

Annex 5

Area	Location	Yes	No	Unknwn	Comments
Aylesford	Howick Close	1			By my rough calculations this will displace 15-20 cars able to park their cars will you be making any provisions for these cars to park elsewhere near their homes? I can agree that it makes sense to have these double yellow lines not only for the waste services but for the emergency services too, a fire engine in an emergency would struggle. Maybe you should think about demolishing the garages to help with the parking spaces.
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		There is not enough parking already and putting yellow lines in will only exacerbate this problem I've seen waste drivers get through no problem and other not even attempt it maybe get better trained drivers thank you
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		There is insufficient parking already and there are many elderly and disabled people who will be adversely affected with no parking outside their properties, I have seen plenty of waste vehicles getting through with no problems and some not even attempt to get through and drive straight past. Thank you.
Aylesford	Howick Close			1	I understand the problem of cars etc blocking the road so that Ambulance's fire service & bin lorries, can not get through to the end of the rd, But before this proposal is actioned I would like to point out one or two issues. No 1/ If cars cannot park outside their houses there is very little space now. No2/ The garage block at the end of the rd often have cars left there making it impossible to have access to our garage's there would be constant parking there if the road is out of use. No3/ On Tuesday AM the veterans meet at Dennis Cadman House they park anywhere there is a space eg outside my house, when ever DIC have a quiz night etc people arrive in their cars because they come from further afield. No4 I have my 80 yr old mother living here also I am disabled & have a blue card, I am sure you will appreciate that I have to park by the house to off load mum, shopping etc. I hope this highlights a few pointers
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		I am a resident of howick close where these line will be place outside my home. I object to this decision - 1) The proposed yellow lines will stop the 10 cars belonging to numbers 1-6 parking where we currently do outside our home. The allocated car park is already full between the hours of 6pm-8am. Where are we now supposed to park our cars?? 70 years old parking outside my house is convenient, I am too old to be carrying heavy shopping down the street, and I don't want to be stressed out fighting for a new parking space everyday. 2) I have monitored the time at which the household waste has come over the last 3 weeks since the proposal arrived and they have not come before 10am once!! The majority of the cars where these proposed lines are, have gone by 8am. As you can see by the pictures I have attached they are more than capable of getting the bin truck up this road with no issues. One day they even came at 1:30pm. Everybody who parks where these lines are proposed goes to work between the hours of 8am-6pm. 3) These yellow lines will cause more issues for us residents than the 1 time a year the household waste decides to collect before 8am.
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		My husband has a disabled badge and there is no allowance for disabled people. Maybe you could place parking on one side of the road for disabled badge holders only due to the number of disabled people between numbers 1 to 6 and 31 to 38
Aylesford	Howick Close	1			About time something was done about this. If the emergency services needed to get up here sometimes they cannot.
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		I am a resident of howick close where these line will be place outside my home. I object to this decision - 1) The proposed yellow lines will stop the 10 cars belonging to numbers 1-6 parking where we currently do outside our home. The allocated car park is already full between the hours of 6pm-8am. Where are we now supposed to park our cars?? 70 years old parking outside my house is convenient, I am too old to be carrying heavy shopping down the street, and I don't want to be stressed out fighting for a new parking space everyday. 2) I have monitored the time at which the household waste has come over the last 3 weeks since the proposal arrived and they have not come before 10am once!! The majority of the cars where these proposed lines are, have gone by 8am. As you can see by the pictures I have attached they are more than capable of getting the bin truck up this road with no issues. One day they even came at 1:30pm. Everybody who parks where these lines are proposed goes to work between the hours of 8am-6pm. 3) These yellow lines will cause more issues for us residents than the 1 time a year the household waste decides to collect before 8am. (Photos supplied)
Aylesford	Howick Close	1			I strongly agree with the double yellow lines in Howick Close it is not only a problem with the refuse collections it also has become a problem for ambulances, delivery drivers ect, and because of inconsiderate parking on all corners and both sides of Howick it is getting very dangerous for people and children walking to use any of the pathways.
Aylesford	Howick Close		1		I am not in favour of the double yellow lines for Howick Close as a resident I haven't been informed by the refuse company that there is any issues regarding access to our road to collect waste. As far as I can recall any missed collection where authorised by tmbc due to extreme weather and reallocating the driver's elsewhere to help with dealing with weather conditions. Also the area of parking that runs parallel with no6's garden doesn't have any street lighting and therefore is considered unpleasant and unsafe after dusk. We also have many residents that have medical issues regarding how far they can walk, thus if they have to park further away from their homes, would cause considerable discomfort. Please take these issues seriously as if it was to go ahead, could cause upset to all residents of Howick Close, Clive House (flats) and William Baker house(flats).
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			Rochester Road Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/02. However I would like you to consider extending the double yellow lines on the left side of Rochester Road, after the Unwin Close entrance, going south towards the village. The sight line turning both left and right exiting Unwin Close is both poor and dangerous. There have been many near accidents recently and one serious accident at that juncture just a few months ago. A slightly longer double yellow line was requested by the residents of Unwin Close at the time of painting the existing double yellow lines. However we were told that our request was too late. Hopefully this can be remedied on this occasion. Just two car lengths would make such a difference.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			I am in favour of the proposed double lines along Rochester Road just north of Unwin Close. Would you also please consider repainting the existing double lines shown on drawing DD/598/02 and extend these lines further into Unwin Close to avoid restricted access to No 2 and 11 Unwin Close caused by obstructive parking.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			I am in favour of the proposals overleaf. I would also suggest that the remainder of Rochester Road towards the village is reviewed.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			I am in favour of the proposed double yellow lines as per the above reference.

