

# **TMBC Parking Consultation – Kings Hill July 2021**

## **Introduction**

The consultation to introduce new yellow line parking restrictions is to address a number of complaints made to the authority pre 2019. The consultation is in its second phase (formal), with the first (informal) taking place in 2019. The deadline for the current consultation is 1 August 2021.

Historically, there has been no attempt to do the obvious and actually deal with the perpetrators of the issues, i.e. the people parking illegally and dangerously on roundabouts and at junctions. Guidance recommends education is attempted prior to any restrictions or enforcement. Had these actions been taken previously using current legislation we wouldn't be in this position. Signage and fines could have been used to educate and deter those breaking the laws.

## **2019 Consultation**

This informal consultation was very poorly publicised and took place at the same time a second Yellow line issue at Amber Lane was being campaigned against. With the low numbers of residents that had been informed there was confusion on which Yellow Line consultation was being considered which may well have resulted in the poor response.

There is a lack of clarity with regards to who was invited to respond to the consultation. For example, there are 16 properties on Bovarde, directly affected by the proposals, but the report indicated 43 properties were written to. This makes it very difficult to understand the context of the response. Also of the 16 properties, very few actually received a notification and none wrote in supporting the proposals, which contradicts the statistics.

In general, the role of a private company – Prologis - in the consultation is a concern, as their priorities are not necessarily aligned to those of the residents. This is exacerbated by the lack of openness with regards to the genesis of this proposal.

## **Kings Hill Parish Council response to the 2019 consultation**

As far as can be ascertained, the PC response in 2019 was not based on any significant consultation with the residents so did not represent the wishes of the community. Indeed, at a contemporaneous public meeting regarding proposed development by Liberty, the PC informed the public they supported double yellow lines on Amber Lane. However, faced with the response and objection from the residents, they agreed to withdraw that support. The PC do not now support this formal Yellow Line proposal.

## **Public Meeting 20 July 2021**

Please see the appendix to this report – Minutes to Public Meeting 20 July 2021 held at the Community Centre.

Approximately 65 residents attended the meeting to represent themselves and that of the areas in which they reside. A number of residents spoke and the views / comments are detailed in the document.

It is difficult to convey just how angry and / or upset the community is over the yellow line proposals. Many residents feeling it will ruin the enjoyment of their homes to the degree they will have to sell up. Others will be left with nowhere for them to park let alone anywhere for guests and tradesmen to park.

The general feeling is that, yes there are some problem areas, but they are small focused areas and should be tackled individually. The proposals that sweep across the parish will have huge damaging impact on a large percentage of the parish unnecessarily.

It is only with the consultation that has now taken place with the community areas that the PC now understands the intense objection. The Parish Council will represent the wishes of the community and campaign against this plan in its current form.

In reality, the residents actually do already use their parking allocation. In some cases due to very poorly thought-out planning, the parking available including garages that are just too small to use. One gentleman said, “if I take the door mirrors off my car it would fit in the garage, but the doors won’t open wide enough to get out of the car”. The opinion from TMBC detailed in the 2019 report saying that restrictions would encourage the residents to use the current property allocated parking, simply, is not accurate or true. This misconception from TMBC needs to be corrected before we can move forward on addressing the poor parking.

TMBC was invited to attend. Leader of TMBC Cllr Boughton was unavailable to attend but wrote with apologies. KH Borough councillors were also invited but did not attend, the TMBC Parking Office also did not attend.

### **Displacement statistics from the current TMBC Proposal**

Below are the statistics of average cars parked on the roads against the estimated allowance following the installation of the yellow lines and the percentage of vehicles that are accommodated under the plan. The excess will obviously be displaced to adjacent roads.

Road	Current Vehicles	Proposed Spaces	Percent Accommodated
Discovery	76	45	59%
Fortune Way	56	12	21%
Queen St	12	5	41%
Regent	45	8	17%
Bovarde	6	4	66%
Alexander Grove	20	12	60%

Side roads such as Milton Lane are already affected by non-resident parking, increasing the difficulty of access for residents and other traffic. Displacing further vehicles of other roads as is being proposed, will make the situation much worse for all adjacent roads.

