parish council and county council don't listen to our concerns again. I hope all the current proposals are rejected and I look forward to receiving a better solution in the future.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|---|---|
| KH-0220 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | Other (please elaborate)  | This consultation is difficult to respond to because you ask for numerous roads to be commented upon individually. So I've chosen the first. While I can see the need for some kind of enforcement around Alexander Grove, Milton Lane, Fortune Way, Queens Street and Tower View, particularly at the pinch points near roundabouts, these proposals are too draconian. Not only are the yellow lines excessive but they will look awful. Better to have signs similar to those in Gibson Drive that are enforced properly. If yellow lines are put in they will need to be enforced to be effective, so surely the former is a better option?   |
| KH-0298 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | the double yellow lines in Alexander Grove, as we feel there is a real risk of cars that currently park in Alexander Grove will move to Alton Avenue once the double yellow lines are in place and we don't want our road to become a car park. We live right on the main road of Alton Avenue and this will become a real problem for us, with regards to reversing out of our garage and driveway.  |
| KH-0163 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | Whilst some of the proposals are necessary (in particular near Discovery School) I believe that overall, they overreach to solve the problem. I support efforts to enforce parking around the roundabouts but the knock on effects for this are going to be significant - the cars currently parked will have to go somewhere.  |
| KH-0318 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | I don't feel the proposals are necessary because the road situations have changes since the original assessment was performed back in 2018. Traffic flow and parking on Alexander Grove has changed vastly since the review was performed. Negative impact on safety from the proposed yellow lines on Alexander Grove (45M) stretch: Increased speed down Alexander Grove - when the roads are clear outside of school hours cars use this road as a cut through to Asda, Kings Hill Village or to beat traffic jams a 5pm. If the park cars are removed completely, cars will increase speed and the chances of accidents will increase. The houses on the roadside of Alexander Grove like ours, would step straight on to the open road because the double yellow lines are on the proposed housing side whilst the schools side has grass verges. Our front door is only 3M to the road and we have a very young children and our parked cars act a traffic calming measure and a barrier to traffic. The changes will reduce my options for parking and |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>cause major disruption to other residents on the surrounding non-adopted roads: The proposal will render Alexander Grove impossible to park on and the cars will move to the surrounding roads that have not been adopted. This will cause major disruption (accident, access issues) down Milton Lane, Hawkridge Grove and Laxton Walk increasing dangers to pedestrians on very narrow roads. The Double Yellow lines would stop me maintaining access to our property - The changes will prevent me loading and unloading. You will be removing all access to the front of our house. This will cause major disruption to my families lives by: 1. We would have to park our cars a distance from our house, and we will have to cross the road with 2 very young children and would make shopping trips will become a nightmare 2. Having spoken to workmen (plumber/ electrician) about this proposed change and they have advised that costs to me will increase and in one instance our window cleaner cannot clean our window if it happens - 'He will not have access to our side of the road to park his van to run the hoses to our property' 3. It will impact our quality of life because relatives (elderly) and friends cannot easily access or visit us anymore - this is really need after Covid-19 crisis and having a young child. Unfair bias to how the assessment was performed: As your proposal states the yellow lines are aimed at improving safety near schools. However, the new double yellow lines will reduce parking options and force parents to park down the side roads due to inadequate parking at the school. Your original assessment was done at the school rush hours and things have changed post Covid - increase numbers on residents' working from home and more people are not using the car to get the kids to school. Residential requirements need to be fairly evaluated - The school (drop off/ pick up) only use road 38 weeks a year for 1 hour per day (AM / PM) = 190 hours. This compares to residents 365 days (24 hours) - 8760 hours - Why isn't the assessment focused on our requirements? Where will the residents park and how will it impact us? So far, every area managed by Liberty Property Trust have been sold off to business or handed over KCC and TMBC. We have no residential parking areas for visitors on the estate - double yellow lines everywhere expressed to people they are not welcome and will turn neighbour on neighbour. In conclusion, the current parking proposal for Alexander Grove is not fit for purpose. The assessment is 3 years out of date, a wider review needs to be carried out with all parties that are responsible for roads (resident management companies, Parish Council, KCC, Liberty, TMBC). From your report, I can</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|---|--|
|         |   |                  |   | see no investment into traffic calming measures, parking, etc. Therefore, it doesn't make political sense use a blunt instrument like double yellow lines to resolve wider management issues in the Kings Hill community. There has be no accidents on the roads that are having proposed double yellow lines, but it will aid driver's ability to do excessive speed on narrow residential roads. As a resident, I have seen many situations where people park poorly but a strategic campaign of awareness and education could improve this as well as using current laws (e.g.10M from junctions or roundabouts). However, parked cars in Kings Hill and on Alexander Grove does help to slow cars / vans especially in the day time and evening. Our fear is that our road will be seen as a cut through to shops and would increase, if the NEW Aldi is built at the bottom of Alexander Grove. On top of this you are removing ALL my access to my property and stopping others being able to visit my property to perform cleaning and maintenance. As an NHS worker, please do not put these double yellow lines outside our home destroying my families lives and forcing us to move with two young children from Kings Hill. |
| KH-0143 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | Whilst it is sensible to prevent parking at junctions/roundabouts/crossing points (kerb drops) and particularly dangerous locations, the extent of the proposals across Kings Hill is simply unnecessary. This will cause far more problems than it will solve. More effective enforcement regarding irresponsible and dangerous parking would be far more effective. TMBC granted planning for the developments - concerns were raised vehemently regarding the lack of parking in favour of more houses and profit. The issues now faced were more than known to you at the time and continue to be so. This is a cop out solution to cover your mistakes.   |
| KH-0292 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking                                    | My wife and I have lived in Hawkridge Grove for three years and have seen the traffic and parking problems increase during that time.<br><br>There is no doubt that the proposed extra parking restrictions in Alexander Grove WILL increase the already difficult parking problems in Milton Lane and the surrounding areas, thus making it even more difficult for emergency vehicles, such as ambulances and fire engines, to have adequate access along these roads. The cars and (dare I say) small commercial vehicles presently parking in Alexander Grove during the day and overnight will have to go elsewhere - but, where (there are not nearly enough provisions  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>for residents' parking NOW)?</p> <p>Kings Hill School - there is already chaotic parking in Alexander Grove at school 'delivery/collection' times and any more parking restriction will exacerbate the problem and pass it on to surrounding areas. These proposals will encourage higher speeds in, for example, Alexander Grove - thus endangering the school children and local residents.</p> <p>Further, the obvious lack of discussion between the TMBC and the bodies responsible for these 'other areas', who have similar problems, will cause ongoing problems on a wider scale. Talking to neighbours has shown that many living in roads not under TMBC 'authority' are not even aware of these proposals, although they will be badly affected by the changes proposed, and the implications will be felt all over Kings Hill.</p> <p>Having lived here for three years, I am cognisant of some of the problems and the planning authorities are not moving 'with the times' - all building MUST stop, until due consideration has been given to the problems we have NOW, rather than adding to the problems with every new planning consent. I attended a planning meeting at the Control Tower, some two years ago, where a senior Planning Official proudly advised me that all new properties would be built with 'at least 1.5 parking spaces, off the road' - farcical, in this 'day and age' with many properties supporting more than two working adults.</p> <p>I could go on, and on - but now look forward to hearing your further proposals on how these increasing problems can be lessened.</p> |
| KH-0350 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0148 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking |  |
| KH-0280 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>The proposed changes will cause more problems than they solve and will result in safety issues for residents in neighbouring streets. issues mainly due to school traffic No Loading restrictions ineffective - parents would use the available space restricting traffic to the parking areas, negating effectiveness of changes, but maximum negative impact on residents.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries. Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.   |
| KH-0021 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                         | By adding yellow lines, you will only be pushing the parking problem to other roads.   |
| KH-0384 | DD/586/09A<br>Alexander Grove,<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Alton Avenue | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking   | Kings Hill is already having huge parking problems due to over development of housing of high density. We need more parking choice. Not less   |
| KH-0022 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of Alexander Grove)            | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I am hoping that the proposal will induce School Children's Parents to use the available car park which in turn will give road users better viability and therefore safer for the children leaving or going to School. |
| KH-0078 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of Alexander Grove)            | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |  |
| KH-0366 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of Alexander Grove)            | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         |  |
| KH-0098 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of                             | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | Not enough parking as it is  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         | Alexander Grove)   |                  |  |   |
| KH-0014 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of<br>Alexander<br>Grove) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I object to all new double yellow lines suggested for all roads.</p> <p>I feel that Kings Hill is already difficult enough to park in as it is, it will be made considerable worse / impossible by painting double yellow lines every where.</p> <p>This will impact Kings Hill as in general people will not visit Kings Hill bringing there money to spend in the area which will have an impact on the economy / money, jobs etc.</p>   |
| KH-0348 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of<br>Alexander<br>Grove) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.</p>   |
| KH-0281 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of<br>Alexander<br>Grove) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets.</p> <p>Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0382 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of<br>Alexander<br>Grove) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It is ill thought out and will cause no end of issues for residents   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0151 | DD/586/10A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(east of Alexander Grove)       | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | As per title. This will increase traffic speed and make the village look Dreadful. It's completely OTT  |
| KH-0400 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                         | The proposals are long overdue. Parking surveys on Kings Hill circa 2015 confirmed this. Many reasons including garage sizes are only 2.5m wide KCC standards are 3.6m in width. But more importantly bus services, refuse collection, are restricted due to on street parking.   |
| KH-0104 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | Parking has long been an issue on kings hill and whilst I welcome these restrictions I don't feel there is a solution to the problem. This is very much a two phase problem, first we need to stop cars parking on roads and secondly we need to offer an alternative solution. This isn't just a question of people not using their drives or garages. There simply isn't the space on kings hill for most people, as the majority are 2 car families. Whilst I support the restrictions, I do strongly object that they are displaced to other unadopted roads causing further bottlenecks and endangering drivers. At the discovery drive and fortune way roundabout cars have taken to parking on the roundabout which is highly treacherous for all. The golf course, Asda and other areas have large car parks and I would like to see a residents scheme where you can pay for a permit yearly |
| KH-0072 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | <p>we do support these changes, nevertheless there are some outstanding topics that require attention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discovery Drive speed limiters. it's an issue today that many (car and busses) use Discovery Dive as a race road, largely exceeding the speed limit in an area with constant having children playing and elders walking. I believe this matter require an urgent solution, I've seen daily near misses and car/busses/trucks largely exceeding the speed limits and -in some cases- driving from the opposite side of the road.</li> <li>2. Affordable car park: isn't our case, but it's a reality some houses have more cars than car parks available, I believe a solution is to allocate a window time for cars to be parked in car park supermarkets at an affordable cost.</li> </ol>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0038 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | I don't agree<br>with the charges  | <p>I disagree with your proposal to extend the yellow lines in Milton Lane from Fortune Way to Lindel Court on the south side, encouraging vehicle to park on the north side. I feel this will make things worse than they are today</p> <p>Further, I do not see the benefit of restricting parking to the West of Fortune Way between Discovery Drive and Cleese Court. This is a T-junction with limited traffic, and seems a reasonable place for on street parking. Whereas your plans show no lines to the North of Discovery Drive between Fortune Way and Alexander Grove, despite this being a major thoroughfare and bus route.</p> <p>On the whole, I think your plans are sensible in preventing parking on bends and roundabouts. However, I think the council must accept responsibility for past errors in approving poor planning. Previous provisions were in my view overly idealistic, but totally unrealistic, perhaps due to the foreseen business park not materialising, being replaced by additional housing, also poorly planned.</p> <p>It seems totally unreasonable to limit on street parking, whilst also limiting options to utilise the car parks in the area to park safely.</p> |
| KH-0359 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | I like most of the<br>proposals in<br>general, but I'd<br>don't want...<br>(please<br>elaborate) | <p>Preventing parking on bends is certainly supported but restricting parking options on straight bits of road such as at fortune way south part has no basis for safety.</p> <p>There are flaws in the way planning permission has been granted for developments leaving insufficient parking options for residents. Garages are generally too narrow for people to use as intended (although we do use ours).</p> <p>We have a single drive and single garage that we use for 2 cars. Our son then has his car and he parks it on fortune way (south) as this is somewhere that does not cause any risk to anyone.</p> <p>Plans need to consider the needs of residents and I fear they go too far.</p> <p>Removing options such as these has no merit whatsoever.</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0173 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary |  |
| KH-0155 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | The area around Lindel Court shows excessive yellow lines where cars are able to park with no obstruction. There is literally nowhere to park for residents of the flat that I own (5 Lindel Court) since the indoor parking space allocated is so poorly designed it is literally impossible to park a moderately sized vehicle. I also strongly object to the introduction of yellow lines anywhere on Kings Hill. I moved out of London to escape such petty bureaucracy. You could design out genuine instructions by installing street furniture or other physical restrictions.  |
| KH-0347 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.   |
| KH-0028 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | I agree something needs to be done with the parking situation and danger caused by vehicle obstructions. However, where will others park??? I use my underground car park but all neighbours have two or more cars, where do they park. This will just cause issues elsewhere on Kings Hill. You need an agreement with Asda or provide additional car parks for residents.  |
| KH-0396 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive and Fortune Way (southern section) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | These proposals will restrict access to the front of our property as our driveway is situated to the rear. The double yellow lines will prevent trades people from accessing our property to carry out necessary maintenance, which as homeowners we need to periodically undertake and also we are required to do under our management property agreement. Our preferred solution is to make Fortune Way a one-way road to improve traffic movements and visibility. Preventing parking in Fortune Way and Discovery Drive will just move the parking problem elsewhere in Kings Hill, it does not provide a solution to the inadequate parking situation. If the introduction of one-way streets, speed limits |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |   |                  |                          | and additional residential parking are outside of TMBC's parking remit as mentioned in your recent letter (ref: DD586/11/Form -1) then you should escalate this matter to Kent County Council.   |
| KH-0301 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>There are some justification for controlling traffic parking on the roundabout for safety reasons, but whether that is by double yellow lines or bollards or another solution is in question.</p> <p>Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|---|---|
|         |   |                  |   | <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0222 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | The changes<br>will reduce my<br>options for<br>parking | <p>Where will my 2 children park, not to mention visiting family/contractors etc and anyone visiting me?</p> <p>The cars keep the traffic slower, free roads will speed up traffic and it will become dangerous.</p> <p>I don't want my home to be devalued because there is nowhere for visitors to park. You can't take away parking without making provision somewhere and not too far away either.</p>  |
| KH-0390 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | The changes<br>will reduce my<br>options for<br>parking | <p>The proposal to add double yellow lines outside numbers 61 and 63 Discovery Drive will have a disproportionate impact on my family life. We have a garage for parking our own car but will have absolutely nowhere for our childcare provider or visitors to park. I do not feel that this impact on my family is justified - I am not aware of any collisions or queuing traffic that justify such a heavy handed action and would welcome sight of the relevant data. If it is felt necessary to add double yellow lines around the corner with</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|---|--|
|         |   |                  |   | Fortune Way or around the traffic calming island a little further up Discovery Drive (though again I am not aware of collision or queuing traffic that would justify it), then I still do not see how it can be justified to extend the lines all the way along the road in between, depriving us of that parking option.  |
| KH-0204 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | There are no problems on Fortune way including accidents etc so i am unsure why there are yellow lines being put in. I have 1 parking barn which is great but if i have visitors then this is going to be a massive issue for me. I live on my own and regulary have visitors, they will have nowhere to park and it will probably prevent friends coming to see me. There is no congestion/traffic or accidents so I feel its just a complete waste of time putting double yellow lines in. Maybe put bays in so residents can apply for a 'FREE' parking permit this will prevent people who don't live in the roads from parking but will still allow residents to be able to use the spaces outside their homes.   |
| KH-0150 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | <p>I note that the plan for the northern segment of Fortune Way correctly notices that double yellow lines are necessary to prevent parking opposite and around junctions. This as I understand it is Highway Code. Why do you do the opposite on the Southern end of Fortune Way? As far as I can see, the only parts NOT double yellow are opposite Milton Lane and Queen Street turnings. In my view double yellows are required there as well, so the whole stretch is double yellow. The few cars able to park will fill those areas and make driving into and out of those exits even worse and less safe than they currently are.</p> <p>Further, looking at the proposals as a whole, where will the existing cars go - they are not parked on the roads because residents have space in their garages and allocated parking? You have to solve where cars will be moved TO. The only options you are leaving people are to park badly in the small unadopted closes off Milton Lane and Queen Street, or along the only adopted roads you are leaving largely untouched - Milton Lane and Discovery Drive. People in my view will select the closest option to their homes i.e. NOT Discovery Drive, which will make Milton Lane even worse than it currently is.</p> <p>In my view, double yellows are a good idea PROVIDED that you (i) do it in full, especially Milton Lane; (ii) properly cover opposite all junctions, including Queen Street</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---|