Annex 5

Aylesford	Rochester Road		1		I have consulted with immediate neighbours regarding your proposal for double yellow lines who are involved according to those illustrated on your enclosed plan and which are directly impacted by this implementation. In accordance to your enclosed plan, all are opposed to this proposal, including myself at [redacted] Rochester Road. I can also confirm that being a permanent resident who does not want double yellow lines, that there has never been a parking issue and that no vehicles ever park here, therefore question the motive for this? I note, that you suggest there will be a number of responses and that you will be unable to respond. I believe this statement to be misleading, since there are only 3 properties that are immediately concerned with your proposal.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			Over several years I have contacted TMBC re this problem, exit from our driveway get completel obscured when people park either side of drive they also park two wheels on the pavement obscuring access for pedestrians, cyclists. We exit our driveway extremley carefully but one occasion i did have a very frightening near miss with a cyclist, i had no view at all of him approaching. ive sent pics to you before.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			We reside at number XXX and are in favour of the council s proposals for yellow lines. REF DD/598/02
Aylesford	Rochester Road		1		Thank you for your most recent communication regarding the proposal to provide double yellow lines due to obstructive parking on Rochester Road. We object to the proposal on the following points: - North side of the road does not have a curb and is not used for parking at all. The proposal would only have an impact on the South side. - Current proposed area does not connect to any junctions and therein parking here does not obstruct views onto the road. - Cars parked in this area do not cause an obstruction to the pathway for pedestrians - Parking needs in the village have increased, in part due to approved developments in the area. - It will force cars to park further along Rochester Road where both the road and path are narrower causing obstructions.
Aylesford	Rochester Road	1			In Favour would it be possible to extend the yellow lines to outside no3 and 10 unwin close We and neighbours experience parking opposite our drives which reduces our ability and vision to reverse out of our drives. Parking also causes obstruction and difficulty for dustcarts and larger vehicles. A lot of the parked vehicles park on the pavement as the road is narrow. Have noticed Powell Close has Double yellow painted on after the road was resurfaced.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)		1		I mainly object to double yellow lines outside Premier Parade, as shown in your plan. This has got nothing to do with parking on the corners. Majority of cars parking at the parade are using the shops etc. there and are only there 5-10 mins tops. The parking spaces provided are mainly taken up by residents of the flats above and surrounding houses and staff! By putting double yellows outside the shops the knock on effect will be loss of trade to the shops and also move the parking issue to local roads near by.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)			1	I am a resident in The Lindens of just over 10 years and live opposite the dentist. I have just received the letter regarding the proposed addition of double yellow lines around the Avenue, outside the shops and in the Lindens. Of course the parade of shops attracts a number of cars and on occasion there are some drivers who don't park with much sense. However, I would say this is actually quite rare. You have proposed double yellow lines in a number of places that parking doesn't happen anyway. For instance, the entrance to The Lindens is too narrow for cars to park so there is no issue there. You have also proposed lines to be added diectly outside the shops. There are often cars parked there but this doesn't cause a particular problem. Cars are only parking there when the car parking spaces are full anyway. If those spaces are full regardless of the lines the parking will still happen unless you are also proposing constant enforcement. The proposed double yellow lines in my opinion are very unlikely to solve a problem and will only create a new issue. If you remove the option to park outside the shops those drivers that would have parked there are then going to park in The Lindens or in The Rowans. Possibly over or between driveways. These roads are narrow and this will present a bigger problem for residents. Is there a great deal of evidence of the issue, for example some time lapse photography that you can also share to prove the extent of this issue? If this evidence is there to support it then it would make a case for some investment in a better solution than painted lines. With regard to alternative solutions worth consideration. The businesses have a kind of garden space at the rear. The dentists employees must have at least 3 or 4 cars arriving daily. Those businesses could create parking for 2/3 staff cars at the rear. This will free up parking spaces for their customers. The existing parking spaces are generous in depth. The parking area could be redesigned so the spaces are slanted more. This would free some more space in the road way and along the kerb in front of the shops so additional parking at an angle in front of the shops could be put in place. This would provide more parking spaces compared to parking adjacent to the kerbs.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)				Continued I think it would be sad to lose any of the green space or trees but sympathetically toward The Rowans a few additional spaces could be added. In The Lindens there is a wide path that is often parked on anyway. The level could be reduced and the foot path reduced in width to allow for safer parking (again it is happening anyway!) A time limit for parking in the spaces outside the shops could be introduced. This will reduce the number of staff cars or residents using the parking spaces. Again freeing them up for the actual customers. Any of these ideas in my opinion would be more of a solution than the proposed lines that simply push the problem further on. To add another point (and you may well have a proposal for this too) but the parking at school times on corners at both ends of The Oaks. On the junctions of The Oaks and on The Avenue around that area is a much bigger problem and concern for safety. In addition to that the number of drivers going up The Avenue half on the pavement while children and parents are walking toward the school is a much more desperate safety concern. I do really hope that my opinion is considered in this case before this action is taken and the consequences felt by the residents who will be affected.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)			1	I support the double yellow lines on the bends, as people do park inconsiderately there and cause obstruction. I do not support the double yellow lines in front of the shops, as I have not come across a problem with this - people are usually just using the shops and then driving off. If the lines were to be put there there is not enough alternative parking and I think people would just shop elsewhere. Your plan showing the existing double yellow lines in red is incorrect in showing these on the odd number side of The Avenue near where I live. There are no double yellow lines there at the moment and I don t think any are necessary aside from the ones proposed nearer the bend. We have a caravan which we have to move in and out of our driveway when we go away and would like to know how we would be able to manage this with too many double yellow lines.