The parking problems on Kings Hill were negatively impacted by the decision of Asda, closely followed by Waitrose and the Community Centre, introducing maximum – very short – parking limits in their car parks. Previously many residents used the Asda car park for overnight parking of commercial vehicles, as they are not allowed on many Kings Hill roads due to covenants. These vehicles are now found parked along the streets within Kings Hill. Many people were told by developers, Rouse originally then Liberty that the Asda car park was considered the overflow parking for the parish. This position changed when Asda purchased the rights to the car park from Rouse Kent a number of years ago. This has no doubt severely contributed to the parking issue and should not have happened. It would be beneficial if the owners of the car parks, TMBC, the Parish Council and Prologis could work together to see if an ‘overnight’ compromise could be found. A small section of the car parks could also be given over to residents commercial vehicle parking on going. This should be a condition of the new Aldi supermarket car park if it is granted. In addition, space should be found by Prologis to create a permanent residents overflow car park to assist in solving a problem, partly caused by them and the planning authorities.

## **Official Kings Hill Parish Council Position July 2021**

The Parish Council has changed its position on the Parking Consultation and the installation of yellow lines. This supersedes the response sent in 2019. Following consultation with the residents including the Public meeting on 20 July 2021 the Parish Council and its Councillors must represent the views of the residents. Overall, the public believe the proposal is poorly thought out and will cause more problems than it solves. The PC urges the JTB and TMBC to digest the comments made by its community and whilst some areas and issues do need addressing, the large-scale installation of Yellow lines is not the answer and not what the majority of the residents want to see happen. When you have families stating that the proposal will make their lives a misery and unworkable, it is time to go back to the drawing board.

More consideration needs to be given to people who are to be affected by the proposals and less to those that choose to transit through the area. Kings Hill does not provide for through-traffic, being accessed from a single road (A228) on one side of the Parish. In addition, the safety aspects of the proposals need to be considered further; displaced vehicles will undoubtedly clog up side roads, making access for local residents, refuse lorries and emergency vehicles much more difficult or impossible. This will cause an increased risk to life and property.

The Parish Council also believes that the Parking Review 2021 has not been communicated sufficiently. Many residents are unaware of the proposals and the affects they will have on them. Those that do have mainly heard via social media groups and many residents, even those that attended the Public meeting (on 20 July) did not know how to raise objections. The web address, which is lengthy and unmemorable, was only found on sparsely placed, copy heavy, noticed tied to lampposts. These proposals have not been communicated to the wider community in adjacent areas that will be severely affected. The website itself is very restricted and will only allow for opposing one road area to leave comments. This has made it very difficult for residents to comment on the proposal as a whole.

### **Notes on individual area proposals**

Gibson Drive:

There are no issues at this location. It is a wide road and the flow of traffic is naturally restricted by the intersection with the A228. The Proposal is unnecessary the Parish Council is against the proposal.

Crispin Way:

This road has been operating perfectly well without yellow lines since the school opened. With the current arrangements there is still a shortage of parking for the school children to be picked up safely. The traffic flows unimpeded currently and is not an issue that requires attention. Car users should continue to park safely away from the junctions. Introducing yellow lines will make parking pressures considerably worse in the view of the Parish Council. In the 2019 report TMBC/JTB state "There seems to be to be a general reluctance from residents to use private parking spaces or garages that may be out of direct view from properties" On consultation with residents this statement is simply not true as the vast majority houses use their allocated parking already. The garages built in this area generally cannot be used for parking as they are too small to get out of the vehicle even if you can drive the car into the garage. This situation is of poor planning by the developers and should not have been approved by the local authority. TMBC cannot penalise the residents due to historic planning deficiencies.

The Parish Council is opposed the proposal

Alexander Grove, Discovery and Alton:

This road is where parents and carers park to pickup from Kings Hill School. In addition, the residents from this road area already use the available private parking and are forced to also use the road adjacent to the properties for overflow parking. The parking allocation for these houses was inadequate and garage size deficient from the developer planning. TMBC allowing this building phase to go through unchecked has caused this parking pressure so cannot now penalise the residents that now live in the road. School users operate a one way system which works very well. Installing yellow lines will increase an already difficult situation and will not resolve the problems.

In 2019 resident comments included-

“Lack (removal) of parking outside a property will devalue by 5%”

Response by JTB/TMBC-

‘Parking on the public highways is not a right, it is tolerated’

No parking for visitors including Grandparents (that care for children) feeling trapped and stressed, considering moving.

Response by JTB/TMBC-

‘Like any parking visitor parking cannot be taken for granted’

The Parish council finds these comments unhelpful and inappropriate.