|         |   |                  |                          | <p>and Milton Lane, onto Fortune Way and, if not fully double yellowing Milton Lane, you need to double yellow around and opposite every close coming off it (which will mean pretty much all of Milton Lane).</p> <p>I've seen LEMC's letter to you suggesting a one-way system clockwise around Milton Lane and Queen Street. In my view, that is a terrible choice UNLESS accompanying double yellows down both roads. ANY large vehicle trying to get down those roads will still be squeezing past even more badly parked cars (pushed off other roads) and will push the entire system into gridlock - watch the refuse collection on a Tuesday morning down Milton Lane and you will see a road entirely blocked for the time it takes the lorry to navigate the road. The refuse collectors do a splendid job in trying circumstances - residents in the closes of Milton Lane HAVE to retain the option to go either way out in the morning - if you One-Way Milton Lane you can only keep things flowing with full double yellows. LEMC propose One-Way as an alternative to double yellow, and I respectfully suggest that will make things worse not better - it would need to be both, if One-Way is seriously considered.</p> <p>In my view double yellows is a good idea, but needs extending properly on southern Fortune Way and down Milton Lane entirely. The Borough Council needs then to address where those extra vehicles CAN park - either widen Discovery Drive to permit parking along its north side west of the Fortune Way roundabout, and on the southern segment east of Fortune Way, or open up parking somewhere else on the estate, such as the exiting large car parks around Asda (which are currently limited to 3 hours, making them unsuitable for residents to overflow onto), or build new car parks for this purpose around the Kings Hill school/community centre - lots of trees there which could be thinned out allowing overflow/visitor parking a short walk from homes.</p> |
| KH-0387 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The parking problem is caused by poor planning on development of new houses. There is currently a lack of parking spaces. So, to take away options to park on street is not the solution. The cars currently parked on these areas will be pushed to other residential street and cause even more problems of parking.</p> <p>Currently, many new built homes have very high density and are poorly designed with</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |   |                  |                          | <p>no character and a lack of provisions for parking spaces, very small gardens. To many people in the UK, they are considered ugly and low quality. Such developments will create horrible neighborhoods with very narrow streets where cars are parked on pavements. Residents have no place to even store their rubbish bins. Just imagine such living condition whereby people live in highly density and poorly designed houses. You can only see other houses when you look out of your small window and almost can't even see a patch of sky, where you will be stressed about parking spaces everyday, where people are forced to walk in the middle of streets due to pavement parking. Such development will create a community with rising conflict among neighbors, rising anti-social behaviour (e.g. vandalising cars etc.), and even a rise of violent crime. Such development will also destroy the communities and environments nearby. We are already seeing a rise of anti-social behaviour in Kings Hill. It is likely this deterioration is caused by over-development of this area, i.e. building those high density, poorly designed and soulless houses by those greedy developers. Putting double yellow lines don't solve the problem.</p>   |
| KH-0386 | DD/586/11A<br>Discovery Drive<br>and Fortune<br>Way (southern<br>section) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>Currently, many new built homes have very high density and are poorly designed with no character and a lack of provisions for parking spaces, very small gardens. To many people in the UK, they are considered ugly and low quality. Such developments will create horrible neighbourhoods with very narrow streets where cars are parked on pavements. Residents have no place to even store their rubbish bins. Just imagine such living condition whereby people live in highly density and poorly designed houses. You can only see other houses when you look out of your small window and almost can't even see a patch of sky, where you will be stressed about parking spaces everyday, where people are forced to walk in the middle of streets due to pavement parking. Such development will create a community with rising conflict among neighbours, rising anti-social behaviour (e.g. vandalising cars etc.), and even a rise of violent crime. Such development will also destroy the communities and environments nearby. We are already seeing a rise of anti-social behaviour in Kings Hill. It is likely this deterioration is caused by over-development of this area, i.e. building those high density, poorly designed and soulless houses by those greedy developers.</p> <p>So, the solution is not to reduce parking. We need to increase parking choice. We</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | should think about building more parking spaces or making use of the empty parking spaces in business car parks.   |
| KH-0376 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety         | This proposal is long overdue Accidents have happened in the past at the junction of Queen Street and Fortune Way and Fortune Way and Discovery Drive  |
| KH-0033 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | The changes should improve access to and from properties | <p>I support these proposals in principle, however they seem very draconian. Where I support the protection of 30' space from junctions, this isn't going to make people reduce their car ownership, as majority of homes have at least 2 cars, with more cars than spaces people have to park in. The issue comes with the original guidance from the Govt. when planning permissions were granted.</p> <p>This sentiment applies to all the parking restrictions in this tranche of planning, and will temporarily move the 'parking problem' to other areas that aren't covered in this tranche.</p> <p>You will also have to enforce these yellow lines with some form of enforcement, or you will have spent good money painting lines (and wasting tax payers money) for no good reason.</p> |
| KH-0065 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety         | <p>I would like to know who will police this ?</p> <p>Will an outside company be giving out parking tickets ?</p> <p>Will it cost residents an additional yearly fee ?</p> <p>When will this be in full operation ?</p>  |
| KH-0020 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                                 | <p>Only time will tell if yellow lines get the go ahead to choose a reason for support.</p> <p>Yellow line will not stop parking on pavements.</p> <p>The narrow section outside 16 Fortune Way causes more problems, due to layout of the road (out of your control and down to poor planning initially). If you are heading towards Waitrose and a vehicle comes towards you have no where to go, hence vehicles then</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>mount the pavement - remove the chicane.</p> <p>Ramp outside Richmond Avenue/Fortune Way is 'sailed' over by 4 x 4 vehicles, delivery vehicles, dustcarts, the only vehicles that slow normally are sports cars - otherwise they leave the bottom of the car on the ramp.</p> <p>Due to the fact that the ramp forms part of the pavement vehicles use the pavement so that don't have to slow down when a vehicle approaches them. Remove the ramp it is not fit for purpose and puts pedestrians and vulnerable at serious risk.</p> <p>The chicane outside 14 Fortune Way does not show on your map and also does not help flow of traffic - probably installed due to a vehicle accident a number of years back.</p>   |
| KH-0160 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | <p>I would either put yellow lines down this road or make it one way. This is a dangerous road and half the road is full of parked cars. It is extremely dangerous on the bend opposite Waitrose when you can't see the vehicles approaching you in other directions. Also there is a blind spot towards Braeburn Way pedestrian part. You have to rely on reflection on other cars to take the opportunity to drive on. Also on many occasions cars have mounted the footpath to get by. Dangerous road in my opinion.</p>   |
| KH-0099 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | <p>There cannot be a greater importance, in Kings Hill, than the safety of our community. I am in support of road markings to stop vehicles parking in areas that are stated in The Highway Code as being dangerous/illegal. Vehicles are parked on the Golf Course roundabout, over pedestrian crossings, on the corners and opposite junctions. Our house has two off street parking spaces and we always use them. Many of the local residents have opted for more indoor living space and have therefore converted garages, claiming they are too small to park in. Ours is not too small for the car we chose, making sure it would fit in there when we bought it. I walk 3 young children to the local school and rarely can we walk the short distance on the pavement as cars are parked across them. The biggest issue is the crossing (dropped curb) opposite Kings Hill School as cars park on it and the visibility for children crossing is extremely poor. Please can we have a zebra crossing? Thank you.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0154 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | This will just mean people parking in Fortune Way will just resort to parking in side roads such as Richmond Avenue causing access issues for what is a single lane road and parking issues for residents. Why not restrict parking in dangerous areas such as a junctions and bends.   |
| KH-0096 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | These houses have been built to the MINIMUM building legal requirements, therefore, road parking is relied upon by many Fortune Way homeowners. Our 4 bedroom home has a small garage and drive to the rear. The garage is so small for our car, bins, recycling and 4 bikes and our garden is too small for the sheds that would be needed for this storage. Many of us are squashed onto phases 2 - 3 as it is so I consider it as totally unacceptable to build homes - garages to the minimum legal requirements then take away the alternative parking options too. Houses will devalue/be difficult to sell (or rent), friends/family/caregivers/tradespeople won't be able to access us. The friendly Kings Hill community will be replaced by arguments over parking as cars displace around the development merely moving the problem on. Fortune Way - Queen Street need to be ONE WAY, this will keep the parking AND improve the flow of traffic - safety. I have lived opposite the Fortune Way - Queen Street junction for 6 years and honestly believe one way systems will be the best option. This proposal will seriously affect the enjoyment of living in Kings Hill and will be detrimental to mine and many others well-being and mental health. I already feel panicked at the thought of not being able to easily sell up and move off Kings Hill should this go ahead. I feel trapped and saddened by these unnecessary plans. |
| KH-0171 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | My main objection is that Fortune Way needs to be ONE WAY not lined. Putting lines in place will increase car speeds and will only move the parking onto other roads causing arguments between neighbours. Not only will house prices will go down and will also be difficult to sell.  |
| KH-0218 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | We currently have 2 cars as we both work off kings hill. We have access to 1 parking bay. Want to know where we must now park, as the side roads are already full. Trade cant visit at the moment to do work and that will get worse.<br><br>I am concerned that this decision will devalue the property as we will not be able to sell or even rent. No solution for visitors.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|         |                               |                  |   | <p>This is not a Fortune road problem but one for all roads on kings Hill. Those adopted and those not.</p> <p>Need to do a full survey of all residents and a total traffic review on the area.</p>   |
| KH-0328 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | There is absolutely no requirement for these proposals. The yellow lines will just displace the parked cars to adjacent roads which will cause a parking problem in those smaller roads causing access issues and a potential risk to life and property in the event of an emergency. The lack of parking was caused by TMBC Planning and now at this late stage removing the only reasonable space for parking some properties have is beyond ridiculous. A trial, one way system should be considered through consultancy with KCC Highways first, and also tackling people parking illegally using the current legislation in consultation with KCC and the Police. This is totally unnecessary and a waste of public money |
| KH-0153 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | parking restrictions on corners are fine but not to the extend proposed as it is already difficult to park for residents living on Kings Hill.   |
| KH-0027 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking                                    | If I have a guest they can park in road where we live, plus my gated drive leads onto fortune way, the cars park do not obstruct traffic . Waste of tax payers money   |
| KH-0326 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | <p>The council to do half a job and move the same risks your trying to eliminate to new roads, I live on Hazen Rd that has already been impacted with many cars not from nearby homes leaving parked vehicles from the roundabout near Waitrose all the way down the left side of Hazen Road which is already dangerous as on many occasions I have turned off Tower View into a parker Car at the top of the junction and am then blind as to when I can come out to proceed down the road.</p> <p>If this plan is approved the displaced cars will end up on Hazen Road completely filling up one side of the road making it single lane for 300 yards creating thus life threatening</p>                                    |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|         |                               |                  |   | <p>risks for people and cars coming into and out of Woodford Grove and Hazen Road leading onto Tower View.</p> <p>You also have the new road being built for the "The Landings" develop that will create another dangerous junction and more road traffic, this plan will take already a dangerous segment of road and increase the risks further that for 300 yards you will have blind spots and no way for cars to pass.</p>             |
| KH-0239 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking                                    | There will be no parking for people and people will end up wanting to move off of Kings hill. It will cause massive problems for parking  |
| KH-0152 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't agree with the charges  | There will no parking on kings hill anywhere, will effect people's social life and also people will not want to move onto the hill because of no parking  |
| KH-0188 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | None of the properties have sufficient allocated parking so street parking is needed. I believe it should be made permit parking maybe instead of yellow lines.   |
| KH-0129 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking                                    |   |
| KH-0185 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | I like the idea of driving down the road with less parked cars which make it difficult when faced with oncoming cars BUT with young children that cross the road I would be concerned at the resulting speed increase from a faster flow of cars.   |
| KH-0346 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |
| KH-0025 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>We have 2 cars, one is parked in the garage and the other on the road.</p> <p>The majority of cars on Fortune way belong to resident who don't actually live on Fortune Way.</p> <p>So you are going to devalue my home through lack of management.</p> <p>Making parking bays for resident parking on one side of the road and making the street a one way with speed bumps would be much better.</p> <p>This plan is ludicrous and we VEHEMENTLY object.</p>   |
| KH-0006 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>I don't believe much thought has gone into providing alternatives for additional parking. All that will happen is that the parking problem will simply move to non yellow line marked roads (like Richmond road)and thus creating more chaos for those residents. Fortune way is quite a busy road and once there are no cars parked I believe that motorists will start to increase their speed and create a more dangerous road. Is it not possible to give residents parking permits? Or why can't excess cars be parked at the waitrose or asda car park overnight at no cost. This issue will not go away by simply putting yellow lines down... we need a better solution and one that works for everyone. I do however think that restrictions should be in place near waitrose at the corner and near roundabouts.</p> |
| KH-0332 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>This is an objection to all the Kings Hill proposals.</p> <p>The option should be available to object to all of the TRO amendments at once. The consultation is flawed.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and unnecessary. This is a sledgehammer to crack a walnut.</p> <p>There is some inconvenient parking in places, but this could be dealt with by a very</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>small amount of lines over pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>The double yellow lines will result in more speeding because of empty roads.</p> <p>They will look unsightly.</p> <p>Householders will have nowhere to load or unload from the road, which is not acceptable in a residential area.</p> <p>The yellow lines will just make additional problems on side streets and unadopted roads.</p> <p>If there is to be a review it should be done when Kings Hill is complete and all the adoptable roads are adopted.</p> <p>I object to the extent of yellow lines. They are not necessary across such a wide extent.</p> <p>This isn't a town centre, it is a residential environment where people should be able to park and have visitors.</p> <p>The KCC members of the JTB should instruct their officers to consider a one way street along fortune way / queen street. As a mum with a pushchair and a young child on a bike, I am greatly concerned about this road having double yellow lines. This road is tricky to cross safely as cars already speed down there and you have to cross on a bend. Removing the parked cars will make this a cut through for many, therefore increasing speed and the likelihood of a terrible accident. A one way street would be greatly favoured as it will still allow for the parking required and allow pedestrians to cross in a much safer way. It's not enough to simply say 'that's not in our remit' because it is an available option that would work, and would get support. Yellow lines should be a last resort.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0331 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>This is an objection to all the Kings Hill proposals.</p> <p>The option should be available to object to all of the TRO amendments at once. The consultation is flawed.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and unnecessary. This is a sledgehammer to crack a walnut.</p> <p>There is some inconvenient parking in places, but this could be dealt with by a very small amount of lines over pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>The double yellow lines will result in more speeding because of empty roads.</p> <p>They will look unsightly.</p> <p>Householders will have nowhere to load or unload from the road, which is not acceptable in a residential area.</p> <p>The yellow lines will just make additional problems on side streets and unadopted roads.</p> <p>If there is to be a review it should be done when Kings Hill is complete and all the adoptable roads are adopted.</p> <p>I object to the extent of yellow lines. They are not necessary across such a wide extent.</p> <p>This isn't a town centre, it is a residential environment where people should be able to park and have visitors.</p> <p>The KCC members of the JTB should instruct their officers to consider and consult on an alternative to this - a one way street arrangement along Fortune Way and Kings</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |                               |                  |                          | Street. That would be more effective and would get greater support. Yellow lines should be a last resort.  |
| KH-0302 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>More resources need to be provided for non-resident parking; double yellow lines will cause more problems than they will solve.</p> <p>Current issues with vehicles parked directly opposite the Waitrose car park entrance could be resolved by waiting restrictions. Rest of street not a significant issue except when meeting aggressive and/or inconsiderate drivers. Should not be major through-road as houses front directly onto pavement.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0202 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | <p>I don't agree with the proposals of double yellow lines as all this will do is push the cars onto side roads, it just moves the problem. I personally think the way around this is to make certain roads such as Queen street and Fortune Way, one way roads, which I thought was the plan when this section of Kings Hill was built.</p> <p>Unfortunately Kings Hill was built for families but the parking facilities for each home did not account for the fact all those families have now grown up children and In general there are a number who have more than 2 cars per household due to the young children now being of an age where they can drive. I strongly object to double yellows as the cars have to park somewhere.</p>   |
| KH-0124 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>Relating specifically to Anisa Close, TMBC granted planning permission for multi-bedroom properties with only one allocated parking space. To put it very simply, this area does not have the capacity to not let people park along Fortune Way. Has this assessment actually been done? Is this even possible given the number of cars parked on average? I cannot see how it is. I live in Anisa Close and yes there are vehicles parked all along Fortune Way. Yes this is not ideal, but it is quite normal for a built up area. There are no driveways to be blocked or access points along Fortune Way, so I</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | really do not see who is being affected here. Imposing these restrictions is not the answer and will create an impossible situation for local residents.   |
| KH-0200 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                         | To put yellow lines everywhere on Kingshill is ludicrous. Not only will the cars park elsewhere on the estate but what about our visitors. Where are they going to park?   |
| KH-0203 | DD/586/12A Fortune Way        | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | <p>Whilst I see the need for some short yellow lines on some junctions there is no need for excessive yellow lines everywhere. These will cause people to park cars on side roads which may lead to confrontation - disputes between neighbours.</p> <p>Parked cars also act as traffic calming on some of the main roads so reducing speed. We do not need an increase in speed which may cause accidents.</p> <p>Many houses on Kings Hill simply do not have enough parking. Family houses were built with sometimes 1/2 parking spaces - no thought to children growing up, visitors or cars of trades people.</p> <p>A one way system on roads such as Fortune Way, Queens St and Milton Road are a much better idea. Allowing better access but also room for parking.</p> |