Annex 5

Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)	1		Fully in favour. Particularly on the bend on the avenue as cars are forced onto the wrong side of the road into a blind bend to avoid parked cars. This is dangerous when some vehicles do not adjust their speed.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)	1		We have no objection to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements. However, we don't believe that anybody will adhere to these double yellow lines as parking spaces are so limited and they are taken by members of staff that work in the shops along Premier Parade, therefore leaving very little car parking spaces for customers. Would it not be more practical to turn the whole road into a one-way system, therefore, minimising the risk of cars trying to get past each other on such a narrow stretch of road and, as we have witnessed numerous times in the past, colliding with each other?
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)	1		I welcome these changes which I feel are long overdue. Often regularly people park directly in front of the shops even when spaces are available. It makes it impossible to access this area and use the shops. Excellent to see this proposal.
Aylesford	The Avenue (near Premier Parade)	1		This plan shows existing double yellow lines opposite the hawthorns. There are no double yellow lines but should be. Both residents and visitors continually park opposite this junction causing obstruction. When existing DYL were put in place previously they did not extend far enough, which we stated at the time. they are no going to be extended which is desperately needed. if the DYL are no opposite the hawthorns junction this junction will continue to be obstructed 24/7. There have been many near misses at the junction and at various other locations on the greenacres estate due to inconsiderate parking. this is why this would not be reflected in crash data for greenacres. most of the houses on this estate have driveway capacity for several vehicles. parking on estate roads is due largely to lazy residents who cannot be bothered to manoeuvre vehicles on their driveway.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks	1		At school times cars are parked on the corners restricting traffic flow in both directions. Causing congestion as parents and children are trying to cross the road. It is an accident waiting to happen.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks		1	Good morning, as a resident on [REDACTED] ME20 7LT, we have just received a notice of New & Amended Parking Restrictions, for the junctions of The Avenue, The Oaks and Elm Walk. However, you have not taken into consideration our house that bisects all three junctions and is not shown on your plans., see attached plan, with our house now shown. Therefore the restrictions that you are looking to employ will impact on our ability to park outside our house at any time, this would cause a great inconvenience to us, for many reasons. I am happy to discuss this matter further with you and hope to hear from you soon.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks		1	The road has a good deal of parking during the day providing natural surveillance therefore reducing crime. It is unlawful to park within a certain distance of a junction, so enforce that. It would simply not look good and spoil the look of the road. There are only issues when the children arrive and depart from school. It is absolutely fine at all other times. Not enough problem to warrant additional road markings.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks		1	The main problem with parking at this junction is the schools drop off and pick up. which is approx 1 hour in the afternoon. We as residents will be living with lines 24hrs a day 365 days a year. For the lines to work they will have to be policed. All this extra money that we are led to believe the council cannot afford.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks	1		This has been needed outside my house is a safety hazard and accident waiting to happen. I look forward to this being implemented.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks		1	not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangement for The Avenue and The Oaks, Aylesford as shown on plan DD/598/04. We are not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements by putting extensive "No waiting at any time" double yellow lines in the Avenue and The Oaks. These proposals are confusing and will be highly detrimental to local residents. We have lived in The Oaks since 1978 and have 44 years experience of traffic patterns in the immediate vicinity of these proposals. The only issue affecting traffic in this area is during the half hour in the morning and again in the afternoon when traffic is heavy with parents delivering and collecting children from Valley Invicta Primary School in Teapot Lane. The time span is therefore just half hour in the morning, again in the afternoon, and then only Monday to Friday during term time. Much of these proposed double yellow lines are already covered by parking restrictions in the Highway Code viz Rule 242 in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road. Rule 243 opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction or on a bend (see Appendix A). Adding double yellow lines sets a confusing precedent. If some areas already covered by the Highway Code have additional double yellow lines, and others don't, what sort of confusion does this generate? For other areas where parking causes obstruction during busy times there could be single yellow lines (see Appendix A) Greenacres Estate is a delightful, quiet residential area with minimal traffic flow, and with no problems due to parking apart from school opening and closing times. It is the parents who then generate the situation for a very short period. The few irresponsible drivers among them, who park with no consideration of safety or causing obstruction, are unlikely to be deterred by yellow lines unless they are enforced by traffic wardens. TMBC are unlikely to fund that. For the rest of the time they would serve no useful purpose and be detrimental to residents and the dentist's patients.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks			Continued SUMMARY These lines contribute little or nothing to alleviate this situation For the dubious effectiveness of these proposed parking restrictions during school opening/closing times we, the residents, suffer the inconvenience of 24hr everyday parking restrictions that are unnecessary and confusing. The whole area will also be defaced by these grotesque road markings.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks	1		No comments supplied

