

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**05 June 2023**

**Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure & Technical Services**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters For Decision**

**1. HADLOW PARKING REVIEW**

1.1 As part of the Borough's Parking Action Plan, the Borough Council has been carrying out a parking review of Hadlow. The review started some years ago, and proposals were prepared for consultation in 2020. However, due to the COVID19 pandemic and the following changes to traffic patterns the consultation was not carried out until earlier this year, as "a new normal" of parking demand and traffic movements were established.

1.1.1 The proposals taken to informal consultation are shown in Annex 1

**2 SUMMARY OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION**

2.1 We carried out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers to the proposals from 20<sup>th</sup> January to 27<sup>th</sup> February 2023. We received 83 discrete responses. Hadlow Parish Council also commented on the proposals.

2.1.1 Details of the public responses (redacted of personal information) are shown in Annex 2

2.1.2 The Parish Council response is shown in Annex 3

**3 RESPONSES**

3.1.1 The responses indicated 38 in favour of proposals, 41 not in favour and 5 where responses were mixed or covered a number of issues.

3.1.2 Further analysis looked at the detail of the responses, and the differing elements of the proposals.

**3.1.3 *In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/02 A26 Tonbridge Road***

Residents commented that they did not want restrictions in the layby where there are already "KEEP CLEAR" markings as they found those areas useful for parking.

### 3.1.4 ***The Parish Council commented:***

Junction Carpenters Lane and A26: The proposed “No Waiting Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm” (single yellow line, marked in purple on TMBC’s plan) – This was considered extremely dangerous as any parking in this vicinity would cause visual impairment exiting Carpenters Lane.

Parish response – proposal rejected.

High Street: Proposed “No Waiting at any time” (Double Yellow Lines) – positioning would effectively prevent the elderly and disabled from being able to park or disembark from a vehicle in a suitable and close enough area to their destination.

Parish response – proposal rejected.

Maltings and Old Carpenters Lane: Proposed “No Waiting at any time” (Double Yellow Lines) - not seen as beneficial and the only acceptable proposals were double yellow lines on visual displays for each side road off of Carpenters Lane as they were seen to reinstate the psychology “do not park”.

Parish response – 10m visual displays on roads off Carpenters Lane but remaining proposals rejected.

### 3.1.5 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/03 A26 High Street & Hadlow Square***

Residents have raised a number of differing views, from support and requests for additional restrictions, to objection to any change and concern about the introduction of parking meters (though these have never been considered). Concerns were raised that the proposals did not create new parking, and that the proposals may displace parking to nearby roads.

Residents proposed having a free “residents parking scheme” and “no entry except for access” in Church Street, and potentially in to Appletons, The Forstal and Maltings Close.

There were also concerns that The Square was a conservation area and any further restrictions would be unsightly.

There was also discussion about relaxing the existing 2 hour limited waiting to unlimited parking, and conversely to 20 minute short-stay parking.

### 3.1.6 ***The Parish Council commented:***

Church Street – due to its narrowness and limited space, parking is normally only by house owners on the street and funeral vehicles who need access to the church.

Parish response: proposal rejected.

The Old Barn, The Square down to Grays House: “Proposed Limited Waiting Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm, 2 hrs, no return 2 hours in marked parking bays”. It would only exacerbate the current limited parking available to visit shops and homes. The existing 1 hour only parking in the village square is rarely enforced and increasing the limitation was not seen as beneficial.

Parish response: White marking to designate available parking bays in existing laybys but all other proposals rejected.

### 3.1.7 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/04 Great Elms***

Responses from residents in relation to Great Elms, Smithers Close and The Cherry Orchard were mixed, with some in support of the proposals, and asking for more, and others seeing no issue with the parking as it is, and that the proposals were not necessary.

### 3.1.8 ***The Parish Council commented:***

Great Elms – Proposed “No Waiting at any time” (Double Yellow Lines) - double yellow lines at the entrance from A26 seemed excessive.

Parish response: Double yellow lines on all 10m visual displays for Great Elms and feeder roads with only 3&5 remaining unmarked.

Tonbridge Road - Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double Yellow Lines) - along the Tonbridge Road towards and after Great Elms was seen as unnecessary as not an existing issue other than occasional Sunday church attendance. If parking was restricted, then the visitors would start encroaching on side roads that already have limited parking.