| KH-0379 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | These proposals are essential especially at the junction of Queens Street and Fortune Way where there have been accidents due to poor visibility   |
| KH-0205 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | The parking along curbs on Queens Street causes no end of issues, this is a busy road with larger delivery vehicles up and down it all day, parking on the curbs causes traffic jams, i have seen no end of road rage caused by careless parking. Also parking on the curbs blocks the footpaths meaning people have to take the road, which is always busy and quite fast to get to where they are walking. There is no consideration when parking on both sides of the road for access for emergency services, let alone recycling lorries on recycling day. I have even had people park so close outside my front i was unable to get my pushchair back in my front door.   |
| KH-0149 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Support          | The changes should improve                       | I would prefer it if the entirety of Queen street was to have no parking. As frequently people park on the road near the shops, outside our house causing congestion due to forcing single file traffic. A large proportion of this is Dominos delivery drivers. It  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  | traffic movements                                | astounds me how there is lots of parking spaces in the car parks but people still chooses to obstruct the roads and cause hazards, for moving traffic.<br><br>Regards<br>(Name supplied but redacted)   |
| KH-0093 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I wish to register my support for the whole parking plan. The roads in Kings Hill are incredibly dangerous with inconsiderate and dangerous parking a major problem. I only hope that before too long double yellow lines will be extended to Hazen Road and pavement parking which is a huge problem here will be addressed.   |
| KH-0208 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     | The roads are currently essentially single lane (just) as most of the road and those adjacent have cars parked solidly on one side, or both, and up on the pavements. This leads to issues when traffic attempts to transit the roads in both directions. The roads need to be made available to all, not just those that insist on parking outside their front doors.  |
| KH-0121 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | There is no need for double yellow lines in Kings Hill, that will increase the risk as speeding will occur while now the traffic is quite calm, has any authority done some proper research of how many accidents happened around here in the last years? There should be an improvement in parking solutions, did anyone think where all the residents will park after that? double yellow lines will create even more issues, conflicts between neighbours will increase as parking will be limited, there are many other ways to tackle the inappropriate parking or parking on pavement and so on, you can't penalise 90% of the residents for 10% that have some issues<br><br>I hope you will take the right decision to support majority of the residents<br><br>Many thanks |
| KH-0216 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking   | I work in Kings Hill and on a daily basis have to visit a number of homes, parking is difficult enough, if the yellow lines are done it will make visiting my clients very difficult, especially if no other provisions for parking are offered.  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0161 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary   | This is a very nice residential area which would look look unsightly painting yellow lines all over the place. There is no parking issues on Queens Road except for people parking in the passing bays out side the Indian. This is the only issue and it is at a limited time period only . Putting yellow lines on corners is not required if the are was monitored and patrolled by parking attendants. You will be driving these cars into the private parking area un-adopted by the council but paid the residents. This is not a very thoughtful process its a reaction to problem across the area and you are making a reaction without thought.   |
| KH-0159 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | I don't agree with the charges   | There is limited parking available outside our house. We have one allocated space and we have two cars. This is a similar story for most of our neighbours. If theses changes were implemented we would have to park one of our cars in a non effected street hence causing a huge impact to that area for those residents living there who also are have parking issues. The restrictions are not solving the parking problem it is creating another one.   |
| KH-0187 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want...<br>(please elaborate) | There's a clear reason why yellow lines are a good proposal because parking is lawless and thoughtless in these areas. I feel the restrictions should be extended to Milton Lane. Restrictions in Alexander Grove, Fortune Way and Queens Street will push the problem onto Milton Lane.   |
| KH-0123 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary   | <p>My objections, are to cover all the double yellow line proposals for a large section of phase 2 on Kings Hill. T</p> <p>We wish to raise the following objections.</p> <p>Firstly we believe that the parking should remain as it is. There is no need for yellow or double yellow lines to be imposed on the suggested road ways. We do accept that there are clear parking issues, that need resolving. However these current proposals do not address the real need for "viable" parking spaces for residents.</p> <p>Despite Kings Hill being a newer development, the development did not properly take into consideration "viable" ie useable parking spaces for the family homes built here.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>Most of the spaces in the direct vicinity where we live are not fit for purpose. Garages or car ports that are built so close to other garages or houses, that entering or exiting them is virtually impossible. Another example is that we can fit our car inside our garage but then are unable to open the doors to exit or enter the vehicle. We have one family car that is a Kia Sportage, so I would suggest an average size family car. The garages are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Again building continues on kings Hill with a complete lack of thought about parking. All of the car parks have time restraints, which I totally understand. However those who commute to kings hill to work, or commute to the central area of liberty square are forced to park on residential roads. Making the already busy residential roads busier.</p> <p>More thought needs to be given to parking solutions, rather than narrowing down the already limited parking. All the plans will do is push the issues into the roads or areas where there will not be yellow lines.</p> <p>Many families have multiple cars. Where I live there is no visitors parking available. Where do tradesmen or delivery drivers park?</p> <p>Car speeds will increase as a result of the yellow lines freeing up the road, which in turn will mean more accidents.</p> <p>The whole idea simply moves the problem on, it does not solve it.</p> <p>We would like our objections as a family considered.</p> <p>(Name supplied but redacted)</p> |
| KH-0089 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | If parking is removed from the road it will become a 'rat run' or 'cut through'. Currently most people avoid passing through here and go round by the main roads.  |

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0240 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Most households have more than one car. These proposals are borderline ridiculous. Where are people going to park, you obviously haven't thought of the implications of these actions. Where are visitors going to park??   |
| KH-0135 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | By reducing parking in surrounding roads it will push parking into Queen street (where parking will be reduced as well). Looking at the plans, it looks likely that cars will be parking on Discovery Drive- where currently they don't park. Causing more problems there. Traffic is slowed by parking on Queen Street as well which with less cars it will allow speeding putting pedestrians in danger.  |
| KH-0044 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | I don't agree with the charges                 | The proposal will be make it impossible to park in front of the house where myself and neighbours have been parking for years. There is no alternative parking and with only 1 parking spot allocated per household, this proposal does not take into consideration residents parking needs. I can understand the need for this review however, if it needs to take into consideration where residents already are parking and there is a set "norm" compared to obstructions where delivery drivers and visitors park without consideration. |
| KH-0215 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | I work in Kings Hill and visit homes on a daily basis and this will restrict my access for parking when doing my job.   |
| KH-0345 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.      |
| KH-0085 | DD/586/13A Queen Street       | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | I do not feel that this is correct solution to parking issues on Kings Hill. I understand the need for yellow lines around junctions to prevent accidents occurring where people have parked inconsiderately however to put yellow lines along all of these locations will only compound the issue and push people to park in other locations that are even less desirable.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|
| KH-0233 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | Police what's already there and maybe Yellow line the roundabouts and junctions only. You can't just yellow everything and say "although luck" to those who need to park somewhere   |
| KH-0303 | DD/586/13A<br>Queen Street    | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>Justification for restrictions close to end with Fortune Way to allow traffic to turn into Queen Street. Reducing width of traffic calming measures mean vehicles could pass; double yellows would be excessive.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0026 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                         | I agree to the lines on the roundabouts but not down the road as mentioned in the letter on the lamppost. The plans are different so I assume the letter on the lamp post is incorrect  |
| KH-0196 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I think the chicane part of Winston Avenue should also have yellow lines to stop parking too close to the part nearest to Braeburn Way. It's sometimes difficult to manoeuvre round here, especially for large vehicles.  |
| KH-0003 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | Hesitantly I support this proposal HOWEVER I fear that this is just stage 2 of the complete yellow lining of Kings Hill. There is no doubt that residents and/or visitors and/or trades people park poorly. Certainly around my part of KH the parking close to the small roundabouts on Discovery and close to junctions is very poor and is dangerous and needs to be stopped. As long as there is no mission creep and the rest of the estate is yellow lined you have my support.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|---|---|
| KH-0355 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Support          | Other (please elaborate)  | I support the yellow lines in and around Kings Hill, although I think big chunky yellow lines will spoil the beauty of KH I believe Parking measures are needed. Unfortunately some residents don't give two hoots about how they park or obstruct footpaths or corners. My only concern is residents will ignore yellow lines and just park on them regardless. There needs to be some enforcement by tickets, otherwise it is completely pointless. I'm more than happy to pay a little more council tax to recruit a parking enforcement attendant.  |
| KH-0255 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | Yellow Roads on the main spine roads are acceptable but the smaller roads would create chaos<br><br>residents would be left with nowhere to park or accept visitor vehicles or unload children and shopping.<br><br>It would also take the characteristic beauty away from the development .<br><br>TMBC allowed developers planning for narrow roads and garages too small to occupy cars for many, many years !   |
| KH-0224 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | Other (please elaborate)  | I object to yellow lines at Braeburn Way and Winston Ave. these are stopping residents from parking outside their own property. The parking is bad at the moment as most residents have at least two cars and one parking space and with yellow lines in fortune way and discovery drive, these cars will basically come and park in Winston Avenue and Braeburn Way. This will cause more badly parked cars over residents driveways as people will just dump there cars to get them parked. Please tell me where the 16 plus cars I counted on Fortune Way will park? Fortune way should be made one way! |
| KH-0194 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | Whilst I support the general principal of yellow line restrictions particularly on areas where the highway code advise no parking i.e. roundabouts, junctions and double parking. However in this particular junction it isn't often too much of a problem. Most people do park back from the junction.<br><br>We have disabled transport on a daily basis and any changes to the restrictions on this road will just exacerbate the parking issue by pushing it further up the street and therefore preventing this pick up from being able to park outside our house as those                             |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>that already park will continue to do so. In addition this will effect any visitor parking residents may have.</p> <p>Action is needed to address those that park on the street and not their own drives due to convenience rather than use the drives/bays they have already.</p>   |
| KH-0182 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>I appreciate the need to manage parking however putting yellow lines down does not solve the problem it just moves it to another place.</p> <p>I am concerned that the introduction of double yellow lines will force people to park in other inappropriate places and force people to park down side roads.</p> <p>Since the introduction of yellow lines on tower view the parking on Winston Avenue has gotten worse. People park outside our house who live in properties along Tower view.</p> <p>Unlike properties close to train stations who suffer with commuters parking along nearby roads I do not understand the need for further yellow lines along or around these roads.</p>   |
| KH-0357 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I object in the strongest terms to the proposed yellow lines. The yellow lines will have a hugely detrimental effect on the lives of the residents of Monarch Terrace. This is a short 'no through' road, where peace and quiet are enjoyed by the residents - one of the main reasons for purchasing a property in this road. If the proposed yellow lines were to go ahead, the obvious and immediate impact would be the displacement of cars from Melrose Avenue into Monarch Terrace. This displacement would cause huge inconvenience to the residents of Monarch Terrace as it would become a car park for residents from the surrounding streets. It would cause noise pollution for the residents of Monarch Terrace with vehicles and people coming and going at all times day and night. As mentioned at the start, I object in the strongest terms to the proposed yellow lines and implore the board to re-consider their decision.</p> |
| KH-0130 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave                       | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>The issue of parking should have been addressed BEFORE any houses were built. Children grow in to young adults that will eventually drive. They have been forced out of the housing market by rising prices and are unable to leave home, therefore households end up with 3/4/5 cars, with allocated parking for 1 or 2 vehicles at most. All this plan will do is force drivers to look for parking on already full side roads. It will not work. to</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | and Melrose Ave  |                  |  | ease congestion - allow access to these roads why not make some of them one way, especially Fortune Way. All these actions will do is force vehicles to look for parking on already congested roads.   |
| KH-0294 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | The parking on Braeburn way has no issues and yellow lines will only cause issues rather than fixed a problem that is not there. Yellow lines will just push residents to park elsewhere unwanted on other streets. Braeburn Way does not need yellow lines  |
| KH-0184 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | I feel the area around Braeburn way does not require double yellow lines. Removing parking will not improve road safety- in fact the opposite. Adding yellow lines will just increase the speed of cars on all roads concerned. There is insufficient visitor parking in the entire area due to the increase in time limited parking in the main car parks.  |
| KH-0183 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | The double yellow lines will increase problems for parking in other areas. There is already insufficient parking. When moving onto kings hill, there was capacity for parking when we had visitors in other car parking areas however these are now all time limited. In addition the introduction of double yellow lines along discovery will mean that cars will speed even more along that route which is incredibly dangerous for all especially children on public transport.   |
| KH-0344 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking. |
| KH-0132 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave                 | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | Whilst I understand that parking near a junction is not ideal, and shouldn't happen anyway double yellow lines will cause chaos.<br><br>The central carparks have all enforced time restrictions so not sure where cars are  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | and Melrose Ave  |                  |  | supposed to park. Stop allowing housing developments with such little parking and then these problems won't arise. Double yellow lines on residential roads will not fix parking problems in kings hill.   |
| KH-0125 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | <p>There isn't enough parking in Melrose avenue and when that happens (people have visitors), people then park in front of my house and driveway which won't have double yellow lines, making access to my driveway and garage very awkward (getting in and out). You are moving the problem, the cars have to go somewhere.</p> <p>Can you not incentivise people clearing their garages to park their cars in there?</p>   |
| KH-0214 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>There is already insufficient parking on Kings Hill. This will only get worse with more housing. Many houses on Kings Hill have two cars (as is normal these days) but insufficient provision has been given for this. Furthermore, there are flats on the junction of Winston Ave and Tower View. They park on Winston Avenue. They do not have off road parking. There is insufficient parking for visitors. If cars were allowed to park on Tower View itself this would actually help a) increase parking and b) slow traffic. Currently the "speed cameras" and chicanes are completely ineffective.</p> |
| KH-0336 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | <p>I have lived in Braeburn Way for over 20 years and I have not once in that time seen a vehicle parked or obstructing the junctions proposed to have lines. This constitutes yet another waste of taxpayers money when it would be far better spent on providing additional speed calming, repairing areas and covers on the road, repairing rotting timber corner posts, repairing and painting the poor quality road lighting columns, etc. Yet another case of no strategic thinking, lack of prioritisation and wasted public funds.</p>   |
| KH-0305 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and are more than could be justified in terms of the aims.</p> <p>Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |   |                  |                          | will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.  |
| KH-0304 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>There are no current problems on Braeburn Way and the roads around it should not be used for through traffic; there will only be issues if double yellow lines in other areas push excess parking onto these roads.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|---|--|
|         |  |                  |   | <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0092 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't agree with the charges  |  |
| KH-0036 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  |  |
| KH-0388 | DD/586/14A Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston Ave and Melrose Ave | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | <p>Whilst I agree with yellow lining the junctions to avoid people parking over where pedestrians cross. I do object to the continuation of the yellow lines beyond the junctions, in effect removing 4 parking spaces at best and at worst removing 8 parking spaces. The people who park on the street do not do this because they don't park in their drive, they park there because the parking provided with their home is insufficient. The proposal put forward to lay down the yellow lines without a solution for the people that park their cars at these junctions is poor and so I will not support.</p>   |

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location  | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0162 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave  | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | This will just push people to park in side streets which will block the roads. They are already too busy.   |
| KH-0361 | DD/586/14A<br>Braeburn Way,<br>Tower View,<br>Winston Ave<br>and Melrose<br>Ave  | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking   | <p>These changes will reduce parking options in the area which is likely to reduce rather than improve safety in the area. On Braeburn Way we do not have any safety issues at present. I strongly feel that the proposed changes are unnecessary and will cause crowding in the remaining parking areas, hence leading to more dangerous parking.</p> <p>These changes will reduce parking options for visitors and trades people. The marks on the road will also be unsightly.</p> <p>Where is the evidence that these changes are necessary on Braeburn Way? There is no necessity based on the residents experience.</p> |
| KH-0133 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston<br>Avenue &<br>Melrose Avenue<br>area) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |   |
| KH-0035 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston<br>Avenue &<br>Melrose Avenue<br>area) | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                         | This should make the roads safer for the school   |
| KH-0041 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston<br>Avenue &                            | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     |   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         | Melrose Avenue area)  |                  |  |  |
| KH-0012 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | We have a children's play park in Melrose avenue and mums and dads park here to access the facilities. It is very difficult now and it will only make it more difficult. Why do we have to have 24 hour 7 days a week yellow lines when we don't have buses on a Sunday and few and far between on a Saturday?   |