Annex 5

Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks			1	I am in favour of the lines but not the double everywhere. Why cant it be single with time restrictions? This would be much better. I agree with the double yellow lines outside the dentist and opposite as often I drive out to turn right onto the avenue and i am on the wrong side of the road, due to parked cars, and if i get hit by a car entering the oaks, its my fault. I dont have any other opinion when leaving to turn into the avenue. i dont feel yellow lines will make any difference no one polices it, and they already park on the corner of teapot lane/elm walk and that has double. i feel the dog bones would be of more benefit across drives, i often have trouble getting out of the drive. i have no problem with people parking outside my property ig they give me enough room to get out. unless they are policed they make no difference. I work at a school and they have the same problems parking. the lines on sycamore drive look horrendous, please dont make our road like that. Its just a pebble effect. MO - attached diagram where residents park on a junction within 10 metres.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks			1	I note from your ref Phase 14-inf-DD/589/04 for the proposal of double yellow lines on The Oaks and The Avenue. Is there a proposal to put double yellow lines in Orchard Avenue and the corner of Orchard Avenue with The Oaks ? I consider this is necessary for safety. On school days at about 15.15 to 15.40 (also in the morning 08.30 approx.)cars are parked by parents to collect/deliver their children from/to Aylesford School, this results in driveways being blocked, parking on pavements and the corner of The Oaks and Orchard Avenue ,which creates considerable traffic congestion liable to cause accidents and for residents to access their drives. I would be grateful for any information or advice on the above.
Aylesford	The Avenue & The Oaks	1			I am in favour of the Borough Councils proposed parking restrictions (ref. DD/598/04) on the proviso that they will be enforced. Something needs to be done to reduce the hazard caused by inconsiderate drivers, not just on these junctions, but also in the surrounding area. If approved, the problem will be moved elsewhere unless suitable and sufficient consideration is given to the impact of the proposal on surrounding roads. People regularly ignore the existing double yellow lines at the junction of Elm Walk and Teapot Lane as the restriction is never enforced. Double Yellow Lines mean No waiting at any time , but people deem it acceptable to cause an obstruction opposite a school gate whilst sat in their vehicles. The problem of parents picking up their children in the afternoon has become exponentially worse over recent years, with drivers obstructing driveways and prohibiting residents wanting to exercise their legal right to access the public highway. Also, if a fire tender was on a shout it would not be able to make progress. I would welcome double yellow lines across residents driveways as per the recent restrictions in Sycamore drive. More concerning is the trend of inconsiderate parking over the pavement, thus forcing mothers with pushchairs, people in wheelchairs and others to walk in the road. This I find concerning as it increases the likelihood of an incident occurring. Also of concern are people driving up Teapot Lane above its junction with Elm Walk with two wheels on the pavement and inappropriate use of speed along The Avenue. This is not a council matter, but regular joint action between the police and local authorities would be a deterrent. As far as I m aware it s been many years since the local authorities have taken any action. The photos below are typical of an afternoon school run. (photos supplied)
Blue Bell Hill	Common Road	1			We definitely want to keep white access markings, have no objection to DYL, Please keep us update on proposals progress
Blue Bell Hill	Common Road		1		As a resident at XXXX, this proposed change will impact me and my family in a negative way and therefore I OPPOSE the change of restrictions. Whilst parking can, on very rare occasions, be busy, should there be double yellow lines in front of my house on both sides of the street, and for some considerable length of the road, this would have a detrimental impact on visitors to my home. We have 2 looked after young people with [REDACTED] living with us and 2 teenage birth children. As a result, we have frequent and numerous visitors. I believe that double yellow lines on ONE SIDE of the street is necessary, perhaps on the North side of the road where there are houses, allowing people to exit their property and also provide enough space for vehicles to pass safely. It can be inconvenient when cars park opposite our driveway, however this is rare. In reality, the only people parking along the road, other than visitors, are people enjoying the beautiful Bluebell Hill Picnic site. Preventing visitors from parking near to the site will only mean that drivers need to park further away, which would increase parking in the Maidstone Road area of the village and further down the narrow parts of Common Road. Or worse still, that people don't bother coming to visit. This would result in an even worse situation. There are already existing parking restrictions along Common Road. Who actually enforces these? And would Double Yellow lines actually prevent people parking, as it's evident that - without enforcement - they don't work. These proposals will not alleviate the current problem, rather they would just push the issues to a different area. Do we really want to prevent people from accessing this wonderful recreational site? Perhaps the funds could be better used to prevent the speeding motorists through the village and the late night anti social behaviour at the picnic site?
Ditton	Cherry Orchard	1			My sister is [REDACTED] and needs to park outside our house [REDACTED] when she visits. People who need to visit i.e. serviceman and other tradesman need to be able to be able to park. Over the road where parking is allowed , is full of people from around the corner.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Cherry Orchard, Aylesford, as shown on plan DD/598/06. I am NOT in favour. I must bring to your attention that the proposed double yellow lines outside my property are not acceptable. As a resident and taxpayer, I believe I have the right to park outside my own house, provided it does not cause any inconvenience to others. I would appreciate it if you could reconsider this aspect of the proposal. Furthermore, I would like to highlight that the proposed changes do not address the actual problem area for parking on our street, which is at the end of the road, not on our crescent. I urge you to review the proposal and consult with the residents before making any further decisions.