The Parish Council is opposed to the plans.

Discovery Drive (east of Alexander Grove):

There are absolutely no issues with this stretch of Discovery Drive. There is no need for yellow lines.

The Parish Council is opposed to the proposal.

Discovery Drive and fortune Way (southern section):

This is one of the few areas that does require attention. Cars park on the roundabout and too close to the junctions, crossing points and traffic calming island. The Parish council supports the tackling of the constant perpetrators parking illegally or dangerously. Yellow lines are not required if current legislation is used to educate and/or fine the vehicle owners via the correct authority. This approach should be used first before permanent yellow lines. If there is a cost element to this way of dealing with the individuals at least it will be self funding through the fines.

The proposal significantly reduces parking on Fortune Way, which will cause problems for residents and displace vehicles into adjacent roads that are already full.

A one-way system should also be trialled to ease flow of traffic through Fortune and Queen Street. The suggested route is starting at Tower View / Waitrose end turning one way after the Store entrance. This would involve KCC Highway involvement.

The Parish council would support a different approach but opposes a yellow line installation that would still have to be policed and fine the perpetrators.

Fortune Way:

Again, this is an area that requires a plan but enforcement of illegal and dangerous parking, along with education of drivers, should be pursued before considering yellow lines. Fines will stop people parking illegally. Un-policed yellow lines will not. Parking is at a premium in this densely populated area. There was inadequate parking allowance made for the size of properties. Quoting that planning regulations were followed at the time just highlights how flawed they were and still are. The residents already use their allocated parking, those that do not say it is because the allocation is not fit for purpose, too small.

Reducing parking provision will displace the additional vehicles onto adjacent roads that are already full.

Residents that attended the Public Meeting (20 July), suggested that the lack of response from residents in the informal review in 2019 could be explained by a high number of properties that were Let and that tenants are less likely to respond to a Parking Review than Homeowners.

The Parish Council would support a proposal that will deal with perpetrators of illegal or dangerously parked cars, but not yellow lines. A one-way system should also be trialled to ease flow of traffic through Fortune and Queen Street. The suggested route is starting at Tower View / Waitrose end turning one way after the Store entrance. This would involve KCC Highway involvement.

The Parish Council opposes the current proposal.

Queen Street:

As with Fortune Way, the illegal and dangerous parking at the entrance to Queen St from Fortune should be approached through education and fines process. There is very little problem with Queen St other than this entrance and the residents and their enjoyment of living in the area would be severely impacted if the yellow line proposal is approved. Residents have said "where will be supposed to park if the parking capacity is halved?" residents already use their allocated spaces.

The Parish Council would support a proposal that will deal with perpetrators of illegally or dangerously parked cars, but not yellow lines. A one-way system should also be trialled to ease flow of traffic through Fortune and Queen Street. This would involve KCC Highway involvement.

The Parish Council opposes the current proposal.

Braeburn Way, Tower View, Winston, Melrose:

There is no significant parking issue in this area. This is unnecessary  
The Parish Council opposes this proposal

Discovery Drive (Winston to Melrose):

There is no significant parking issues at this area, yellow lines on a road with this low amount of traffic is unnecessary and a waste of council money.

Proposal will just displace the vehicles into Winston and Melrose which are already full. This will create a dangerous access problem to the side roads in the event of an emergency.

The Parish Council opposes the proposal.

Discovery Drive (Rougemont to Boverde):

There are no parking issues at all in this area, yellow lines on a road with this low amount of traffic is unnecessary and a waste of council money.

This proposal will just displace the vehicles into Rougemont and Braeburn and create increased parking there. This will create a dangerous access problem to the side roads in the event of an emergency.

The Parish Council opposes the proposal.

Bovarde Avenue:

Having spoken to the residents of Boverde, not many of them received the consultation letter and not one of them wrote in to support the proposal so I find it hard to understand where the 2019 figures come from?

This road should not have been designated a school drop off / pick up point as it is such a short road. The parked cars do not cause any issues. Two buses dropping off or picking up opposite each other on a small road is what causes the congestion but it is only for the 30 mins in the morning peak time. The bus set down point should be changed to the wider point

which is one way only at the top of Tower view. Again, it is the poorly thought out bus pick up / set down points that cause the issues on this road not parked cars.

The Parish Council opposes this proposal.