| KH-0316 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Melrose avenue is already chockerblock with cars if the lines go ahead there will be too many and become a danger. We need new ideas like extra parking bays or more car parks available. I use my allocated parking however still need to use the road due to my disabled wife if I cannot park outside my house it will be a issue for my wife.  |
| KH-0372 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | It will just push the inconsiderate on-road parking further up the road and will effect more residents. It might be more appropriate to introduce the yellow lines for the whole road, which will force those on-road parked vehicles on to their respective drive ways or garages.  |
| KH-0168 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | For a good proportion of Discovery drive introducing yellow lines will cause more problems than it will solve and we shouldn't be chasing the errors made in poor house planning into side streets. Keeping yellow lines to junctions, roundabouts, and traffic calming is all that is required as, certainly from Forest Way all the way to Alderwick Grove, I rarely see any issues that are more than a delay of a few seconds to oncoming traffic and already autonomously managed to single sides of the road. By condensing parking areas to small desirable areas it will inevitably have a knock-on effect to narrow side streets. Rougemont, for example, is already marginally capable of taking two car widths without pushing parking from Discovery into it. Yellow lines may be something to revisit in a few years but I don't believe the current volumes of cars are sufficient to justify causing further issues and alienating residents. |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0368 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | I have lived on Kings Hill for 21 years and do not believe there is a problem with parked cars in this area. The cars that do park here help to reduce the speed of other vehicles. If these roads do have yellow lines, the cars in this area will move to the side streets and will then cause a parking problem for other homes. Unfortunately there is very limited parking for any visitors and yellow lines would prevent these few extra cars from parking.   |
| KH-0354 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | When our house was designed it was intended to have 2 off road parking spaces, but there was room for more cars, however the plan was changed to allow access to our neighbours property so we only have 1 off road parking space. We have to park 2 cars on the road outside the house. There is no visitor parking - visitors have to park in the surrounding area. Many drivers speed down Discovery near the golf course as it is a straight road. Parked cars force them to slow. There is no parking near the junction as there is a bus stop outside our house. So it is currently safe. Introducing yellow lines would mean additional parking in Melrose - Braeburn - this could cause problems with access for emergency services. Also I feel it would cause problems for pedestrians as additional cars would mean they could not see the road clearly to cross safely. I think limited car parking would cause people to park near the junction of Melrose - Braeburn which would cause a hazard for pedestrians - drivers. |
| KH-0343 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.   |
| KH-0079 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | As is common with such schemes, they are drawn up by people with no knowledge of the area.<br><br>I have lived on Discovery Drive for over 20 years and have never had any difficulty on the main routes, such as Discovery Drive, the problems are on the side roads. One drive around would tell you that without a survey! So you propose to impact the main routes first to drive more parking on to the already problematic side roads - very logical!  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location   | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>There is no need for any lines or bust stop clearways between Winston and Melrose - if it isn't broke why do you want to fix it!</p> <p>The bus stop is always clear because there is a driveway after the stop which means it never gets blocked. There are 5/6 spaces outside 97-101 on the bus stop side which serve those houses. So why would you put the double lines there when they could go on the other side of the road - it would mean people would not have to cross the road (safer) and more importantly, and quite obviously, if a bus is stopped at the bus stop and cars parked where your plans show, the whole road is blocked! Did you really think this through at all?</p>  |
| KH-0136 | DD/586/15A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Winston Avenue & Melrose Avenue area) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | <p>I want to object about this particular parking area as well as the many others listed on your site around Kings Hill. Yellow lines are an eye sore and do not solve any issues. We need more parking and not less. If you put in yellow lines then more people will be forced to park in other areas and disrupt other residents. If your CEO have the power to issue tickets then why not do so for those who currently park poorly, in wrong areas, close to junctions etc. Try to think of other solutions to increase parking on this huge development rather than ugly yellow lines. There are thousands of houses here and more still to come. Due to its location we all need cars and recent housing provides less and less per house, unlike Phase 1. There is still plenty of space to add parking. Rather than a third supermarket turn that area into parking?</p> |
| KH-0157 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue)          | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |   |
| KH-0081 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue)          | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |   |

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                  | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0349 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | Whilst I don't disagree totally I do believe that you need to take in to consideration the amount of cars that are parking on the roads that you now wish to add yellow lines too. Where are these extra cars going. I counted 20 cars on one of the roads this morning. Them 20 cars will have to park somewhere. Ok some might start to use their space but at least 50% are over spill. Have you considered the consequences of doing this? Yellow line at junctions but not the complete road.   |
| KH-0311 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | The proposals across Kings Hill as a whole will drive existing street parking further into unlined roads. This is merely displacing the problem of inconsiderate parking too close to junctions, roundabouts and bus stops. Planners are at fault for not recognising the shortage of adequate parking, and the fact that as children grow up they too want cars. The proposals in their current form will mean lack of parking for tradesmen, delivery drivers and visitors. The widespread introduction of double yellow lines is likely to lead to neighbour disputes.  |
| KH-0324 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | There is absolutely no requirement for these proposals. The yellow lines will just displace the parked cars to adjacent roads which will cause a parking problem in those smaller roads causing access issues and a potential risk to life and property in the event of an emergency.  |
| KH-0170 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Boverde Avenue) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | For a good proportion of Discovery drive introducing yellow lines will cause more problems than it will solve and we shouldn't be chasing the errors made in poor house planning into side streets. Keeping yellow lines to junctions, roundabouts, and traffic calming is all that is required as, certainly from Forest Way all the way to Alderwick Grove, I rarely see any issues that are more than a delay of a few seconds to oncoming traffic and already autonomously managed to single sides of the road. By condensing parking areas to small desirable areas it will inevitably have a knock-on effect to narrow side streets. Rougemont, for example, is already marginally capable of taking two car widths without pushing parking from Discovery into it. Yellow lines may be something to revisit in a few years but I don't believe the current volumes of cars are sufficient to justify causing further issues and alienating residents. |
| KH-0167 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to                 | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | For a good proportion of Discovery drive introducing yellow lines will cause more problems than it will solve and we shouldn't be chasing the errors made in poor house planning into side streets. Keeping yellow lines to junctions, roundabouts, and traffic  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                  | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | Bovarde Avenue)  |                  |  | calming is all that is required as, certainly from Forest Way all the way to Alderwick Grove, I rarely see any issues that are more than a delay of a few seconds to oncoming traffic and already autonomously managed to single sides of the road. By condensing parking areas to small desirable areas it will inevitably have a knock-on effect to narrow side streets. Rougemont, for example, is already marginally capable of taking two car widths without pushing parking from Discovery into it. Yellow lines may be something to revisit in a few years but I don't believe the current volumes of cars are sufficient to justify causing further issues and alienating residents. |
| KH-0369 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Bovarde Avenue) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | I have lived on Kings Hill for 21 years and do not believe there is a problem with parked cars in this area. The cars that do park here help to reduce the speed of other vehicles. If these roads do have yellow lines, the cars in this area will move to the side streets and will then cause a parking problem for other homes. Unfortunately there is very limited parking for any visitors and yellow lines would prevent these few extra cars from parking.   |
| KH-0342 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Bovarde Avenue) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.   |
| KH-0254 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Bovarde Avenue) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | <p>Thank you for your letter of 9 July regarding the proposed addition of double yellow lines to some parts of Discovery Drive and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>We do not agree with the proposed plans for the sections of double yellow lines detailed in Drawing No DD/586/16 Discovery Drive (Rougemont to Bovarde Avenue), specifically the section immediately opposite house numbers 115 - 123, for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Primarily, today school buses, parents, residents and various tradespeople park immediately opposite the shared driveway for house numbers 115 - 123 Discovery Drive and this causes major problems:</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>1. Buses frequently stop in the driveway entrance to pick up and / or drop off, blocking both Discovery Drive traffic and access to our properties. Double yellow lines opposite the driveway entrance would prevent the road being blocked when buses are stopped.</p> <p>2. Children crossing the road here have to walk between the parked vehicles and so may not see oncoming traffic. A large number of children cross the road both in the morning and late afternoon to wait for the school buses that stop in Bovarde Avenue. Double yellow lines opposite the driveway entrance would reduce the risk these children face on a daily basis.</p> <p>3. In winter the driveway, pavement and road can be frost, snow or ice covered as the parked vehicles hinder gritting the road. There is a danger that the parked vehicles opposite could be hit by the residents of the 5 houses that share the driveway skidding into these parked vehicles as they leave or return to their homes. Double yellow lines opposite the driveway entrance would remove the risk of this happening, by ensuring the road is completely clear and that gritting can be conducted thoroughly.</p> <p>4. The local schools use the section of Discovery Drive between Bovarde Avenue and Bancroft Lane for cycling proficiency training. This proves difficult and dangerous when vehicles are parked here on Discovery Drive. The addition of double yellow lines from Bovarde Avenue to Bancroft Lane on both sides of the road would ensure the children's safety when practicing their cycling proficiency.</p> <p>Not painting double yellow lines on the section of Discovery Drive opposite the shared driveway to houses 115 - 123 will only exacerbate the problems we currently face with danger to children and vehicles, double parking and traffic obstructions. Having continuous double yellow lines from Bovarde Avenue to Bancroft Lane on both sides of the road will remove the issues stated above and encourage residents to park their vehicles on driveways and in garages as the designers anticipated.</p> <p>If continuous double yellow lines are not introduced on Discovery Drive on both sides of the road, then the addition of double yellow lines on the roads surrounding Discovery</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                  | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--------------------------|---|
|         |  |                  |                          | <p>Drive will, by default, result in increased levels of parking on Discovery Drive and increased traffic congestion. Currently parking is spread along Discovery Drive and other than when buses stop randomly (i.e. not at a bus stop) there is no parking on both sides of the road at the same time and therefore no obstruction to through traffic. The proposed gaps which are designed to “constrain parking to one side” will bunch parking and will continue to cause the same obstructions when buses stop anywhere.</p> <p>Surely the approach taken for Discovery Drive should be the same as Tower View between Waitrose and Bovarde Avenue, with unbroken double yellow lines on both sides of the road all the way along?</p> <p>To conclude if double yellow lines are established, will there be penalties enforced for parking on the double yellow lines and if so, what will happen with the revenue generated from these penalties?</p> <p>We look forward to reviewing the revised proposals, and please let us know if you have any queries regarding our comments or would like any additional information.</p> |
| KH-0009 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to Bovarde Avenue) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>I have already rejected against these proposals once precviously and am disappointed to see that the proposals have been brought again unchanged and that you have entered into no dialogue with me on these. I would hope for better this time.</p> <p>I agree with keeping bus routes clear and so support the broad idea but feel your application is incorrect.</p> <p>I don't agree with the location of the parking zones in this section, in fact I feel strongly that there should not be any parking zones on the main arterial routes. Please see more detail below - simplistically the current plans are not well thought out from a safety perspective for road users or members of the community who live at these affected addresses:</p> <p>1 - Parking zone opposite Rougemont access will result in increased levels of danger for vehicles exiting Rougemont and on Discovery Drive</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>2 - Parking zone either side of Bancroft Lane will result in increased levels of danger for vehicles exiting Bancroft Lane and on Discovery Drive</p> <p>3 - Zone to right of 2 Discovery Drive - opposite 119-121 Discovery Drive - will result in increased levels of danger for vehicles accessing driveways for 115-123 Discovery Drive</p> <p>4 - Small zone from 113-115 Discovery Drive will result in increased danger levels for our householders. Across the 2 houses there are 6 girls (4 of primary school age and 2 of secondary school age). As a parent I do not want a parking zone directly outside of my house that could put children or pets at increased risk. You are effectively directing traffic to this spot for other residents. This means that there was increased danger to my property, to my children and increased noise and air pollution for us all, through these proposed actions.</p> <p>I would urge you to rethink these plans and keep the bus route clear of parked vehicles for the safety of road users and pedestrians alike. If there does need to parking zones (and I do not understand why there does) I do not think that there is a suitable location for these in this particular planning application DD586-16A.</p> <p>On a related note if these no parking zones are not going to be effectively policed, as is indicated on your website as part of the proposal, what is the point of all of this? What issue are you trying to deter here?</p> <p>Are you trying to stop people parking on the road at all hours? If so put in place a no parking between 11:00-12:00pm or some such 1 hour window to deter leaving vehicles on the road and then make sure that wardens are out at these times to police the roads. This could also be applied for a time in the evening to stop people parking there vehicles for long periods of time.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location  | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--------------------------|---|
|         |  |                  |                          | <p>The plans that you have created will also impact delivery drivers etc who I do not believe are an issue and should be allowed to park for loading / unloading purposes in the most convenient locations or else you run the risk of more danger / risk for them and other road users.</p> <p>In my opinion parked cars are the challenge here and you should be doing all you can to remove these from the roads but in such a way that still a delivery driver a 15-30 minute window to be able to carry out their work.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you to discuss in more detail. I would sincerely like to help you make these plans (both in my particular area and for the whole of Kings Hill) better.</p>  |
| KH-0306 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to<br>Bovarde<br>Avenue) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and are more than could be justified in terms of the aims. Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location  | Object / Support | Reason                                       | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0296 | DD/586/16A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Rougemont to<br>Bovarde<br>Avenue) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary     | One of the stated aims of the parking review is "...to deter parking displacement to areas where it may cause a future problem." However, there is no mention of displacement deterrence in the actual plans, or how displacement will be mitigated. It seems to me to be self-evident that if parking restrictions are introduced along Discovery Drive, then the vehicles that currently park there will be displaced to the smaller roads, exacerbating existing problems. Therefore I object to the proposals.  |
| KH-0374 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue   | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements |   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0075 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     | I live on the corner of Bovarde Avenue and I am sick of the traffic congestion due to my neighbours parking their cars on the street rather than in their drives or garages. It means all of the buses struggle to get through and this causes chaos right outside my house. We need Yellow Line on all access routes to make people park responsibly.  |
| KH-0232 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     |   |
| KH-0031 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     | <p>I am in full support of the proposed parking restrictions. Vehicles regularly park inappropriately at junctions, islands and block exit routes from side roads.</p> <p>Larger vehicles such as busses and emergency services will struggle due to obstructions and limited space to manoeuvre.</p> <p>We have 1 parking space for 3 vehicles but will always park considerately, many don't so I am strongly in agreement with TMBCs proposals.</p>  |
| KH-0119 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I agree with the lines on Bovarde located on the opposite side to the bus stop and on the roundabouts at either end. I'd like the bus stop clearway to be 2 bus length's, otherwise the bus will not be able to manoeuvre to the pavement. I see no point in the 1-2 car section to the right of Alfriston Grove entrance road on the bus stop side. I have no view on the lines shown on Discovery or Regent Way. I do not live on either of these roads so do not think my view should be considered. |
| KH-0039 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     |   |
| KH-0272 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking   | I feel it's a disgrace to implement yellow lines on Kingshill. Residents don't have enough places to park as it is. Kingshill roads are extremely tight, houses are built with no driveways, the garages are too small to put an average size car. This is to the financial benefit of the housebuilders who can build more homes in their allocated space. This is also for the benefit of the council as more houses mean more council tax, the council   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | should be doing more to improve and provide more residential parking space, not limit it. Thank you.  |
| KH-0007 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | I don't disagree something needs to be done to clear the main roads of Phase 2 and stop people parking in dangerous places. However you are not fixing the route cause by simply forbidding them to do it. You need to supply alternative overflow and visitor parking. People don't want to have to park on roads and kerbs, they simply don't have any other choice when the average house on phase 2 only has 1-2 parking spaces. If you double yellow my road - Boverde where are contractors/visitors supposed to park? There are plenty of easy options to create overflow parking if you utilise what is glaringly obvious. Why not open the cricket car park on regent that is never used. Put a little extra car park at the end of amber lane, open the car park by the linear park at beacon roundabout. Open the prologis car park in queen street. Create some visitor bays in some of the over sized verges. I would like to see the yellow lines BUT only if over flow and visit parking is introduced at the same time. |
| KH-0008 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | I don't disagree something needs to be done to clear the main roads of Phase 2 and stop people parking in dangerous places but You can't just introduce yellow lines and not supply alternative overflow and visitor parking. where are contractors/visitors supposed to park? I would like to see the yellow lines BUT only if over flow and visitor parking is introduced at the same time.   |
| KH-0235 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | I don't agree with the charges                 | Currently there is a by-law that prohibits parking vehicles on the road. By marking several roads with double yellow lines it will infer that parking on the road outside of those areas is legal and acceptable. This is a mistake and will drive people to park in the surrounding streets illegally in front of other people's houses. This is clearly wrong and I would urge the council to find alternative ways of restricting the illegal parking which is happening on the roads around Kings Hill. Perhaps the council should seek civil prosecution for those vehicles that are causing problems.   |