Annex 5

Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		I am very much against the idea and just wanted to express this and also ask if you are quite sure you have ear marked the correct area within Cherry Orchard. Our area is just a little close off the main drag of Cherry Orchard. I have never been aware of any issues with cars parking in areas and causing obstructions etc. The close has always remained very clear as the majority of it is dropped curb as all the houses have driveways. This means there is very little roadside left to park where you are not blocking a driveway - therefore you will not find many cars parked up other than on driveways. If you were to yellow line the whole close then this would mean that when occasionally someone living there has a visitor that can't fit on their drive, the visitor would have nowhere to park. Currently this is about the only time someone would park on the road and when they do they are only blocking the drive of the person they are visiting so it is not an issue to anyone else. There are certainly never any issues with turning or obstructions. I think this is a crazy idea and hopefully someone will see this and the double Yellow lines do not get put around the close.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		We have disabled family who rely on parking outside our house and in the cul-de-sac when they come over. With these changes, they will now have to park far up Cherry Orchard which will be detrimental to them. We understand double yellow lines being put on the main curve of the entrance to Cherry Orchard, as cars (especially large vans which often park here) can cause obstructions and a difficulty coming in and out of Cherry Orchard. However, we cannot accept that double yellow lines will be put in front of our house and on our cul-de-sac. The only people that park here are visitors to the houses. We all use these spaces to allow our visitors to park their cars safely and have ease of access to our homes. Regarding turning in the cul-de-sac, there is more than enough room to reverse out of a drive and turn around with other parked cars being there. We do this on a daily basis very easily and we have never seen any issues with other drivers either. It is a wide cul-de-sac due to the indent in the road right next to 17 Cherry Orchard, so we do not see how there could be obstruction parking issues in the turning area. We at ■ Cherry Orchard strongly disagree with the double yellow line proposal. We are also quite shocked that this proposal has been brought about or considered a priority considering other areas of Ditton where parked cars are causing a large risk of traffic accidents which has been brought to attention over the years.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		no issue with parking in square outside our houses. We have marked where we think the parking problems are most. Most of the cars parked at the end of the road do not live in the road but come from Brampton fields school parking.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		In my opinion the cause of the problems of cars parked are because of non residents of cherry orchard parking somewhere for days at a time. Perhaps the problem would be solved by making the parking area for residents only.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		Not required in cul de sac of cherry orchard no1-no 23
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		Whilst I am in agreement with other residents that something does need to be done in order to address the inconsiderate and obstructive parking which has recently become an issue in the estate, I do not agree that the proposed double yellow lines are the best solution, and I am not in favour of the proposal in its current form. The majority of the problem parking is further down the access road to Cherry Orchard, usually extending around the north west side of the road past number 23. Often to leave the estate it is necessary to drive on the wrong side of the road from before number 23 Cherry Orchard until the junction with Kiln Barn road. This is especially hazardous when cars are turning into the estate travelling in a north westerly direction from the community centre, as you can turn into the estate to find a car on your side of the road trying to exit the estate. I have never seen cars parked to the south east side of the access road where double yellow lines have been proposed. My concern is that if double yellow lines are placed at the locations currently proposed this will simply push inconsiderate parking by non-residents further into the estate. I would suggest that single yellow lines with enforced parking restrictions at certain times may serve better, and not penalise the residents of the estate as heavily. I have not previously noted inconsiderate parking in the turning area marked for double yellow lines by non-residents of the estate, rather the issue is to the north west side of the main access road extending round past number 23 Cherry Orchard. The vast majority of the cars and vans parking there do so because of the recent enforcement of pre-existing restrictions in Brampton fields, which has caused people living in Brampton fields to now park their vehicles in Cherry Orchard. These restrictions have always been present, and were present when the home owners purchased their houses, but have only recently started to be enforced.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		ContinuedThere is also a UK Power networks van, the owner of which lives on Kiln barn road, who uses the access road to Cherry Orchard to park the van overnight. Compounding the issue, the property at number ■ Cherry Orchard has also converted half of their garage into a "Beauty Salon" type of business recently, which leads to frequent, inconsiderate parking on the blind bend to the south east side of the road, outside number ■ by their customers. Coupled with cars parking along the north side of the access road to Cherry Orchard, this makes entering and exiting the estate hazardous. Unfortunately this is further exacerbated at the school drop off and pick-up times for the local Ditton infant and junior schools. Parents, especially during the afternoon pick-up, will park in a dangerous manner, often right on the junction with Kiln Barn road, and sometimes on Kiln Barn road itself forcing cars onto the opposite side of the road on the back of the blind bend by the Brampton fields estate. They choose not to use the freely accessible community centre car park as it is a further 2 minute walk down the Kiln Barn road. The estate was built in 1977, and the majority of the houses in the first part of the estate have limited off road parking provision. I have lived in the estate since 2012, and this has only recently become an issue in the past year or so, which was predicted by Cherry Orchard residents, when the private company which enforces parking restrictions in Brampton fields took action there in regard to inconsiderate parking, at the request of Brampton fields residents. This has simply made the problem of poor parking provision in Brampton fields the problem of Cherry Orchard residents, and subsequently yourselves at TMBC.
Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		Your proposed parking restrictions will cause more problems than solve. In the household there are three cars. Two park on the drive and one across the drive, with yellow lines where does the third car park. It is already an offense to block access to a drive with a dropped kerb. Most of the close is covered by this. It is also an offense to park on the pavement and cause an obstruction. Neither of these problems have been an issue here. Where will visitors park. Blocking your own drive isn't a problem. There is still plenty of room to turn a vehicle round. Even an HGV which is common. Your plans allow parking in the turning area. So where do you think people will park.