Parish response - proposal rejected.

### 3.1.9 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/05 Court Lane***

There were 9 public responses in relation to proposals in the Court Lane area, 8 supporting the changes and 1 unclear. The Parish Council also responded.

The residents’ comments were supportive, but with discussion on whether the proposed restrictions on the northern side were warranted.

### 3.1.10 ***The Parish Council commented:***

Court Lane: Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double Yellow Lines) - on the left side of the road from A26 entrance was seen as unnecessary cost. The road is used by agricultural vehicles and as a “cut through”, with

parked cars keeping to the opposite side of the road. There seemed no reason to make any adjustments, unnecessary expenditure.

Parish response – Proposal rejected.

Appletons & The Forstal – Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double yellow lines) - visual display lines beneficial as site impaired and heavy use of Court Lane.

Parish response: Proposed 10m visual displays approved.

### 3.1.11 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/06 A26 Maidstone Road (south)***

Residents commented that the proposals may displace parking in to nearby areas including private parking facilities.

### 3.1.12 ***The Parish Council commented:***

Proposed “Limited Waiting Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm” (Single yellow line) - Pound House & Alma Place – Already restricted parking for visiting shops and for residential parking in the locations such as Pound House. The proposals would further exacerbate the problem. Parking in surrounding roads already at a premium.

Parish response: Proposal rejected.

The Vicarage & The Terrace. Proposed “No Waiting Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm” (Single yellow line) – both seen as unnecessary. Parking in these areas particularly on the Vicarage side assists with natural traffic calming.

Parish response: Proposal rejected.

- Maidstone Road: Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double yellow lines) – Most vehicles only park on the Vicarage side of the road and generally there are only a few parked cars around Henley House which are seen as natural traffic calming.

Parish response: proposal rejected.

### 3.1.13 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/07 A26 Maidstone Road (north)***

- Residents commented that the introduction of double yellow lines would prevent deliveries and limit disabled access. However, loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow lines and disabled drivers have concessions for parking on double yellow lines through the Blue Badge scheme.

### 3.1.14 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- Monypenny Close & Caxton Lane - no reason to extend the double yellow lines past the 10m visual displays on Monypenny Close but agree with double yellow line visual display for both roads.

Parish response: 10m visual display line only on both roads.

#### 3.1.15 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/08 Carpenters Lane (north)***

- The responses from residents were mixed, with some in favour, and some against. Parking in Water Slippe seemed to be a particular concern, again with differing views.

#### 3.1.16 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- Mill View, Hope Avenue, Freehold, Water Slippe, Twyford Road, Warren Gardens: Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double yellow lines). - The extended lines on Water Slippe and Warren Gardens deemed unnecessary. The 10m visual display double yellow lines will ensure clear visual when entering road or exiting onto Carpenters Lane particularly as Carpenters Lane often has numerous parked cars on it which although may block visibility do act as natural traffic calming on a road that would be a fast-track rat run if the vehicles were not parked there.

Parish response: all the above noted roads to have standard 10m visual display (yellow lines).

#### 3.1.17 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/09 Carpenters Lane (mid)***

- There were 4 public responses in relation to proposals in the Carpenters Lane (mid) area, 2 supporting the changes, 1 against and 1 unclear. The Parish Council also responded.
- The residents’ comments were supportive, but with differences of opinion about whether the lines should be extended or not. The objection was on a similar basis, that the restrictions should be extended further on the west side of Carpenters Lane.
- There were conflicting comments relating to restrictions in Monypenny Close, some wanting far more restrictions and some wanting less.

#### 3.1.18 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- Monypenny Close & Caxton Lane - no reason to extend the double yellow lines past the 10m visual displays on Monypenny Close but agree with double yellow line visual display for both roads.
- Parish response: 10m visual display line only on both roads.

#### 3.1.19 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/10 Carpenters Lane (south)***

- Residents comment both in favour and against the proposals, with some wanting extension in to Kenward Court and others wanting reductions.

3.1.20 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- this has already been addressed under DD/587/02 A26 Tonbridge Road.

3.1.21 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/11 Maltings Close***

3.1.22 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- Proposed “No waiting at any time” (Double yellow lines) Kenward Court – extending the double yellow lines onto the cobbled area would ruin the aesthetics.

Parish response: Dray Court – 10m visual displays beneficial.