| KH-0323 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | There is absolutely no requirement for these proposals. The yellow lines will just displace the parked cars to adjacent roads which will cause a parking problem in those smaller roads causing access issues and a potential risk to life and property in the event of an emergency. Any parking issues in this road which are very minimal, are caused by the Bus stop and school bus pick up and drop off points on both sides of the road being on the shortest road in the area. These busses should be using Discovery or Tower   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | View where the road is wide enough and only single way to safely embark and disembark on journeys. This is the only issue that needs addressing on this road.  |
| KH-0315 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | There has been no provisions thought out for where the cars will park. Everyone has cars and everyone needs to park near their houses. In my opinion people do use their allocated parking but in certain areas of Kings Hill the allocated in insufficient. The lines proposed will force all the cars onto the smaller roads causing already busy small road even more problems and a safety issue with emergency vehicles not being able to get through. The proposal needs a complete rethink - please liaise with the KHPC as they seem to have the right idea now. It is obvious from the public meeting that the majority on KH object to the plans.  |
| KH-0165 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Putting double yellow lines on any of these roads listed in Kings Hill will just force residents/visitors to park on the smaller roads off of the 'main' roads causing congestion and difficulties for neighbours. I feel that this is a money making scheme as there is no problem with people parking on the 'main' roads. It acts as a natural traffic calming solution and doesn't cause problems for buses or other large vehicles as there's still plenty of room to get through. Putting double yellow lines on these roads is also not fitting with the community feel of Kings Hill.  |
| KH-0102 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>While I am not on one of the listed roads the wider impact of these changes will be obstructive for all residents.</p> <p>I want to know the TMBC long term plans for parking?</p> <p>The current restrictions are already pushing additional parking in to the surrounding roads. I am also aware of neighbours who have registered complaints of difficulty accessing their drives being told "there is nothing TMBC can do" and the police can only act if vehicles do not have Road Fund Licence, insurance etc.</p> <p>Recent enforcement of both Asda - Waitrose car parks (that are perfectly reasonable) have made the issue even worse.</p> <p>Why has TMBC allowed planning permission for so many houses/dwelling to be built without adequate parking capacity?</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>Why are plans for more buildings being proposed without adequate planning?</p> <p>When all the vehicles affected by the proposed restrictions are pushed in to surrounding roads, causing congestion/obstruction/safety issues what will be the planned solution? More parking restrictions in those new areas too? Then what?</p> <p>So I repeat, what is the long term solution for parking on kings Hill? How is this problem being addressed in plans for the proposed new housing?</p> <p>I see 4 - 5 bedroom houses being built with minimal parking capacity yet these properties are likely to have families with multiple car ownership.</p> <p>From my perspective I am fortunate enough to have garage and driveway that caters for more than the vehicles in my household. However, it's not unusual to either have to squeeze through tight gaps to get in or out of my road/connecting roads, let alone the issues for bin collections/deliveries etc.</p> <p>So I object to the collective proposed parking restrictions without being informed about how they were calculated, what the impact assessment is, what the plan will be to get out of the issues that they will create and what calculations are being factored in to all the new housed being proposed?</p> |
| KH-0341 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |
| KH-0271 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | We don't agree with any of the yellow lines as this will simply push the vehicles into already overcrowded streets/areas. This will also cause friction amongst neighbours .  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|         |                               |                  |  | We firmly believe this will make residents pave over whatever land they have left which in turn will cause more drainage problems / flash flooding to occur.   |
| KH-0082 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | This will push parking into nearby side roads, leaving residents and visitors no place to park. Planning has allowed building to the minimum requirements for parking per house. At the same time as permitting narrow roads that make parking on them unsafe (Fortune way, Queen Street). Add to this a naturally ageing population with children owning vehicles and we have the situation we are in now! The answer is to provide more parking. Not to take it away, forcing the problem somewhere else.  |
| KH-0307 | DD/586/17A Boverde Avenue     | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>The use of Boverde Avenue as a drop-off / pick-up location for Discover School will become more dangerous as car speeds increase with the introduction of clearer roads due to double yellow lines.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|         |                               |                  |  | <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0375 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | I don't agree with the charges                 | I feel this plan is too broad brush in its approach and needs to be re-thought, to provide a better balance of the needs of residents and visitors, with road safety. A mixture of yellow lines plus fines for inconsiderate parking is what's needed. Hastily slapping yellow lines down everywhere on Kings Hill is not a solution, it will only lead to parking chaos.   |
| KH-0097 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue  | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | The proposal for double yellow lines is beyond incomprehensible. Parking will be forced onto smaller roads making them completely congested and unsafe. There is no need to put double yellow lines around Kings Hill and especially outside my property. This will be unsightly and an inconvenience for when I need to park on my road. Car thefts will likely increase due to cars parking in more secluded areas as well which the council have not thought through. Empty roads will become a race track to other drivers. I am completely in objection to this.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                           | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
| KH-0077 | DD/586/17A<br>Bovarde Avenue                            | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking           | It is unreasonable to restrict the parking on the streets without providing adequate parking alternatives   |
| KH-0122 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | The changes should improve access to and from properties | I support all the parking suggestions to improve access and visibility. Please note - the speed of vehicles will increase and consideration should be made for a 20mph limit in residential areas. Kind regards   |
| KH-0377 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety         |   |
| KH-0398 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | The changes should improve access to and from properties | Being on (Address redacted), we have struggled with cars parking in front of our door and also visibility when turning into Regent Way.   |
| KH-0266 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety         | Irresponsible parking has made some of our roads dangerous to children and pensioners like myself   |
| KH-0399 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements             |   |
| KH-0270 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Support          | Other (please elaborate)                                 | I do not support the lines between Kendall and Ruby, here is the problem, 1. Motorists slingshot into Regents from Tower View at dangerous speeds making it difficult to join Regent from Kendall. Although not fond of street parking 2. It does slow down the speed of drivers therefore allow parking on the road between Kendall and Ruby. Hope my point makes sense. |
| KH-0013 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way                                | Support          | The changes should improve                               | Can the double yellow lines be extended all the way into Sunrise Way as people park there every day - night half on kerb half on road, making the pavements Impassable for mothers with buggies ( therefore having to push buggy on roadway) and making it  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         | (Tower View to Sunrise Way)                       |                  | access to and from properties                  | difficult for people turning into and egressing from driveways and courtyards. There is also the issue that on many, many occasions there's not enough gap for larger emergency vehicles to get through. I have complained about this several times before but this has only resulted in a letter to residents and no follow up after the letters have been completely ignored by the residents  |
| KH-0362 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | There is currently a lack of parking in Kings Hill and further restrictions will cause long term negative affect. Also I strongly believe this will encourage people to speed causing more of a safety issue.  |
| KH-0367 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | There are already so many extra vehicles parking on Regent way that the new yellow lines on the neighbouring roads will make Regent way jam packed. I have three young children and often like to stop close to my house to get the children in and out of the car. The yellow lines will make it impossible for me to stop my car anywhere near my front door. I feel the bigger issue is the small number of households that have numerous vehicles, Way beyond the number that their property provides spaces for. One household on our street has seven cars, plus they buy and sell cars as a business. Another household has been rented, and the new tenants have industrial vehicles that they park on Regent way permanently. It is these issues that need addressing, rather than double yellow lines. Also, as I work, my young children are looked after by grandparents four Afternoons per week. It will be very difficult for elderly relatives to be able to park near our home to help us with childcare if they are unable to park their vehicles. |
| KH-0371 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | I will not be able to support my daughter and her family with child care if I am unable to park near their house in Regent Way. I regularly look after the 3 children after school. My husband who is a disabled badge holder and not very mobile accompanies me.  |
| KH-0273 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | We don't feel the proposals and/other options have been fully considered and also feel that the extent of the proposed restrictions will only exacerbate the parking issues not solve them. Specifically:  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>1. We note from the plan enclosed with your letter dated 9th July that the double yellow lines proposed are even more extensive than those contained in your letter dated 4th October 2019 which is extremely concerning. On average, at least 20 vehicles park on the stretch of road between Kendal Avenue and Sunrise Way at peak times every day. The plan attached with your letter appears to accommodate 4 to 6 cars in total on this stretch of the road. Where do you propose all the other cars park? As we have submitted previously, such extensive restrictions are only going to significantly exacerbate the situation rather than alleviate it.</p> <p>2. We attach a link to the recent report from the RAC 'Standing Still' which highlights the fact that garages are inadequate for the size of modern sized cars. In light of the report (which also cites other reports and findings), Steve Gooding, director of the RAC Foundation states that, "domestic garages are also often unfit for their intended purpose - the planning system needs to recognise that garage design needs to catch up with vehicles design". This supports the point we made previously that many households, including ourselves, are unable to use the garage to park a vehicle as it is simply too small. The Borough Council should be taking these irrefutable findings into consideration in its plans and in doing so, consider ways to address this fundamental issue, working with residents rather than making matters worse for them. It should be borne in mind that ultimately it was the Borough Council that approved the plans for the garages which are unfit for purpose. <a href="https://www.racfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/standing-still-Nagler-June-2021.pdf">https://www.racfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/standing-still-Nagler-June-2021.pdf</a></p> <p>3. It is not the parking that is an issue but parking on both of sides of the road and/or immediately opposite a road. We wonder whether you have visited Regent Way in person to see for yourself that this is the case and that lines on only one side of the road would address the current problem. An issue only arises when a thoughtless few individuals park on the other side of the road in close proximity to another car already parked on the other side and/or directly opposite the junction making access for larger vehicles more difficult.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>4. If you proceed with your proposed plans, cars will park on the residential roads which are not as wide as the main roads which will, in turn, cause more issues for the residents who live on roads such as Kendall Avenue, Pearl Way and Ruby Walk, not help them.</p> <p>5. We would suggest that the more practical option, particularly in Regent Way, would be to utilise the wide grass verges and create car parking spaces there, on one or other side of the road, with yellow lines on the other side. This option would allow for car parking for those who need it, for the reasons set out above, but also mean that the road would then remain clear for buses and emergency services - we understand this to be the main reason for introducing the double yellow lines.</p> <p>6. If the double yellow lines extend well into Ruby Walk as indicated by your plan, we will be unable to park our car outside of the house as will be the case with number 11 opposite which we currently do without any impact on vehicular access to anyone else. We will have nowhere else to park our car.</p> <p>We sincerely hope that you will give this matter further consideration rather than go ahead with the current proposal which will only compound matters and make the situation for the residents unmanageable. There are other options which would not have such a profoundly negative impact on parking which we trust the Borough Council will explore.</p> |
| KH-0317 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to<br>Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | How can our visitors park? Plus when our children pass their tests where will they park their cars? This is a family estate and due to the greed of developers there are too many houses crammed next to each other with nowhere for visitors or families to park. There needs to be another area available for people to park, open the cricket club car parks?  |
| KH-0207 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to<br>Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Where are growing families and guests supposed to park?!! I understand that some places people park are very dangerous but putting double yellow lines everywhere is completely unrealistic considering Kings Hill is a family estate.  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                           | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0370 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges                 | It will force the problem elsewhere rather than dealing with it.<br><br>Maybe yellow line just down one side would be a better option  |
| KH-0114 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | The introduction of double yellow lines on the main adopted roads in King's Hill is likely to mean greatly increased traffic speeds as well as significantly increased parking on the smaller side roads (most of which are already full). Our garages are not of sufficient width to park a family car inside and most households possess more than one car meaning many of us have no choice but to park on the roadway.   |
| KH-0212 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Yellow lines further down my road and in adjoining roads will mean Regent Way will be full of parked cars from other roads, leaving no parking for residents and their visitors and more noise and disruption. The buses which currently struggle with parked cars on this road will be unable to get through, especially on the blind bend where owing to parked cars you cannot see cars coming the other way. Please leave arrangements as they are so parking will be evenly distributed   |
| KH-0237 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | These proposals are a very heavy handed solution to the problem. The only issues in the stretchy are people parking too close to the junctions and a five metre double yellow extended from each route off a junction would be ample to address this. A blanket parking prohibition along regent way will simply enable cars to speed and create significant problems in the adjoining non adopted roads.  |
| KH-0147 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Only need yellows on corners and by roundabouts! There will be huge issues for residents parking   |
| KH-0360 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | The roads and appearance of Kings Hill, is one of the reasons we moved here, after living in London. The spoiling effects of yellow lines are not necessary, and detract from the appearance of the beautiful monoblock roads and pavements that we have. There are offences of parking on pavements, close to junctions, causing unnecessary obstruction, which can all be dealt with, legally, without the requirement for yellow lines. Yellow lines in these roads will only result in previously well managed side roads, being populated by displaced vehicles. The majority of drivers causing these issues, are repeat offenders. They have often been approached regarding this and have become |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | very abusive. It is not for residents to sort, but also there should not be a blanket approach to this problem.   |
| KH-0190 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I admit that exiting Sunrise way on to Regent way is ,most of the time, unsighted due to parked cars. However, using the junction has never been an issue and I believe the lack of viability has a positive effect in slowing down the traffic. If we clear the roads then I firmly believe we are inviting higher speed accidents and having two young children myself am very concerned. I live on the corner of this junction and currently park my car safely on the road in Sunrise way. The planned yellow lines on Regent way will increase the parking in my road dramatically, thus making the quieter roads unsafe especially for children. A lot of pedestrians use our road for access to the cricket pitch increasing the likely hod of accidents if Sunrise way suddenly has to house vehicles from Regent way.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned on the negative effect this will have on the house prices.</p> <p>I do reason more with a possible trial of yellow lines on queen street - fortune way as these roads have a higher volume of traffic and often restrict passing of oncoming vehicles.</p> |
| KH-0101 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | If people cannot park on the road it will mean parking on side road such as ours, where there is already too many parked cars   |
| KH-0289 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary |   |
| KH-0293 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | It's crazy to put double yellow lines on Kings Hill when you allow developers to build houses without adequate parking facilities. Existing houses dont have garages big enough to park cars in. You have to provide places for households to park before curtailing parking on the roads. If you dont chaos will ensue, setting neighbour against neighbour.   |
| KH-0087 | DD/586/18A Regent Way                             | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | It will cause all residence to park in the side roads and my road is very narrow anyway   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         | (Tower View to Sunrise Way)                       |                  |  |   |
| KH-0333 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | I believe the yellow lines in Regent Way will mean the cars that park there now will have to park in other roads which are already struggling for space.  |
| KH-0327 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | There is absolutely no requirement for these proposals. The yellow lines will just displace the parked cars to adjacent roads which will cause a parking problem in those smaller roads causing access issues and a potential risk to life and property in the event of an emergency. The lack of parking was caused by TMBC Planning and now at this late stage removing the only reasonable space for parking some properties have is beyond ridiculous. The road has parking on it but it never creates a problem and vehicles including large lorries can always get through. This is totally unnecessary and a waste of public money   |
| KH-0365 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | I strongly object to *all the proposals! Implementing yellow lines, and thereby reducing the ability for residents to park, *without* creating alternative parking arrangements - such as opening one or both of the Cricket Pitch overspill areas - will only create havoc and mayhem in adjacent streets (Sunrise Way for example) that are already severely overcrowded with cars! You should instead be more proactive in ensuring that new development not only has adequate parking arrangements but enough to enable a future-proofing scenario, for when young families grow and the children then also start driving! Continued restrictions and fines might help your coffers, but it will do little to help those of us that actually live here. |
| KH-0231 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | Whilst I understand the need for a solution, the proposed double yellow lines in Regent way will simply move the problem to another road and cause upset and inconvenience. I've lived on KH for 21 years so I'm familiar with the issues of parking. Outside 13 Regent Way there are around 20 cars parked on either side of the road from the top near Kendall Avenue down to the mini roundabout at Sunrise Way. Where exactly will these cars park? Most of the houses have just one allocated space (2 of you include garage but hardly anyone uses a garage to park these days) yet many households have more than 2 cars. So, I ask again, where will these cars park?   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                           | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>It's all very well restricting parking but the cars won't disappear and the need to park will remain.</p> <p>A more appropriate solution would be to use some of the wide grass area and create an indent for parking such that parked cars do not obstruct the road and vehicles can pass both ways without having to give way. Why these things are not considered at design stage baffles me.</p>  |
| KH-0088 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Removing parked cars will simply increase the speed of traffic on this road. The cars act as a natural speed restriction measure and give residents a place to park.   |
| KH-0397 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Cars will end up parking in all the side roads and creating a greater problem.   |