Annex 5

Ditton	Cherry Orchard		1		The proposal to put yellow lines in your plan are not necessary and a waste of the taxpayers money and would devalue our property. There is no problem parking and I have never seen cars parked in Kilnbaron road on your plan or on the right side of Cherry Orchard. Problems on the right side of Cherry Orchard are due to lack of parking in Brampton Fields nearby.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			Keeping bend clear from parking for the safety of all, very much needed. With cars parked on the bend its an accident waiting to happen. Very dangerous.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			Would like the cars and vans to not be allowed to have the wheels and body of their vehicles on the pavement. Sometimes leaving only approx 1ft to walk on. No room for wheelchairs or prams or persons with disabilities who have to get off pavement.
East Malling	Cottenham Close		1		I cant see that this idea will help the problem at all, all it will do is create more problems and traffic for the poor residents who live beyond no14. Also where are the people that are being moved park. There is nowhere near. 20 miles an hour seems like a better idea and using the money to repair roads makes more sense.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			We are completely in favour of the double yellow lines being out on the bend. At times we find it very difficult backing out of our drive as it makes it so blind. We are not in favour of the lines being extended up to the bend as we would lose our parking outside our property, we only have room for one car on our drive. the people causing the problems on the bend are nothing to do with cottenham close. we also have 2 sometimes 3 cars that belong to residents at vigor close. Another worry would be if there isnt parking down this stretch of the road will get vehicles speeding down from the bend to the junction of Mill Street. Why are we down this end of the close being penalized when parking further round the close is worse parking on pavements.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			Its a must as parking up and around the bend causes a single track road and I have witnessed many near misses. Its an accident waiting to happen when you cant see round the bend.
East Malling	Cottenham Close		1		It will only push the cars that park there further up the road making an already busy close even busier. The parking on this corner has not been an issue to date and I do not believe it has been obstructive.
East Malling	Cottenham Close		1		Only because cars drive fast enough with cars parked on the corner and I think they would drive even faster with no cars there.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			Long needed. Is it possible to mark up as cottenham close residents only? Cars there belong elsewhere.
East Malling	Cottenham Close		1		The reason for our objection is due to the fact that we are being penalised for a problem that is not of our making. This must be because cars from individuals not resident in Cottenham Close use the area that is being proposed for further double yellow lines as their own parking spaces. This must be to them not using their own allocated spaces where they reside properly. If double yellow lines are imposed as proposed there is no facility for any visitors to our property to park. We ourselves park our two cars off the road all the time and are therefore not party to the problem. Do the restrictions in Mill Street also mean our visitors cannot park? There is also a speed issue coming down the road with double yellow lines and a clear road this would just increase this. A possible solution would be for allocated Cottenham Close resident only parking spaces/permits for this area of the road thus allowing visitors to our property to park. We hope that these matters can be considered.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			If these proposals go through please ensure they are enforced by regular visits from Wardens.
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1			Cars can be forced onto the wrong side of the road due to obstruction of parked vehicles on the bend. Obviously very dangerous.
East Malling	Cottenham Close		1		We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposal for the extension of double yellow lines along the entire length of the entrance road of Cottenham Close in East Malling. I believe that implementing these lines would not benefit anyone in the immediate vicinity and is a waste of time and money and would like to voice my concerns. The bend is a long sweeping curve which allows for good visibility around the corner for vehicles, easily over 40 meters, giving them more than enough time to safely navigate the parked cars and approaching vehicles accordingly. We are highly disappointed in what seems like a self-serving proposal that has been put forward by a councillor who lives on the road in question, who will not experience any inconvenience or burden that this proposal will put on those in the immediate vicinity. It is also very frustrating that this has been put forward as an issue when it is incredibly rare to have cars parked on the corner of the road in a quiet residential street, but the issues that have been reported by local residents such as the dangerous junction opposite the King and Queen and roads flooding have not been addressed or solved. The Road is a cul-de-sac in a quiet part of the village and as such is not a through road with heavy traffic flow. Cars entering the road shouldn't be doing so at 30mph and those driving towards the entrance should be driving less than 30mph to go around the corner. The parked cars along the straight act as natural traffic calming, removing the cars will allow people to drive along the road a lot quicker and potentially more dangerously increasing the risk of accidents along the whole stretch of road especially on the corner with the footpath to the orchards which is a heavily used footpath for walkers, school groups and dog walkers. Removing the cars and their calming effect could cause a serious accident. Not everyone along this stretch of road has the ability to park all their vehicles on their drive and rely on the on street parking for themselves, visiting friends and family (some of whom are elderly and need direct access), carers and deliveries. We, as a household have 2 cars and a motorbike. We recently extended our driveway to allow us to remove one car from the road and still be able to access the garage with the motorbike which is used for daily commuting. If the lines are installed we'd have to move a car every morning and evening during rush hour to be able access the garage and motorcycle which could prove very dangerous to us if cars are driving around the corner at speed. If the double yellow lines are implemented our nearest on street parking would be more than