Regent Way (Tower View to Sunrise):

Regent Way has significant road usage for parked cars. The residents all use their limited allocated parking already. The adjacent roads are also busy with parked cars so where will these cars be displaced to? The PC has spoken to a number of residents and users of the road. Whilst it does have cars parked, traffic flows, HGV's can always get through easily so installing yellow lines will just make the situation worse not better.

In addition, Regent Way is a long straight main route, so without the parked cars in the road, the speed of the traffic would greatly and present a threat to life, as many children cross here to access school bus stops.

Installation of roadside parking bays would improve the road significantly and there is space to do so, this would actually deal with the problem of inadequate parking, rather than just move the issue. This would involve KCC and Prologis involvement.

The Parish Council opposes the proposal.

Discovery Drive (Bovarde to Quindell):

There are no parking issues at all in this area; yellow lines on a road with this low amount of traffic is unnecessary and a waste of council money.

The proposal will just displace the vehicles into Cobham, Alderwick and Quindell which are already busy with parked vehicles. This will create a dangerous access problem to the side roads in the event of an emergency.

The Parish Council opposes the proposal.

Discovery Drive (Clearheart to Tiffin):

There is no parking issues in this area, yellow lines on a road with this low amount of traffic is unnecessary and a waste of council money.

Proposal will just displace the vehicles into McArthur, Eden and Victory that are already full. This will create a dangerous access problem to the side roads in the event of an emergency.

The Parish Council opposes the proposal.

Discovery Drive (Tiffin to Holly):

Resident largely use their allocated private parking but inadequate allowance dictates the road is being used for parking. This is rarely a problem other than at school pick up / drop off times where it is busy. Removing over half of the parking capacity in this part of the road will just displace vehicles onto side roads causing a dangerous access point in the even of an emergency. Parking around the school should be policed more. Currently there are people parking on school zig zags at busy times. No one does anything about that. Parking that is illegal or dangerous should be tackled by the correct authorities using current legislation, this will calm the issue in this area which is only ever a problem at pick up times. Perhaps the use of mobile parking cameras would deter drivers from parking illegally and educate that it is not acceptable behaviour. These have been used outside other schools.

Installation of roadside parking bays would improve the road significantly and there is space to do so, this would actually deal with the problem of inadequate parking, rather than just move the issue. This would involve KCC and Prologis involvement.

The Parish Council would support the tackling of illegal and dangerous parking but not the current proposal.

## **Electric Vehicles**

This Parking Review does not even touch on the provision and capacity for electric vehicles in the Kings Hill Parish but this is also going to be a very real problem shortly. The driving habits and the vehicles that get driven will be changing over the coming years under the current government guidelines and targets. Any parking consultation taking place in the coming years including this one by TMBC will have to include looking at how residents will be charging their electric vehicles. Many properties in Kings Hill have parking or garages that are remote from their house. Even if they have power at the parking/garage/barn it will not have sufficient amperage to charge effectively. When residents investigate having fast charging installed, they are finding that local management companies, Prologis or other factors make it impossible.

It is very possible that in the future, local authorities will be installing roadside charging bays instead of yellow lines. There are many areas along these effected routes where this should be being looked at now as well as the installation of roadside parking bays, perhaps dual purpose?

## **Conclusion**

Kings Hill Parish Council is opposing this proposal mainly because we are representing the wishes of the residents. At the Public Meeting on 20 July, not one resident spoke in support of these Yellow line Restrictions, in fact every member of the public that attended very strongly objected to them. In addition several Councillors have been out speaking to residents along the routes. Everyone spoken to believes that aside to a small number of localised areas, traffic flows very well around the parish. It is also thought that this proposal represents an unnecessary waste of public money that could be better spent in other areas.

The severity of negative impact this proposal would have on hundreds of residents dictates the Parish Council must do everything in our power to protect the community from it.

The 2019 informal consultation comments from residents received responses from TMBC/JTB that the Parish Council believes are wholly inappropriate and in many cases are completely inaccurate. The view is of TMBC and the JTB that residents just need encouraging to use their allocation of parking to alleviate the impact of the Yellow lines. The resident already do use the private parking for the properties where it is possible to do so. TMBC Planning allowed homes to be built with insufficient parking and garages to be built that are too narrow to use. TMBC is also approving planning applications to turn garages into living space and car ports to have doors installed. These actions have created the situation we are now in. The local authority must not penalise residents now for historic planning deficiencies and flaws, many of whom have lived in their homes since Kings Hill was built without experiencing any parking problems.