| KH-0274 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges                 | <p>Existing issues</p> <p>Firstly, based on our experience, the parking problems on Regent Way arise from three principal issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lack of allocated parking provided by the housing developers. Putting it simply, it is totally inadequate. It is difficult to see how this issue can be resolved but it should certainly be a consideration for future developments. However by reducing the available space to park will only exacerbate the existing problem not resolve or alleviate it.</li> <li>2. Vehicles park on both side of Regent Way. More often than not, this includes commercial vans on Regent Way belonging to residents taking up some of the much needed parking space. This could be alleviated by restricting parking to one side of the road only.</li> <li>3. Vehicles park directly opposite Ruby Walk or any of the other roads off Regent</li> </ol> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>Way when cars are also parked on the opposite side of the road limiting visibility and access to larger and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>4. The speed with which some vehicles travel along Regent Way as there are no speeding calming measures in place.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>Whilst we are in agreement that some limited parking restrictions would be helpful, it is imperative that this is balanced against the lack of available parking not only to the residents themselves (as referred to in (1) above) but also, their visitors.</p> <p>The extent of the yellow lines in the Borough Council's proposal seem overly excessive and will only worsen a problem that at present is not unmanageable. In our view, it will create many more parking issues rather than resolve or alleviate them. It is very possible that if the Borough Council were to implement such extensive restrictions, people will then look to the unadopted roads such as Ruby Walk, to park their vehicles making the situation much worse for the residents of Ruby Walk than at present. An alternative would be to ensure that the restrictions only apply on one side of the road.</p> <p>Our property only has one space in front of the garage as like many other properties on Kings Hill, the garage is not big enough to park a SUV sized vehicle. As a result, we park one vehicle in front of our house well off the road and sufficiently back from Regent Way to ensure that it does not ever cause an issue. Notwithstanding this, it is not necessary to extend the yellow lines onto Ruby Walk in front of our house to the extent illustrated. We please ask that this is scaled back so as not to restrict our existing ability to utilise this space.</p> <p>The only issue that does arise is when cars park on Regent Way right up to where Ruby Walk joins (to the right of Ruby Walk) and a vehicle also parks immediately opposite restricting both visibility and the space available for larger vehicles and/or emergency vehicles. Limited yellow lines at either of these points on Regent Way would prevent this</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>issue from arising. Any yellow lines on Ruby Walk itself will only compound a situation that at present is not problematic. We would be happy to show you this in person so that you can see for yourself.</p> <p>As a resident, we of course enjoy seeing the landscaped green areas but one way to alleviate the current parking issues would be to reduce these along the path on Regent Way without the reducing the width of the pedestrian paths to provide for a wider road and hence, more parking.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider our response to the Borough Council's proposals and I hope that we have provided some constructive input that the Borough Council will take into consideration together with some alternative suggestions as to how to alleviate the problem.</p> |
| KH-0181 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | Kings Hill has grown from nothing in record time, but as per an open letter I saw today, the extra developments that have been allowed haven't make allowance for the current levels of car ownership in their new developments, nor have they considered extra parking for the houses currently inhabited, and who's families are growing along with their parking requirements. I wholeheartedly support yellow lines 15 feet or so next to roundabouts and junctions as terrible parking is dangerous. However I believe yellow lines around the majority of Kings Hill will detract from the appeal of living here and we will see a slow down in uptake for the new properties, along with current residents choosing to leave.  |
| KH-0340 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |
| KH-0291 | DD/586/18A Regent Way                             | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd | The proposals to reduce the amount of parking available in Regent Way will push parking into Sunrise Way, where there is already a paucity of parking availability.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         | (Tower View to Sunrise Way)                       |                  | don't want...<br>(please elaborate)            | The proposal will simply make things worse in Sunrise Way.   |
| KH-0394 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Insufficient accommodation is made for those vehicles that will be shunted off the main roads into the already full side roads. This goes throughout all the consultations I have looked at. I don't disagree will double yellows on corners and roundabouts. However, parking issues are likely to escalate given the proposals laid.   |
| KH-0268 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       |  |
| KH-0391 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | There will be reduced parking for mine, and all neighbours visitors ..<br><br>So will cause problems in Sunrise way causing problems for us to drive in and out of our courtyard   |
| KH-0282 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | We have one parking space outside our house and if parking is restricted on Regents Way then some people will try to park in Sunrise Way restricting the use of our parking.<br><br>Also, there will be nowhere for our friends and relatives to park when visiting which is one of the reasons we bought this house as there seemed to be ample parking for friends and relatives who are only occasional visitors but would deter them from visiting at all. If you were to install yellow lines where would friends and relatives park ? Do you have a solution to that?<br><br>I don't think that the parking in Regents Way at present is a problem. We drive down along Regent Way every day and there doesn't seem to be a huge number of cars parked there causing problems. |
| KH-0300 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets.<br><br>Available parking pushed onto North side of near roundabout with Bovarde Avenue by proposed lines. Traffic travels fast around roundabout from Tower View to Regent Way,   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>and if traffic is passing parked cars, risk of serious accident. Poor visibility around the corner due to current planting. What is justification for extent from Pearl Way to Sunrise Way?</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                     | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0113 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Not only will this restrict our options for parking and lead to greater traffic speeds in the area but we are greatly concerned and that the traffic unable to park on the adopted roads with the newly proposed parking restrictions will be displaced to the unadopted smaller roads.  |
| KH-0267 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Kingshill, does not have enough Parking. narrow roads many of the residents have 3 cars and one garage. Plus any building working and example a loft conversion 1 parking space resident 2 cars and 4 builders vans. This is for 1 house in an already very overloaded street. This is built on a very American style villiage which is why we live here, but in America there is much more room for off road PArking!   |
| KH-0277 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | There are not enough parking spaces for the amount of houses â€¦ it will also cause cars to speed even faster - Where will all the current residents park when they have more than one car per household ?? Also visitors ??   |
| KH-0363 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Parking is already at a premium on Kings Hill and this will only cause further issues. Also I believe this will encourage more people to speedy causing safety risk.   |
| KH-0265 | DD/586/18A Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Will just push the traffic out onto side roads which already have too many cars parked   |
| KH-0264 | DD/586/18A Regent Way                             | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Parking should be considered when building the houses in the first place not an after thought. If yellow lines get put in the parking problems will be pushed onto other roads   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                           | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|---|---|
|         | (Tower View to Sunrise Way)                             |                  |   |   |
| KH-0004 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary  | <p>I strongly object to the proposal for adding double yellow lines to so many of the roads in Kings Hill and fear this is simply going to create a race track on already dangerous roads (Regent Way and Discovery Drive especially).</p> <p>I object to the amount of yellow lines proposed for Regent Way, the notes say that lines will reduce parking to one side, yet it appears to cover most of both sides of the road between Bovade Avenue and Sunrise Way. All this will do is push those cars to park in the much narrower side roads of Pearl Way, Kendall Avenue, Ruby Walk and Sunrise Way - which already struggle with a lot of street parking and this will just make access for waste removal lorries, healthcare and deliveries even worse.</p> <p>The parking currently on Regent Way (and on many other roads) acts as natural traffic calming and without this it will become extremely dangerous for children crossing road to walk to school. It is already a fast road and this will just make it worse.</p> <p>With the newly imposed parking limits at Asda, Waitrose, Crispin Way and the Community Centre, combined with the insufficient parking at homes, especially for visitors, taking away on-street parking is not the solution. A more sensible solution would be to allow people to purchase parking permits for longer-term parking at Asda/Waitrose etc which most of the time sits empty, especially at night.</p> <p>Double yellow lines around so much of Kings Hill are just not necessary and no thought has been given as to the implications of doing so and the impact on the community in Kings Hill.</p> |
| KH-0106 | DD/586/18A<br>Regent Way<br>(Tower View to Sunrise Way) | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | <p>Agree with yellow lines at junctions and other places where it is dangerous for example junction Ruby Walk /Regent Way</p> <p>Would like to see the analysis TMBC have done on estimated number of cars that will be impacted and which roads the displacement will impact.</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>Would be better to look at creating parking options on the wide verges that allow in conjunction with the yellow lines.</p> <p>If it goes ahead I would like some guarantee from TMBC that breaches will be enforced, otherwise it is just cost for no benefit</p>  |
| KH-0032 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | <p>When exiting Victory Drive onto Discovery Drive near Tiffin Way we regularly experience difficult pulling out. Vehicles are parked close to the junction, opposite junctions and this causes significant problems.</p> <p>We regularly have to creep out to avoid vehicles coming down the road or struggle to pull into our road due to congestion any inappropriate parking.</p> <p>Coming from Discovery Drive near Clearheart and Dawn Lane, vehicles park in the bend coming out of the roundabout and visibility ahead is obscured due to vehicles parking very close to the road and opposite the McArthur Drive junctions.</p> <p>Not only does this cause visual obstructions but road congestion.</p> |
| KH-0109 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     |  |
| KH-0195 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         |  |
| KH-0229 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | I walk up and down these roads most days, apart from a few parked cars there is not a huge congestion issue. An absolute dream compared to real congestion in London! All this proposal will do is push the parking into the side roads causing huge problems for people trying to exit their drives/roads. If there are a few problem areas why don't you tackle those? eg bus stops, or individual houses having bad neighbour issues instead of   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut? Stop building houses and supporting unnecessary supermarkets and provide overflow parking instead!   |
| KH-0312 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | Residential parking is becoming difficult enough without restricting the available space available . This just seems to be a money making scheme that is guaranteed to generate parking fines .  |
| KH-0141 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I fully agree that parking in Kings Hill is an issue and has been for some time. However, it appears to me that most problems relating to it appear at tight junctions, roundabouts and outside schools at drop off and pick up times. I feel these issues could be resolved by more specific targeting of problematic junctions and roundabouts, coupled with enforcement.</p> <p>If the proposals as they currently exist go ahead, I believe it will actually worsen the existing problems. For example, most of Discovery Drive is plenty wide enough to allow people to park without impacting traffic, except near junctions where vehicles will impede vision for drivers. Should Discovery Drive become effectively a no parking zone, cars will be forced to park on the smaller side streets which are much narrower and are already near full capacity for parking for residents of those roads.</p>                             |
| KH-0131 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>For a beautiful estate to have awful yellow lines all over will bring the look of kings hill down hill!</p> <p>The cars parked how they currently do May cause a minor hinder (I hate how close to roundabouts people park but) if people are sticking the speed limits it shouldn't cause a problem it is just more of an annoyance. I think less cars parked along all roads will cause speeding of road users, causing a risk to children, pets, pedestrians in general!</p> <p>Also the cars that are parks in areas where lines are wanting to be painted they are just going to find somewhere else to park causing a hinder to someone else. It's not the car owners fault there just isn't enough room for park on these new estates! For example my house is a three bedroom house luckily it's just me and my children but if I was to have a partner I only have a drive with space for 1 car! I already have to park on the</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | road in front of my house due to my drive way being so tight I can't get my 1 year old twins and 3 year old out there back no matter how I park on it, it's ridiculous! A three bedroom house needs 2 spaces with at least a drive way size you can get out the car on! Some three bedroom houses will have 2/3 cars with a mother, father and teenage child that's passed their test etc! Let alone the 4/5 bedroom houses.  |
| KH-0236 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>This is a ridiculous proposal, that has been brought on by the council themselves, they have allowed people to turn garages into home spaces reducing their parking capacity, they have allowed builders to build ridiculously small garages that cars of today cannot get in. The council will be responsible for pushing cars to side street, making it dangerous to walk for people and emergency vehicles from getting through, I am sure there will be some major incident if this is allowed to go ahead and it will be the councils lack of foresight and planning</p> <p>I agree there is some bad parking, and lines in certain areas could be useful ie roundabouts and at entrances of roads, but rally turning this lovely village environment into a yellow frenzy will put people off buying and push others to sell up and leave. Please also look at the buses, they seem to be able to stop anywhere and cause congestion and chaos</p> |
| KH-0002 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Parking is already a struggle in kings hill. I understand why the proposals have been put forward but they completely ignore the situation for us living here. Many of us have several cars, and would simply have no where to park if these changes were put into place. Cars would only be pushed onto smaller roads without double yellows, just exacerbating the problem and actually creating a potentially more dangerous, not safer, situation   |
| KH-0213 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | I don't not feel that we require this level of parking restrictions on kings hill. This will only push parking elsewhere onto side roads as no other alternatives are available anymore I.e Asda parking etc. A lack of parking is already an issue and this will make it worse for the residents.  |
| KH-0325 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde                           | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | There is absolutely no requirement for these proposals. The yellow lines will just displace the parked cars to adjacent roads which will cause a parking problem in those   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         | Avenue to Quindell Place)   |                  |  | smaller roads causing access issues and a potential risk to life and property in the event of an emergency.  |
| KH-0251 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want...<br>(please elaborate) | <p>I feel the yellow lines which go up into the side roads should be tailored better to suit each road, crossing position and possible negative effect on the houses closet to the corners of the roads with the junctions to Discovery Drive.</p> <p>It appears that the length of the yellow lines is a generic length for all side roads which is not acceptable.</p> <p>Our house is on the corner of Alderwick Grove and Discovery Drive. The path crossing is closer to Discovery Drive than for example on Quindell Place, however the yellow lines are the same length and do not take into account the natural parking places which have been observed by residence in the road for over 19 years.</p> <p>We completely agree with yellow lines on junctions and on the main road Discovery Drive but object to the distance the yellow lines pertrude into Alderwick Grove.</p> <p>The current plan shows the yellow lines coming up as far as the side of our house in line with what appears to be our fireplace(chimney) this would reduce parking on this side by at least 1 car possibly 2 if people are to allow sensible manoeuvre space between vehicles.</p> <p>Parking never occurs on the opposite side of the road adjacent to 14 Discovery Drive (sensible natural decision by all residents, to allow safe parking without mounting pavements and causing damage to the path or inconvenience to pedestrians, noted that this a problem in other side roads unfortunately, eg Quindell Place.)</p> <p>The pathway from our front door comes out onto the main pathway in Alderwick Grove and I believe we are close enough to the road for this to be unsightly and detrimental to the perception of the parking issues in the road, and will subsequently be detrimental to the market value of our property (address redacted)</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>We currently have no issues with parking in the road but the distance that the yellow lines continue up the road will cause an issue that hasn't existed for any of the residents in the road for the 19 plus years we have lived here (when the road and Brunswick Place was built) but will cause at least 1-2 cars to have to park further up the road and cause other residents who use this area already to have parking issues also, not to mention causing us an inconvenience when unloading our shopping, or having visitors.</p> <p>I would like the committee to consider reducing the length of the yellow lines on the right hand side as you enter Alderwick Grove to allow residents to park considerably as has happened for many years and avoid creating further parking problems in the future.</p> <p>We feel the sensible length of the lines would be for them to stop at the first road waste water drain after the raised pedestrian crossing on the right.</p> <p>Currently no one parks even this close to the pedestrian crossing (in-front of the parkway leading to 10 and Discovery Drive) on the odd occasion a random car does, a note on the window reminding them of inconsiderate parking usually prevents this from reoccurring.</p> <p>Our other objection is to the gap left in the yellow lines on Discovery Drive opposite number 10 Discovery Drive and 127 Discovery Drive. This is a dangerous place for vehicles to park, as it obscures the view for pedestrians using the crossing from the junction on Bovard and Discovery on the exit of the roundabout and causes issues for vehicles then turning right into Alderwick Drive after negotiating the roundabout with the junction of Bovard and Discovery. I myself have had several cars almost hit the back of my car when they assume you are just signalling pulling round the parked cars and do not realise your also pulling into Alderwick Grove, one even tried to go around me whilst still signalling to turn right as I'd obviously slowed right down to turn right and they assumed I'd just stopped!</p> <p>Up until last year 1 resident would quite regularly park vans and cars in this exact spot</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>and we would hear screeching brakes and vehicle horns as cars left the roundabout meeting vehicles trying to negotiate the parked cars and the road junctions for Alderwick Grove and Cobham Drive.</p> <p>There should be no parking on the approach or exit for the Bovarde (flat roundabout) the very nature of the roundabout enables drivers to go at a much higher speed as they go over the cobbles or cut the corner completely in some cases, particularly commercial vehicles making deliveries.</p> <p>Also all properties on the left hand side of Discovery Drive where this gap has been left have large driveways and no urgent need to further parking. What would transpire is that residents pushed away from areas where they park currently, now about to be affected by the introduction of yellow lines would park here, and cause problems for the residents immediately opposite this gap and in Alderwick Grove and Cobham Drive.</p> <p>I would be happy to discuss this further with councillors/committee members should you decide to view these particular points personally on site.</p> <p>I would appreciate your feedback and consideration to these points.</p> <p>Thank you</p> |
| KH-0164 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary |  |
| KH-0169 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>For a good proportion of Discovery drive introducing yellow lines will cause more problems than it will solve and we shouldn't be chasing the errors made in poor house planning into side streets. Keeping yellow lines to junctions, roundabouts, and traffic calming is all that is required as, certainly from Forest Way all the way to Alderwick Grove, I rarely see any issues that are more than a delay of a few seconds to oncoming traffic and already autonomously managed to single sides of the road. By condensing</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | parking areas to small desirable areas it will inevitably have a knock-on effect to narrow side streets. Rougemont, for example, is already marginally capable of taking two car widths without pushing parking from Discovery into it. Yellow lines may be something to revisit in a few years but I don't believe the current volumes of cars are sufficient to justify causing further issues and alienating residents.  |