Annex 5

East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposal for the extension of double yellow lines along the entire length of the entrance road of Cottenham Close in East Malling. I believe that implementing these lines would not benefit anyone in the immediate vicinity and is a waste of time and money and would like to voice my concerns. The bend is a long sweeping curve which allows for good visibility around the corner for vehicles, easily over 40 meters, giving them more than enough time to safely navigate the parked cars and approaching vehicles accordingly. We are highly disappointed in what seems like a self-serving proposal that has been put forward by a councillor who lives on the road in question, who will not experience any inconvenience or burden that this proposal will put on those in the immediate vicinity. It is also very frustrating that this has been put forward as an issue when it is incredibly rare to have cars parked on the corner of the road in a quiet residential street, but the issues that have been reported by local residents such as the dangerous junction opposite the King and Queen and roads flooding have not been addressed or solved. The Road is a cul-de-sac in a quiet part of the village and as such is not a through road with heavy traffic flow. Cars entering the road shouldn't be doing so at 30mph and those driving towards the entrance should be driving less than 30mph to go around the corner. The parked cars along the straight act as natural traffic calming, removing the cars will allow people to drive along the road a lot quicker and potentially more dangerously increasing the risk of accidents along the whole stretch of road especially on the corner with the footpath to the orchards which is a heavily used footpath for walkers, school groups and dog walkers. Removing the cars and their calming effect could cause a serious accident with a dog or child. Not everyone along this stretch of road has the ability to park all their vehicles on their drive and rely on the on street parking for themselves, visiting friends and family (some of whom are elderly and need direct access), carers and deliveries. We, as a household have 2 cars and a motorbike.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>Continued We recently extended our driveway to allow us to remove one car from the road and still be able to access the garage with the motorbike which is used for daily commuting. If the lines are installed we'd have to move a car every morning and evening during rush hour to be able access the garage and motorcycle which could prove very dangerous to us if cars are driving around the corner at speed. If the double yellow lines are implemented our nearest on street parking would be more than 100 meters further along Cottenham close due to the driveways and dropped kerbs along that stretch of the close. This part of the road is already heavily congested with on street parking and would be even worse if more residents are forced to park along there. Proof of this is already evident as half the cars that regularly park along the entrance of Cottenham close are from Vigor Close and do so because their own road has limited on street parking due double yellow lines being implemented on the whole close. We do not understand why there seems to be a continued war on vehicle ownership especially in an region where the need for personal transportation is so vital due to lack of any form of reliable public transport for work, groceries and leisure. A selling point for us when buying our house over new builds was the availability of on street parking. Too many homes we looked at, including on Vigor close, had no parking and were not practical for growing families, visitors and deliveries. We believe the excessive and unnecessary implementation of double yellow lines in Cottenham Close would decrease the value of our home and make it less desirable. It would also cause us to have to seriously consider moving, as it would have a huge negative impact on our day-to-day life and safety. We have attached some photos showing the clear visibility around the corner in question on an average day. Also attached is an image showing the nearest available on street parking which is 100 meters from our home and is this congested every evening. (photos supplied)</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>This is a blind spot with traffic travelling on the wrong side of the road round the bend to pass the parked vehicles. It would also be difficult on occasions for emergency vehicles to gain access when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road here.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>I am in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Cottenham Close, West Malling shown on plan DD/598/07. It is a blind spot with traffic travelling on the wrong side of the road around the parked cars. It would be very difficult for emergency vehicles to pass when traffic is parked on both sides of the road.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>As long as they do not start parking further up the road. They have got all the driveways, they should be told to park on them as we do up our end.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>I have concerns about the proposal. I think the original allowed parking on the straight section up cottenham close is sensible, though needs policing when vehicles park on yellow lines near the close & mill street junction. I feel extended double yellow lines merely shift parking futher into an already crowded road. Double yellow lines are only effective if policed.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>Parking round the corner as they do causes obstruction and danger</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>There is parking on the bend occasionally but to put restrictions all the way from the Mill Street junction is extreme.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>The Parking in Cottenham close is dangerous. The parking at the entrance to the close should be stopped. Cars park on the bend causing obstructions and could cause an accident. you could also go further and stop vehicles ,mainly comercial parking on the pavements. could yellow lines also be put at the end of the close (turning point) stopping the blocking to the end of the close.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>The bend has always been difficult to negotiate as vehicles tend to take it on the wrong side of the road. Parked cars are certainly doesnt help.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>Yes and strongly agree for the yellow lines as it is so dangerous especially at night with poor lighting and dark cars.</p>
East Malling	Cottenham Close	1		<p>in response to your letter,i wish to confirm that I am in favor OF THE STREET PARKING PROPOSAL On many occasions drivers have to reverse to let oncoming traffic pass and to qualify this I believe this corner is now a serious hazard to both streams of traffic,putting life at risk' As i see it the majority of parked vehicles are from the opposite estate , where it seems no parking is permitted which is completely wrong and unfair to the residents of Cottenham Close I might add a similar hazard is on the bend just prior to the red brick paved area. Further more the whole of Cottenham Close is plagued with many residents parking on the pavements, which aside from breaking the law is a serious danger to children the elderly and mothers with babies in prams.It never used to be like this and sooner or later something more serious will happen</p>