Maltings Close – 10m visual displays beneficial

Toby Gardens – 10m visual displays beneficial

Old Carpenters Lane – commented on drawing DD/587/02 A26 Tonbridge Road

3.1.23 ***In relation to Plan ref: DD/587/12 Victoria Road & Three Elm Lane (Golden Green)***

3.1.24 ***The Parish Council commented:***

- Victoria Road – the proposed double yellow lines on the Victoria Road Close extended to the end of #22 seems excessive although the 10m visual display lines would be beneficial providing clear site line onto the main Victoria Road.
- Victoria Road by The Bell Inn - proposed double yellow lines are also too extensive with no general issues currently noted. Surely cheaper and just as effective to white Dog Bone outside #1 if there has been an issue entering or existing their drive.
- Carrickstarne (Three Elm Lane corner with Victoria Road) – limited parking available and mainly used by residents so extended double yellow lines unnecessary.
- Bus Stops – the proposed clearway seems unnecessary as no current parking issues in these locations. On occasion hall parking at a night event may intrude on the bus stop area but routine buses have stopped running at this point in the evening and are therefore not affected.

- Parish response: 10m Visual displays in all areas indicated on the drawing are acceptable but not elongation of these lines. Unnecessary and not cost effective to delineate the bus stop clearway.

### 3.1.25 ***Additional Parish Council comments***

3.1.26 in addition to Recommendations provided above for each Drawing the Parish Council would put forward the following suggestions from residents.

- Re-instate all Keep Clear dropped kerbs throughout the Parish.
- White line parking bays on A26 so it is easier to see just how many vehicles could be parking and to prevent inconsiderate parking over two bays.
- Bump Up Box particularly along the A26 at areas such as Castle View to Hadlow Castle where cars regularly park on the pavement to ensure there is a defined line that they do not surpass ensuring safe passage for disability chairs, push chairs and other pedestrians.

### 3.2 **Other issues raised.**

3.2.1 There were requests for additional off-street car parking to be provided – on the area in front of 2-8 Pound House, the area alongside Littlefields and the area to the southwest of Hadlow alongside the A26 Tonbridge Road. However, this is outside the remit of the Borough Council.

3.2.2 There were also requests for enforcement of the existing speed limits and for a new 20mph speed limit through Hadlow. However, this would be an issue for KCC as speeding and safety on the public highway are the responsibility of the Highway Authority.

3.2.3 There were calls for a number of roads to be made “residents and visitors only” – however this cannot be taken forward on the adopted public highway without the introduction of a permit parking scheme.

## 4 **ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION**

4.1.1 It is clear that the Parish Council are wishing for the Borough Council’s scheme to be significantly reduced. Residents are wishing for controls that promote safety, but do not want restrictions that could displace parking in to the residential areas.

4.1.2 There are a number of conflicting views, where residents report problems in their street, and their neighbours are happy with the current arrangements and the windfall parking that they benefit from, though this is to the detriment of other road users.

4.1.3 In light of the informal consultation, we have listened to the responses and adapted the proposals. However, the result is less of a cohesive scheme aimed at addressing the parking issues across Hadlow as a whole, but a selection of separate locations where new parking restrictions are to be introduced, or existing restrictions are to be made fit for purpose, in line with the requirements of the Highway Code and modern highway design standards.

## 5 **REVISION OF THE PARKING SCHEME**

5.1 The changes to the proposals are;

### 5.1.1 ***Plan ref: DD/587/02A A26 Tonbridge Road***

The proposals were intended to protect access, maintain flow and to provide off peak parking. However, in light of the comments from residents and the Parish Council, we have deleted lengths of double yellow lines in the lay-by and the single yellow line proposals near Littlefields.

5.1.2 We are retaining minor yellow line changes to make the existing parking restrictions fit for purpose near the layby on the northern side and are formalising the bus stop clearway.

### 5.1.3 ***Plan ref: DD/587/03A A26 High Street & Hadlow Square***

The proposals were intended to allow longer-stay parking for residents in and around The Square, but in light of the comments from residents and the Parish Council, we are withdrawing the proposed resident permit scheme and permit parking area.

5.1.4 We are also deleting the proposals for double yellow lines in Church Street, the laybys outside Littlefields and Pound House.

5.1.5 We are also reinstating the disabled parking bay to the layby outside Pound House, removed during the resurfacing work.