| KH-0339 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |
| KH-0313 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>The reasons given for the proposed changes are to improve traffic movements, to maintain access to properties, to maintain public transport facilities, to improve visibility at junctions and to improve safety near schools. The result of these changes, if implemented, will not achieve the above without resulting in a greater risk to residents while further compounding the severe shortage of parking in Kings Hill for the following reasons:</p> <p>The severe shortage of parking space close to homes is the key issue which the council refuses to address and main reason why residents will object to these proposals. Adding double yellow lines will result in residents having to park in courtyards thereby restricting access to garages and properties in general which does not make any sense as maintaining access to properties is one of the primary reasons for the proposed changes. Furthermore, residents will be left with no alternative but to park in areas such as Phase 1 thus creating the same problem but in a different part of the development. In other words, the severe shortage of parking facilities within Kings Hill should be addressed first in order to prevent the issues mentioned above. There are options available to the council such as land directly to the front of several homes throughout Kings Hill which could be converted into parking spaces. At the very least, property owners could be afforded the opportunity to convert the land to parking space at their expense.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|
|         |   |                  |                          | <p>Speeding is another key issue and especially in Discovery Drive. Vehicles parked on the road have resulted in reduced instances of speeding and have been far more effective than the bollards in Tower View. If double yellow lines are implemented nothing will prevent speeding which could result in accidents and possibly, fatalities.</p> <p>We should all be working towards a better, safer and more attractive Kings Hill but I fear that the parking issue for one, will detract potential home buyers from settling in the area while it is only a matter of time before the severe shortage of parking space will effect house prices.</p> <p>Finally, 5 reasons were given for the proposed changes and I feel that we, the residents should be provided with further information to support each of these reasons prior to the proposed changes being implemented if at all. As an example, how will the addition of double yellow lines improve safety near schools? If anything, these changes will result in increased instances of speeding and thus a greater risk to our children!</p> |
| KH-0329 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>Placing yellow lines throughout Kings Hill will not alleviate the problem but will make it far worse. The surrounding side roads do not have the capacity to cope with the additional cars that use them for parking. Perhaps the planners should review any future planning applications to ensure that they allow for the majority of households having at least 2 vehicles and ensure that garages are big enough to park cars in. There is not enough parking on Kings Hill for visitors anyway so where will additional visitors be able to park when there are restrictions on all public parking places on Kings Hill? Sending cars up the side roads to park will be dangerous with many parking on pavements as roads aren't wide enough for people to park on them. This is dangerous for people with sight issues and will force pedestrians into the road. It will also mean that emergency services would not be able to access any of the side roads with cars double parked along them.</p>  |
| KH-0308 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde                           | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and are more than could be justified in</p>   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     | Avenue to Quindell Place)     |                  |        | <p>terms of the aims. Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers,</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                       | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|---|------------------|--|--|
|         |   |                  |  | For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.  |
| KH-0142 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | Kings Hill has been developed for the last 20 years with insufficient parking for the size of the properties built. 4 bedroom houses have one garage that is too small for modern cars and one driveway space for a home that can house 4 working adults. Whilst the inconsiderate parking near schools, roundabouts and bus stops needs to be tackled, covering KH in yellow lines will simply push the problem into smaller side roads. We already have road markings to prevent parking at bus stops which is not enforced, why would defacing all the roads with yellow lines make it any better when existing road markings are not checked? We park our cars on our drive but visitors and trades people who come to our home cannot and need somewhere to park. If property developers had allowed sufficient space for residents to park, this would not be an issue. All these homes were granted permission, this is a problem of the council and Liberty's making. They have benefitted hugely from the success of KH however parking issues are the main reason we would consider leaving the area, and we know many who already have. A more targeted and enforced plan at the school, bus stops and roundabouts would be much more sensible. |
| KH-0284 | DD/586/19A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Bovarde Avenue to Quindell Place) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I am opposed to the proposed "No waiting at any time" (double yellow lines).</p> <p>The roads in question are often used by residents who do not have alternative parking arrangements in the evening and weekends. The cars currently parked in these areas are clearly not day-visitors, or shoppers, they are either residents or visitors of residents.</p> <p>By stopping cars from parking on the road you simply push them into the narrower side-roads in the surrounding areas.</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         |  |                  |  | I would also query why these proposals have been raised, and would hope that they have nothing to do with clearing the roads for works traffic for the proposed expansion of housing south of Kings Hill.  |
| KH-0116 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I had 6 years of walking the school run to Discovery school and it is so dangerous with limited visibility for crossing the road safely. Many near misses with cars going too fast and people having to cross between parked vehicles. Buses struggle to get through due to poor and selfish parking. Most houses here have adequate parking they simply have a garage full of rubbish, are too lazy to drive/walk round to the rear of their house or have been given permission to convert their garage to an extra room. The parking on pavements/crossing points is another major problem for all the same reasons and pedestrians are given little consideration, in fact i've been asked to move off a pavement by a driver wanting to park on it! |
| KH-0373 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Support          | The changes should improve traffic movements     |  |
| KH-0319 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | I broadly support these proposals. However, I am concerned about traffic spillage into adjoining roads and, with some poor parking already causing difficulties for emergency vehicles, how this matter would be resolved at the same time.  |
| KH-0299 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                         | The knock on effect will be forcing everyone into the side roads such as my road to park causing us an unpleasant living situation. Currently everyone is happy with where everyone parks which doesn't restrict any access or cause difficulties!   |
| KH-0172 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | You will push problems onto side roads and cause parking chaos. You need to create more parking not remove it. I live in a 4 bed house and have a garage that does not even fit a fiesta in, and 1 parking space so have to park outside my house and allow room for visitors and potential workman - all cars from Discovery drive will take up the   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         |  |                  |  | spaces in my road. Leading to neighbour disputes and anxiety about parking. Speeds will also increase along Discovery.   |
| KH-0137 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | No need rare occasions that cars are parked inappropriately  |
| KH-0201 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>While I concur that there is a general parking issue on Kings Hill, this issue is widespread and actually manifests itself on the surrounding roads and streets adjacent to those which your proposal seeks to place restrictions (double yellow) on. Dawn Lane is currently like an obstacle course on a daily basis, with cars parked across both sides of the road, and this is before you create restrictions on Discovery Drive.</p> <p>The restriction, because they are focused on main thoroughfares only, will surely only serve to drive those currently parked there to look for parking on the adjacent surrounding roads, thereby compounding that problem, not alleviating it.</p> <p>We have already had large commercial vehicles that belong to residents on Discovery Drive parked down Dawn Lane (presumably because they are "out of sight" and have repeatedly had to raise this with Prologis/Liberty. These proposals are simply going to aggravate that issue, and ultimately likely result in neighbourly disputes and arguments, and be divisive to the community rather than bringing it together.</p> <p>As it stands the current proposals appear to be quite polar in nature... presumably if you live on one of the affected roads (where double yellows are proposed) you will either be delighted that you will not have cars outside your house and that the roadway is clear and unobstructed; or you will be aggrieved that you can no longer park outside your front door. If you are on one of the adjacent roads, I can only assume that you will fall into the aggrieved category when all the displaced cars appear on those roads, making them even more congested than they are now.</p> <p>This approach to the problem is not the solution, it's merely moving the problem</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>somewhere else on the development. If you are serious about parking restrictions, then they need to be all encompassing covering all roads.</p> <p>Has any consideration been given to some sort of residents parking permit scheme, whereby residents will have to pay a fee to display a permit that permits on-street parking. This might encourage more people to consider where they park (although there may well be some that have little option but to park on the street given the rather short-sighted planning that allowed the current parking allocations to be deemed acceptable.</p> <p>It would appear that the approach to building car-ports rather than garages has done little to encourage people to park in their allocated spaces (as I believe was the intention) so some alternative needs to be considered - more appropriate parking allocations to houses would seem a good start.</p> <p>I can certainly see the need to try and manage parking around and adjacent to junctions, roundabouts (incl mini) and islands.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>(Name supplied but redacted)</p> |
| KH-0166 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>I object to all applications for double yellow lines on Kings Hill. This is a new build estate and residents are now paying the price for the greed of Liberty Property Trust, the greed of Developers and the lack of planning foresight. The time to resolve the parking issues are at planning stage when off street car parks or more parking per house should have been allowed. To this day houses are being built with insufficient parking and it is the residents that get the backlash. If you move cars off of the main routes with double yellow lines you will simply clog up smaller roads. I would love to see no cars on my access and exit from the estate but you have left residents with no choice whilst Developers and Liberty laugh their way to the bank.</p>   |
| KH-0100 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart                     | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>I object to the parking proposals for the area of Kings Hill I have specified, as well as for Kings Hill in general. Although I appreciate there might be a problem with parking in certain areas, introducing double yellow lines and preventing parking in some areas will</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | Lane to Tiffen Way)  |                  |  | only move the problem elsewhere, such as to side roads like mine. I am extremely worried that there will be an increase in traffic on my road and it will become more dangerous for my young son. In addition, it will move the parking problem to roads like mine which I feel is extremely unfair when the parking situation is already hard enough. It's absurd to introduce parking restrictions without providing alternative places for parking. The cars being displaced by the yellow lines will have to go somewhere. It is for these reasons I object to the parking proposals for Kings Hill.   |
| KH-0330 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | Whilst I agree double yellow lines are appropriate by junctions and on roundabouts, the remaining proposals will simply compound the parking issues by shifting cars into side streets.  |
| KH-0005 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | Putting these yellow lines will make the parking situation around kings hill much worse. Currently there is no issue to resolve, parking by residents is generally considerate and leave plenty of room for access. Double yellowing as currently proposed will push cars off discovery drive and into the smaller, tighter back streets, causing a bigger issue. Double yellowing will make school drop off almost impossible for people to park, unload and load their children safely onto the grass verge, causing a bigger issue and unnecessary danger to numerous children on a daily basis (Discovery school does not have the capacity for the current number of cars to drop off and pick up through the school gates). Double yellowing could increase the risk of speeding around the estate due to opening up of the roads. There is already a shortage of suitable parking for visitors, deliveries and tradesmen, which will be made worse by the proposals. How is parking during cricket matches or events at the local cricket club going to work, especially given the parking area off Regent way is always closed? The proposal of using CEO to enforce the double yellows will only cause anger towards them - the local authorities. This is unwanted, unnecessary and a waste of public money at a time of difficult fiscal management for local authorities. Money - Planning resources should be used to expand parking in Kings Hill, not restrict it further. Propose TMBC/ KCC carry out a review in real life of how Kings Hill traffic and parking works to see if there is actually a problem that needs to be resolved or not. What may come to light is that developers make 'garages' too small for a normal sized car and driveways too tight, |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | pushing the cars out onto the street, or the number of commercial vehicles on the streets/ people drives that have recently been pushed out of excessively large ASDA carpark, Waitrose and Liberty Square.   |
| KH-0256 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>Putting these yellow lines will make the parking situation around kings hill much worse. Currently there is no issue to resolve, parking by residents is generally considerate and leave plenty of room for access. Double yellowing as currently proposed will push cars off discovery drive and into the smaller, tighter back streets, causing a bigger issue.</p> <p>Double yellowing will make school drop off almost impossible for people to park, unload and load their children safely onto the grass verge, causing a bigger issue and unnecessary danger to numerous children on a daily basis (Discovery school does not have the capacity for the current number of cars to drop off and pick up through the school gates).</p> <p>Double yellowing could increase the risk of speeding around the estate due to opening up of the roads. There is already a shortage of suitable parking for visitors, deliveries and tradesmen, which will be made worse by the proposals. How is parking during cricket matches or events at the local cricket club going to work, especially given the parking area off Regent way is always closed? The proposal of using CEO to enforce the double yellows will only cause anger towards them - the local authorities.</p> <p>This is unwanted, unnecessary and a waste of public money at a time of difficult fiscal management for local authorities. Money - Planning resources should be used to expand parking in Kings Hill, not restrict it further. Propose TMBC/ KCC carry out a review in real life of how Kings Hill traffic and parking works to see if there is actually a problem that needs to resolved or not. What may come to light is that developers make 'garages' too small for a normal sized car and driveways too tight, pushing the cars out onto the street, or the number of commercial vehicles on the streets/ people drives that have recently been pushed out of excessively large ASDA carpark, Waitrose and Liberty Square.</p> |
| KH-0080 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive                                    | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | The wholesale proposal of yellow lines on discovery drive will cause massive issues and conflict in the side roads such as Eden way.  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | (Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way)                                  |                  |  | <p>Large passenger busses and coach's can currently navigate discovery so in the main there are no real problems.</p> <p>I think some balanced restrictions around T junctions and rounds a bouts would be helpful.</p> <p>Planners/developers have created a housing estate with 4 bedroom properties with one parking space – this is fine if there are alternative parking provision so if the proposals are not scaled back you will create social problems and the outcomes could affect a significant amount of residents for the worse.</p> <p>Fortune way needs something doing but to retain parking - Ha the review included a one way system incorporating on street parking.</p> |
| KH-0314 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>I live on Amber lane which is an unadapted road and these restrictions will cause many cars that will be directly affected by the lines will know park on my road causing nothing but stress and anxiety and friction among residents living on Amber lane and non residents.</p> <p>I do not accept that Kings Hill needs these lines but I do agree that certain spots on here need yellow lines especially near round about's and schools.</p> <p>Please consider what the lines will do for people's mental health and people's safety because arguments happen and who knows to what extent????????? Please reconsider before someone gets assaulted or worse.</p>                   |
| KH-0338 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | <p>It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
| KH-0095 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | These proposals are ridiculous. There is not enough car parking in kings hill, where are the cars going to park that currently park on these streets? I can see no issues being caused by these cars at present. The few select few in kings hill with large enough driveways to park several cars, are likely to be the few with enough time on there hands to bother complaining over petty matters. The vast majority are happy with current parking arrangements. Most houses in kings hill have once parking space, many require 2 cars. You cannot reduce car parking spaces without giving residents a viable alternative. I only see a reduction in spaces here, while kings hill continues to expand, it would be negligent to reduce spaces without providing an alternative.  |
| KH-0146 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>Hi,</p> <p>I am a resident that fully opposes the proposal for yellow lines throughout the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will push cars into side roads that are already at capacity with cars, it will be like trying to park in a city centre location and having to park miles from your house</li> <li>2. Car ports are not fit for purpose, they are too small to fit an average size car in</li> <li>3. The council feel like they can impose these lines without understanding what it is like to live here and the impact it will have</li> <li>4. What is the point of having yellow lines if they are not going to be enforced?</li> <li>5. I agree to have them at junctions and roundabouts to stop the idiots that park there. But this should be the extent of it. Don't punish the rest of the village for a few peoples inconsideration</li> <li>6. Inadequate visit parking will mean visitors have no where to park</li> <li>7. Tradesman will not want to service houses as they will have nowhere to park</li> <li>8. House prices will go down as desirability will be affected</li> </ol> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>9. People pay a premium to live in kings hill and unsightly yellow lines takes away from the fact that people want to live in a pretty village. We do not pay management fees to have yellow lines drawn everywhere to ruin what we moved here to enjoy!!</p> <p>10. Building more houses in kings hill is just inflating this issue. Along with a myriad of other issues this brings and more building proposals popping up it is getting exhausting having to protect where we live constantly.</p> <p>Please can you reconsider this proposal</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>(Name supplied but redacted)</p>  |
| KH-0334 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | Parking seems insufficient in the area, I am concerned that this measure will move the parking problem to side streets.   |
| KH-0248 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>Myself and my husband work in different locations and therefore need 2 cars. Our home has one parking space and a garage. The garage however is too small to fit our average sized car. We therefore have no choice to park one car on the main road.</p> <p>We and our neighbours would have no choice but to park on the surrounding roads. These roads are narrower and the roads will become more cluttered, making access more difficult and will increase parking on pavements.</p> <p>I do not agree that the current situation causes safety issues or access issues. I also believe that the parked cars result in slowing down traffic which is needed in such a populated area.</p> |

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | I believe if you agree the proposals, you are creating a larger problem as the cars will move to the narrower, surrounding roads.   |
| KH-0395 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | This will cause undue congestion on side roads that are already full up. Residents cars have to go somewhere, and if they don't fit in garages or have more then one car then they have to be parked on the road. Punish the people that park poorly and educate residents, do not punish all of us that park considerately.  |
| KH-0309 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and are more than could be justified in terms of the aims. Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location  | Object / Support | Reason  | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|---|---|