The small number of parking issues and highways concerns that exist, will require consultation with all agencies to resolve effectively and with the minimum of detrimental impact to the Kings Hill community. As well as TMBC / JTB, the Highways authority, KCC and the Police will need to be involved in a solution. As detailed in this report, the Kings Hill Parish Council believes a targeted approach to tackle the illegal and dangerous parking is the primary route to take, coupled with a road layout change including two, one-way roads – Fortune and Queen Street will make a huge improvement and would be inexpensive to implement.

Proposal from the Kings Hill Parish Council is that all parties to include a PC Working Group, TMBC, JTB, KCC Highways and Prologis plan a meeting to discuss and agree options to reasonably be able to move forward with. The PC suggest a date in early September.

Below is the minutes / Notes from the Public Meeting

## MINUTES OF MEETING OF PUBLIC PARISH MEETING TO DISCUSS TMBC YELLOW LINE PROPOSAL HELD ON **TUESDAY 20 JULY 2021 AT 7.30pm** IN THE NEW HALL, KINGS HILL COMMUNITY CENTRE.

**Present:** Cllr C Henley, Cllr S Kirk, Cllr D Rush

Approximate resident attendance – 65.

### Comments from the Floor

Cllr C Henley opened meeting with facts and figures on number of cars parked on some of the proposed roads during a walk today. He explained what is being offered under new proposal – it was a fraction of the number. He invited residents to give their views and opened the floor.

██████████ – Boverde – proposal doesn't address the issue. A blanket large scale lining is unnecessary and going to turn neighbours on each other. Increase speeding. Why not use current legislation to issue penalties to dangerous or illegal parkers.

██████████ – Windsor Avenue – can it be outlined what the proposal is for management of displacement of vehicles. This is a huge concern for her.

██████████ – Beacon Avenue - proposals are disproportionate to the issue. Cant see any justification when accident rate is so low. Normally yellows are for through roads not generally on contained estate. What happens for social events going forward. No provision for visitors. This will destroy Kings Hill. What will happen for electric vehicles in the future.

██████████ – Stirling Road – former fire brigade. Need to sort out provision of parking for residents/visitors. Wants the parish council to push this message TMBC. Money in S106 agreements from developers should be coming to Kings Hill to help with parking provisions. They shouldn't continue to build homes when they cant provide enough parking.

██████████ – Alexander Grove – Wanted to put on record that following the first review so feedback to the objections has been made public. Despite constant requests for the information from TMBC ██████████ has never received a response this is unacceptable. Questioned the new proposal stating it “wants to improve access to properties”. The proposal for his road actually takes away access to his property. Will ruin his family's lives and will force them to need to move. They are a two car household with one space. Cant park in garage as car wont fit. New proposal also states it will “improve traffic movement” – no will just displace cars. ██████████ witnessed the guy who did carried out a traffic review and he attended twice for a limited time during school drop off/pick up time - parents pick up for 190hrs a year. ██████████ lives there for 8760hrs a year. Why is the proposal giving priority of parking to the

school and not the residents. Speeding will increase. Why are we not using current laws to stop parking on roundabouts and junctions. The laws exist, we just need some signage and enforcement. People need to raise safety issues. No safety review of surrounding unadopted roads has been done.

██████████ – Maypole drive – sold in the early days of Kings Hill that ratio of the residential and commercial would be very different to what it is now. Asda car park was supposed to be for residents overflow parking. That's been taken away as Proligis has sold the rights to the carpark to Asda to enforce their own restrictions. We are being stuffed.

██████████ – Hawkridge Grove – things are bad enough now. This will make it much much worse. We need improvements and to tackle the issues not all residents. Do we think the council are giving due notice to all that will be affected? Some people in the room had said they hadn't been sent a letter. TMBC have not sent the notification letter to all affected roads including adjacent roads.

██████████ – Tower View – where are our visitors supposed to go. Why did we lose parking in Asda – can we not get a deal back with Asda as that helps.

██████████ – Fortune Way – trades people and family visiting – where are they supposed to park. This will make it impossible to live here.

██████████ – Fortune Way – they live right on the junction. Bad design of road from the planners. Would a one way system not be better. Also concerned an empty road will encourage speeding.