### 5.1.6 ***Plan ref: DD/587/04A Great Elms***

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, there are no changes to proposals in Great Elms, Smithers Close and The Cherry Orchard.

### 5.1.7 ***Plan ref: DD/587/05A Court Lane***

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, there are no changes to proposals shown for Court Lane, Appletons and The Forstal.

### 5.1.8 ***Plan ref: DD/587/06A A26 Maidstone Road (south)***

In light of the concerns about displaced parking, we are removing the proposal for single yellow line restrictions that allow for overnight parking. We are retaining the proposals to prevent obstructive parking near Henley House and around the junction with Court Lane.



5.1.9 **Plan ref: DD/587/07A A26 Maidstone Road (north)**

Following the Parish Council's comments we have deleted the proposals for double yellow lines to prevent displacement parking and maintain traffic flow, but are retaining the junction protection restrictions around the junction of Great Elms.

5.1.10 **Plan ref: DD/587/08A Carpenters Lane (north)**

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, no changes to proposals for Carpenters Lane, Mill View, The Freehold, Water Slippe, Warren Gardens, Twyford Road and Hope Avenue.

5.1.11 **Plan ref: DD/587/09A Carpenters Lane (mid)**

The proposals have been amended – reduction of the proposals in Monypenny Close and an extension of the proposals on the western side of Carpenters Lane.

5.1.12 **Plan ref: DD/587/10A Carpenters Lane (south)**

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, at junctions and in front of accesses, no changes are proposed for Carpenters Lane, The Maltings, Kenward Court and Maltings Close.

5.1.13 **Plan ref: DD/587/11A Maltings Close**

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, no changes to proposals for Maltings Close, Dray Court, Toby Gardens or Hailstone Close.

5.1.14 **Plan ref: DD/587/12A Victoria Road & Three Elm Lane (Golden Green)**

As the proposals reflect the requirements of the Highway Code, and are intended to prevent obstructive parking, no changes to proposals for Victoria Road and Three Elm Lane.

## 6 **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1.1 The powers allowing the Borough Council to carry out parking management activity are contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, supplemented by formal agreement with Kent County Council as the Local Highway Authority, in respect of its powers under the Traffic Management Act 2004. In particular section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation 1984 Act imposes a general duty on local authorities exercising functions under the Act to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of safe and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

6.1.2 The Borough Council carries out parking enforcement under an Agency agreement with Kent County Council by way of a Traffic Regulation Order, under the terms of the Road Traffic Act 1988 (and its amendments), the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Traffic Management Act 2004.

6.1.3 Changes to parking charges are made via an Amendment Orders to the Council's on and off-street parking Traffic Regulation Orders, using the procedures set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and will reflect any temporary amendments to procedures introduced to address Covid-19 restrictions. The proposals have followed and exceeded the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996.

6.1.4 The matters raised in this report are considered to be routine, uncontroversial or not legally complex.

## 6.2 **Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

6.2.1 Funding for the development of the Parking Plan is provided within existing revenue budgets.

## 6.3 **Risk Assessment**

6.3.1 The comprehensive assessment and consultation process applied to Parking Action Plans provides the assurance that the Borough Council has the will and ability to adapt proposals brought forward, in the light of comment and circumstances, and to ensure that it achieves a best balance of local parking needs. A regular review of the schemes is crucial to ensure that the Council correctly and effectively manages on-street parking in these areas, as the proposals are either introduced for safety reasons or to provide a more appropriate balance of parking needs.

6.3.2 A major risk is that scheme proposals encounter significant lack of local support. This risk is mitigated by the considerable effort devoted to ensuring there is widespread consultation on proposals both informally and formally.

## 6.4 **Equality Impact Assessment**

6.4.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## 6.5 **Policy Considerations**

6.5.1 Asset Management

6.5.2 Communications

6.5.3 Community

6.5.4 Customer Contact

6.5.5 Health and Safety

7 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 It is recommended that the revisions discussed in Section 5 of the report are taken forward to formal consultation, and the results be reported to this Board for further consideration.

Background papers:

Annex 1 Informal consultation plans

Annex 2 Parish Council response

Annex 3 Informal consultation responses (redacted)

Annex 4 Revised plans for formal consultation

contact: Andy Bracey  
Parking Manager

Robert Styles  
Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services