|         |  |                  |   | <p>for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0241 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart<br>Lane to Tiffen<br>Way) | Object           | I like most of the proposals in general, but I'd don't want... (please elaborate) | It will cause havoc people will find it very difficult to park as some people do not have garages or space for visitors especially workmen attending to property, delivery vans such as online deliveries. Minor roads will be taken over and stop the house owners using the space to unpack items from there car. I feel lots of people will become very anxious which could lead to aggression.  |
| KH-0174 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart<br>Lane to Tiffen<br>Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)  | Not enough car parking provision in kings hill. I object to double yellows on the main roads due to further reducing parking and causing further issues in other roads.   |
| KH-0238 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart                           | Object           | I don't agree with the charges  |   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                    | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         | Lane to Tiffen Way)  |                  |  |   |
| KH-0383 | DD/586/20A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Clearheart Lane to Tiffen Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | Proposal is ill thought out and will cause no end of issue to residents   |
| KH-0380 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way)       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |   |
| KH-0017 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way)       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety | The proposed school time single lines should be double lines The double lines should be both sides of the road for full length of proposed plan The plan of restrictions is nullified if not patrolled and penalties issued to suit   |
| KH-0011 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way)       | Support          | The changes should improve visibility and safety |   |
| KH-0295 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way)       | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking   | As we all know that the parking is really restricted in Kings Hill, esp. the new houses that were built had only one parking space and as both my wife and myself work as NHS doctors have to drive to different places for work and need two cars. By doing this i will be left with no other option but to find any close options to park my other car which might cause nuisance for other neighbours. If the council is thinking about this option then they should be suggesting alternate areas of parking. Therefore i object to these proposals of having yellow lines. |
| KH-0287 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way)       | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary         | There is insufficient parking for residents across Kings Hill. This was not properly considered at the planning stages of development. In addition this reduces capacity for visitors parking and will therefore increase the loneliness and isolation experienced by some residents who live on Kings Hill.  |
| KH-0290 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive                                    | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                         | What do you hope to achieve. The vehicles are not going to disappear over night all you are doing is moving the situation elsewhere, causing friction and upset to the residents.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | (Tiffen Way to Holly Way)                                  |                  |  | Where are residents visitors to park? Due to design issues on Kings Hill i.e.high density housing and garages that are to small to house modern vehicles and inadequate parking areas. THIS PROPOSAL WILL ONLY CAUSE MORE TROUBLE. PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS KINGS HILL PROJECT   |
| KH-0179 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>Not only I don't think that any parking restrictions are necessary in Kings Hill but most important of all the Council and responsible biddies don't give the residents enough parking options but keep allowing the buil of more and more new houses!!</p> <p>I one car and my wife another, which we can't live without to commute daily, but we only have one garage and no drive so we have to park the car outside our street as there are spaces to park on Shoemsmith Lane because the road is too narrow.</p> <p>If rules like this get implemented not only we won't have where to park but everyone else will have to park on smaller side street make them more crowded then they are already, leave the residents with nowhere to park and make them dangerous for the huge number of kids that play in the streets in Kings Hill...</p> <p>Not a good idea at all when no alternative parking has ever been provided throughout the neighbourhood!</p> <p>This objection is for all the locations and just the one chosen as for some reason whoever created this system decided that we can't object for the change as a whole...</p> |
| KH-0140 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | <p>Painting yellow lines all around Kings Hill is just going to exacerbate the current parking problem. All those vehicles are just going to find parking on smaller side roads that don't have yellow lines and block up roads and pavements. Instead of wasting funds on yellow paint, is there no way some green areas can be turned into mini parking lotsâ€¦ I'm not suggesting getting rid of huge amounts of green areas. Maybe the grass part of most of the pavements could be reduced to allow for cars to park and still be enough space on the road for cars to drive down both sides.</p>   |
| KH-0228 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive                              | Object           | The changes will reduce my               | <p>By restricting parking on the main roads all cars will be forced to park in the smaller side roads therefore obstructing these smaller roads and their pavements as side roads so narrow that cars have to park partially on pavement. In the design of Kings Hill not</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         | (Tiffen Way to Holly Way)                                  |                  | options for parking                      | enough thought is given about parking and with both supermarkets restricting parking it is now impossible for visitors to park. So a firm objection against these parking restrictions   |
| KH-0197 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | I don't believe the parking review should be looked at in parts, but as a whole for Kings Hill. By only looking at the main roads and junctions you are pushing the parking into the smaller roads, which just moves the problem, it does not solve it. I only have one car and a garage and a parking space, however my garage is too small to fit my car in, so effectively leaves me with one space and no room for visitors unless they park on the road. By pushing the parking into the smaller roads this reduces the visitor parking. If Kings Hill becomes known for not being able to park, this will make it less attractive and will devalue the house prices. |
| KH-0198 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | The overarching problem on Kings Hill is that there is not enough parking spaces / areas to support the community. Adding yellow lines all over the place does not solve the problem as people directly impacted by the proposals still need to park their vehicles. It is likely that they will simply move their cars to the side roads which don't have parking restrictions and clog those up instead. I do support parking restrictions around the doctors surgery, schools and road junctions as this is a good safety measure.  |
| KH-0176 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't agree with the charges           | King hill has minimal parking, most houses only having 2 parking spots per house hold and barely any visitor spots. For example 8 visitor spots on Clarence way for the 18 houses on that street, plus the houses that also have their garage around the back of houses on Clarence way, which include holly way, pixie way, beacon ave and discovery way. We don't need more parking on back streets.<br><br>I don't know who planned all this, but please get some common sense! Instead of building more houses make spaces to park more vehicles.  |
| KH-0177 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | Most of the houses on kings hill have insufficient parking for a community that is increasing. By putting yellow lines everywhere you'll be forcing people to park on other streets. I think making junctions clearer so people do not park on corners of junctions etc is sensible but restricting residents options of where they can park and that of their visitors will only push people to park elsewhere. It will not take away the need for parking. Instead other roads such as the one I live in will risk having all visitors spaces  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                 | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | that are already rarely empty taken up as well as people parking on pavements. School runs can be a problem but it's only for very short periods of the day so should not impact residents for their entire life in kings hill.   |
| KH-0227 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to<br>Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | Although there are a few spots in KingsHill where yellow lines maybe a good idea, for example just before a round about or a busy junction, I know that if yellow lines are to be added as you have described, there will be hundreds of vehicles with nowhere to park other than the roads which have not being considered. It will be a nightmare, not only will it become an undesirable area to live in, it will be a hostile place too.. I've lived in kings hill for 11 years and I know where the 'hot spots' are are where lines should be placed, is it not better to ask the people that live in KH who know it best what they think! Please don't do it for the sake of our lovely neighbourhood.. oh also, with kings hill being such a wonderful place for kids, please take into account the speed that cars will drive at with no cars parked, it's dangerous to do this and totally in necessary.. if a bus can get down discovery drive, I can't see the issue.. |
| KH-0180 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to<br>Holly Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | Kings Hill has grown from nothing in record time, but as per an open letter I saw today, the extra developments that have been allowed haven't make allowance for the current levels of car ownership in their new developments, nor have they considered extra parking for the houses currently inhabited, and who's families are growing along with their parking requirements. I wholeheartedly support yellow lines 15 feet or so next to roundabouts and junctions as terrible parking is dangerous. However I believe yellow lines around the majority of Kings Hill will detract from the appeal of living here and we will see a slow down in uptake for the new properties, along with current residents choosing to leave.  |
| KH-0288 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to<br>Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | I recently moved into a road adjacent to those affected by the proposed parking restrictions. I object to these changes for several reasons including:<br><br>- The current parked cars on these roads are likely to be displaced and will park in unrestricted roads nearby (where I live)<br><br>- The increase in parked cars from outside the road will limit my parking availability in and around my house for myself and visitors  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--|---|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>- The displaced cars are likely to use visitors spaces which are already limited and may cause a potential access hazard if too many park here</p> <p>- An increase in traffic will make the road less safe for younger residence including my own 2 children who are both under 10 and walk regularly to the surrounding area e.g. cricket pitch</p> <p>- An increase in parked cars, traffic and road usage will likely result in more wear to the unadopted road and surrounds which I pay a management fee for, likely increasing this fee over time.</p> <p>- Increases in parked cars down our quiet road will impact its desirability and therefor the property value of those houses impacted.</p> <p>So my question is, why are TMBC just shuffling the problem along to other residents and other roads? Who will pay for the likely increases in my management fees and cover the decrease in value of my property? Who has considered the knock on effects to safety of the children living in these roads effected as as a result of the these changes that are not part of the restricted parking areas? Not good enough TMBC!</p> |
| KH-0337 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary       | It may be necessary around some junctions/roundabouts (although I believe this is already covered by the rules in the highway code so this is maybe just a policing of the rules issue?) but the blanket approach to applying yellow lines will just create more problems elsewhere in Kings Hill. The lack of parking relative to the number of cars owned will not change, so this is just creating an unnecessary problem of where those cars can park to satisfy a small number of residents who have complained about poor parking.  |
| KH-0103 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | The changes will reduce my options for parking | <p>If there are yellow lines placed outside my house I will not be able to park my car and will cause the road further down with no lines to get congested.</p> <p>I have young children that play out in the street and the last thing we need is more traffic</p>   |
| KH-0335 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive                              | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                       | The proposals will exacerbate the existing issue of a lack of parking spaces available in the area.   |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|--|------------------|--------------------------|---|
|         | (Tiffen Way to Holly Way)                                  |                  |                          | <p>The proposal will concentrate parking into roads without restrictions causing conflict in the community.</p> <p>There are no material benefits to the proposal. There are no real issues in terms of congestion or safety in Discovery Drive or Tiffen Way which we use daily.</p> <p>The proposal will create safety issues on many roads due to increased congestion on those roads without restrictions.</p> <p>The proposal will directly impact our current parking practices causing significant inconvenience.</p> <p>There will be no parking available for any visitors to my property.</p> <p>The value of my property will decrease due to these proposals.</p>   |
| KH-0276 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>Some yellow lines could be possible but personally i believe permit holders only bays is the best way forwards and a viable compromise.</p> <p>Car owners will just park on any road without yellow lines causing congestion and more arguments</p>  |
| KH-0186 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate) | <p>Unfortunately the plans for the whole of Kings Hill do not appear to of been done by anyone who has experience driving around Kings Hill, witnessing where people (particularly children before and after school) tend to cross. Street Parking has been restricted where no issue currently exists and left where issues do. I agree that parking on Kings Hill leaves much to be desired in places but compared to other places (older Victorian terraces for example where no off street parking is available) really isn't that bad.</p> <p>I think enforcement of existing parking rules in the Highway Code would offer far better results than the expense of double yellow lines through out the estate especially as it</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                                 | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|---------|---|------------------|--|---|
|         |   |                  |  | <p>will not solve the problem but simply move it on to smaller roads where children are more likely to be playing or walking and more likely to cross roads.</p> <p>Find would be better spend building parking spaces or inlets, kings hill is awash with wide verges and strips of unused land which could be made into spaces for off road parking. Other successful developments and smaller parts of kings hill have successfully provided parking by narrowing the path ways in places to allow for parking but not causing a traffic issue.</p> <p>Another issue on Kings Hill is speeding and in the absence of cars slowing them down I have genuine concerns over the prospect of far more speeding and dangerous driving something which we already know the police do not have the time to ability to deal with.</p> <p>Additionally the plans leave clear spaces in front of and near both schools, somewhere where children are crossing, sometimes alone and cars dart in and out for only a few spaces. Of all the places the roads should be clear on both sides surely it is these for the safety of our children.</p> <p>Thank you</p> |
| KH-0144 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to<br>Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | <p>Putting yellow lines in ALL over kings hill will create a race track. Having parked cars on the roads slows the traffic down. The developers build houses with tiny gardens and reduced parking spaces. Where are all these extra cars going to go? We personally don't have that issue as we are only a two person household and utilise our 1 garage space and I driveway space but if we were to have my mother living with us or one of our adult children, they have nowhere to park. Lots of kingshill residents are in this situation but the council just doesn't seem to care. We have a 4 bedroom House yet only a garage and one parking space. We are getting to the point of not wanting to live on kings hill anymore and I know a lot of people who are feeling the same way.</p>   |
| KH-0310 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to<br>Holly Way) | Object           | Other (please elaborate)                 | <p>The proposals will cause more problems than they will solve and cause safety issues for residents on neighbouring streets</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are excessive and are more than could be justified in</p>  |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021



## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>terms of the aims. Concerns already raised by residents in neighbouring streets with regards to excess parking before these changes, this will make it worse.</p> <p>Query location of zig-zag lines on other side of street from school. Parking on school side restricts visibility for pedestrians leaving school.</p> <p>Solution should meet requirements of all road users including residents in the immediate area. Restricting parking may contravene Equality Act as available parking does not meet guidance for disabled parking and no consideration for carers and other support workers. Double yellow lines should not be considered in isolation to other activities such as providing parking bays or widening existing roads to allow ease of access with adequate parking. Proposals disproportionate to issue, these issues should be handled by police not by the council. Impact on residents cannot be justified by limited improvement for access by people remote to these locations.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will displace cars onto side roads that are already busy, which will result in safety issues for access by emergency services and refuse lorries.</p> <p>Why have the specific roads been selected? Recorded accidents in the area do not seem to be related to parked cars. Crash map for injury accidents over last ten years seems to indicate that most frequent and most serious accidents happen in other areas which have not been considered.</p> <p>Without seeing planning details, difficult to understand why the proposals have been put in place, who has proposed them, and what justification has been provided. I.e. apparent absence of openness. Inferred issues not documented, so no way to understand whether proposals meet the requirements. Do not know if issues are being created by residents, visitors or people working in the area.</p> <p>If specific issue around school start and finish times, more appropriate to put in restrictions (including no waiting) at those times to prevent parents creating the same level of blocking as is implied by the reference to resident parking, maximizing the</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref | Parking Consultation Location | Object / Support | Reason | Parking Consultation Comments   |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|
|     |                               |                  |        | <p>benefit to the area while slightly reducing the impact on residents.</p> <p>No consideration for daily business activity such as removal vans, delivery drivers, tradesmen, skips etc.</p> <p>What consideration is there for ensuring that road speeds do not increase when streets are clearer, which could result in more serious and frequent accidents? Recent police survey shows how many people already speed around Kings Hill. I have already raised issues with speeding drivers with my councillors, but no action has been taken.</p> <p>The covenants restricting parking on the roads have not been enforced in over ten years, and as such are presumably unenforceable and hence should not be used as justification for draconian restrictions. Houses have been sold on the basis that residents could park on the street.</p> <p>There are other solutions to improve access for buses, including changing routes to make better use of available resources.</p> <p>Widening the roads and removing traffic calming will resolve most of the issues. The development is a collaboration of KCC and Liberty, and KCC should stand up to their responsibility in ensuring that current parking standards are adhered to, with retrospective development of the road system.</p> <p>TMBC have signed off on parking designs for Phase 2 and so should take responsibility for the solution, not just make people's lives unworkable.</p> <p>Nowhere to store bicycles (apart from garages, so restricting their use for cars), which should have been considered as an alternative if cars are not allowed, as is required by the 'two jags' guidance. This was not policed by TMBC planning</p> <p>Issues for electric cars. How are people going to access charging points.</p> |

20<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## Kings Hill Parking Review – Annex 3 Online Consultation Responses

| Ref     | Parking Consultation Location                              | Object / Support | Reason                                   | Parking Consultation Comments  |
|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
|         |  |                  |  | <p>Restricting the use of houses by restricting parking is not compatible with the government plans for housing as it will result in more houses being required to support the same number of people.</p> <p>For some houses up to five bedrooms, parking is limited to a single parking space in front of their garage, in garage areas behind their houses. These typically have restrictive access, so do not lend themselves to the tandem parking, as swapping cars will lead to excessive reversing (incompatible with road traffic act) to get to a location where the 'trapped' car can get out. Disruptive to people living in the area as it will result in excessive noise at unsociable times.</p> |
| KH-0226 | DD/586/21A<br>Discovery Drive<br>(Tiffen Way to Holly Way) | Object           | I don't feel the proposals are necessary | I feel parking along discovery drive is not a problem and never has been. Buses regularly drive along the route with ease, and it is completely unnecessary to add double yellow lines forcing traffic onto smaller roads which will then cause a genuine problem  |