██████████ Milton Lane – parking is a nightmare. Getting worse every year because of lack of parking. No provision for visitors. Milton Parking will get much worse if Fortune yellow lines are introduced. Garages don't fit large cars. Idea that we should all write to the MP. ██████████ explained you can only do that once we have responded to this proposal. We should have a multi-story provision for overflow.

██████████ Discovery – we all saw the fire on Victory Drive which is adjacent to Discovery. If the emergency truck couldn't get down that road due to lots of displaced cars what would have happened. Yellow lines will not solve a parking problem just move onto other smaller roads that could result in very dangerous access situations in an emergency.

██████████ Discovery - Brought in to the dream that this was a luxury development. The are large houses and its is assumed there would be multiple cars. Been here since 2005 and witnessed squashing of plot size and less parking

██████████ Rougemont – Kings Hill is one of the more affluent areas in Kent and sold the dream to live here. Way more houses have been built than was ever proposed. Cant keep my cars in my garage as I cant get out, poor planning. Has CCTV of people with buggies walking up middle of the road as they cant get on the pavement.

██████████ – Milton Lane – short sighted as where are these cars going to go. His road has awful parking and will get much worse if this goes through, has investigated bollard options. He was advised by highways consultant, should try and educate road first. Why aren't KCC looking to do that as well as enforcement of road rules.

██████████ – Milton - Ambulance tried to get down Milton to her son. They had to dump and run as couldn't get through. She does leave notes on cars to try and educate people. An

education system to get people to not park on junctions. Suggested parking bays would be useful. Also needs some overflow parking. Parking in Milton will get worse

██████████ – Regent Way – on junction of Sunrise. Lots of people park on this road that do not live on Regent. She has commercial vehicles on road which are against covenants. Can we enforce some of the covenants already in place like commercial vehicle not being allowed on the road. Yellow lines will just force the vehicles onto other roads.

██████████ – Lapins Lane – can we commission independent traffic consultants to discredit the scheme? ██████████ confirmed parish don't have any budget to do this in the short term. Would Pro-logis help? ██████████ said its unlikely. ██████████ suggested paying for it ourselves as could be a strong tool ██████████ highlighted how little time we have to get our responses in.

██████████ – Emerald Walk – They tried before to put yellow lanes on Amber Lane before and it got stopped but he thinks they are just setting a precedent, trying to clear the road to be able to redevelop Amber Lane.

Fortune Way – what about parking permits for roads. Has this been looked in to?

██████████ - Queen Street – parking is a problem on the corner of Fortune but generally her road is ok. She has been there 16 years without issue. If restrictions on Queen Street are introduced where are residents going to park? All house parking provisions are already used for all homes. If carparks were accessible it would help but all have time restrictions now.

██████████ Discovery – worried that some roads haven't been made aware of the proposals. Because effected roads will end up affecting them. He doesn't think TMBC have made sufficient efforts to inform all residents on roads and in the areas.

Rental properties – will council consider that tenants wont reply as not the home owner.

██████████ Mcarthur Park - Main concern is people parking on roundabouts. We need to tackle parking on junctions, roundabouts and by schools. Worried about speeding if roads are clearer. We need some visitor roadside parking recesses created. There is lots of space to do this on all proposed roads.

██████████ – Bovarde – I do not disagree something needs to be done about parking. There are several roads that are so cluttered with parking that you cant get a push chair along the kerbs and if an emergency vehicle needed to get through it would be impossible. If you double yellow without any provisions for alternative parking how can homes ever have contractors or visitors. You will devalue home homes and obstruct everyday life from functioning.

Perhaps a softer proposal including education and parking enforcement in the first instance:

Make Fortune and Queen street to be one way so that one side of the road can be designated for parking.

Create a commercial vehicle car park on Kings Hill Avenue (or tower view instead of another super market we don't need). It used to work well for vans when they could park overnight in Asda.

Create visitor and overflow parking throughout phase 2 including roadside bays. Easy immediate options open the linear park car parks, the cricket pitch car parks on Eden and Regent, Prologis car park on Queen Street, create recesses in some of the over-size

verges/green spaces. Prologis should take responsibility for this. They have enough community funds.

Allow permission for people to convert suitable front gardens to parking and drop kerbs.

██████████ – Bovarde – as a resident im concerned for where my visitors will be able to park. As a local contractor im concerned where I will park when doing work for Kings Hill residents.

Meeting closed at 9pm.