Annex 5

East Malling	Edward Walk		1		Waste of money as no one ever parks on the side to the let and when the roads are packed no one is ever obstructing the footpath. I am sure all the residents agree that the money would be better spent filling in the extremely damaging pot holes of Edward Walk instead. I've already had to pay for vehicle repairs because of these, but I've never been obstructed by parked vehicles on the left because they've never been there. I've lived here 1 year.
East Peckham	Branbridges Road (cul-de-sac)	1			No comments supplied
East Peckham	Branbridges Road (cul-de-sac)		1		Further to the application for double yellow lines on the slip road to 104 Branbridges Road. We would like to register our opposition to this. We are a local family run business that relies heavily on this area for local people whose cars have broken down out of hours and we then bring them in when we open and repair it for them. Double yellow lines would impact our business significantly if they were to be introduced, we are extremely busy, supplying a service to the local community and this would be extremely detrimental to us. Please do not allow this to go ahead, we rely on this area greatly.
East Peckham	Branbridges Road (cul-de-sac)	1			Thank you for your letter requesting our feedback as a local business. We can confirm we would fully support the new double yellow line proposal on Branbridges Road. We would also highly suggest bollards are needed on the wide grass verge. Customers of The Village Grill food van park on this grass area which completely obstructs the view when entering and exiting the road. One of our company directors had a head on crash which was caused by lack of view by parked vehicles on the verge and customers blocking the road outside the food van which results in the entrance and exit being only one vehicle wide. It is a very dangerous junction which urgently needs addressing.
Eccles	Bull Lane & Alma Road		1		I have lived in Alma road for 20 years, I do not find cars outside 206 bull lane obstructive, parking is seriously limited in Eccles, so I feel taking away yet more parking in the village in unnecessary and a waste of money that could be spent elsewhere
Eccles	Bull Lane & Alma Road		1		Excessive restrictive parking already exists in the area thus reducing Sunday morning church attendees attempting to find somewhere to park.
Eccles	Bull Lane & Alma Road	1			Totally agree but will drivers take any notice I think not.
Eccles	Bull Lane & Alma Road		1		This is not a solution to the parking or lack of at Eccles Please reconsider the growing need for parking in the area. This proposal will push cars onto the dangerous bend on bull lane that leads to Hawkes road.
Eccles	Bull Lane & Alma Road		1		I am not in favour of the councils proposal for the changes to the on street parking arrangements. It only moves the problem elsewhere and is not a solution to current issues.
Eccles	Hawkes Road	1			No comments supplied
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1		I live in Hawkes Road. I am NOT IN FAVOUR of the Borough Council's proposal for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Hawkes Road. Having seen this proposal I am writing strongly to oppose the plan to add double yellow lines to Hawkes Road, Eccles. This is a wide, modern, residential street with lots of family homes and therefore lots of vehicles, especially as the young families who initially moved in when the houses were first built, now have young adults who have cars. The residents of Eccles already struggle to park and this will just exacerbate the problem. Once again your proposals only take away parking options, without providing a solution for where these vehicles can park. They will not magically disappear just because yellow lines are added, but will put pressure on the rest of the village and the extremely limited parking available. I do not believe there is a parking problem on Hawkes Road and no need for double yellow lines.
Eccles	Hawkes Road	1			Thank you this road has got worse and worse especially with the parking when there is football. For me in particular, double yellow lines at the entrance and exit of my street parking, as it can be a blind turning out and in the section upto my house, as its bad enough with parking one side.
Eccles	Hawkes Road	1			Having seen this proposal I am writing strongly oppose the plan to add double yellow lines to Hawkes Road, Eccles. This is a wide, modern, residential street with lots of family homes and therefore lots of vehicles, especially as the young families who initially moved in when the houses were first built, now have young adults who have cars. There are issues when the football teams play on the recreation ground at the weekends, but adding double yellow lines will only push the parking issue elsewhere in the village. The residents of Eccles already struggle to park and this will just exacerbate the problem. Once again your proposals only take away parking options, without providing a solution for where these vehicles can park. They will not magically disappear just because yellow lines are added, but will put pressure on the rest of the village and the extremely limited parking available. I hate to think how much money you have already wasted on this pointless exercise. Please use a little common sense when planning to take parking options away. This should also be passed to your planning department who approve new housing schemes with insufficient parking provided.
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1		Eccles along with the majority of villages throughout Kent have been plagued with parking issues for many years, the current volume of housing built to date has been vastly responsible for the parking situation experienced to many development companies to be allowed to fulfill their proposed volume of building throughout Kent our wonderful country will grind to a concrete stand still.
Eccles	Hawkes Road	1			I have lived in Hawkes Road since 1999 & fortunately have a driveway. Parking has become a lot heavier over the past few years, however I do not feel the residents would benefit from all of the double yellow lines as shown on the proposal. It is a nice road most people are considerate. However I do think double yellow lines are needed on all corners, especially the top bend left to the park, right to the vines, emergency vehicles would not be able to pass through & the dustbin lorry struggles, inconsiderate parking by some!
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1		The proposal is unnecessary and excessive .. any reported obstruction ONLY occurs on a weekend for a COUPLE OF HOURS during the football season ... non residents park close to the public park whilst their children are participating in a league football match ... once the match has ended they leave and there is NO LONGER a parking problem ... local residents park considerately as this is a VERY quiet street ... we should not be penalised with reduced street parking ... a lot of residents have more than one car per household ... Eccles village can not sustain a reduction in street parking for residents as there are limited alternative locations ... visitors to any location for a sporting/social event will increase traffic/parking but this is short lived and not an constant problem.

Annex 5

Eccles	Hawkes Road		1	<p>What a ridiculous proposal. There is indeed a problem with parking in Hawkes Road but how is this a viable solution? There are residents with multiple vehicles per household, work as well as private. There is no visitor parking. Parking is allocated per household but limited, so there is nowhere left to park but on the road and/or kerbs. It is a challenging on Sunday mornings with the local football teams playing on the recreation green. The parking is potentially a major difficulty for emergency services, should they be needed, as cars are parked on both sides of the road and the footpaths, they would not be able to pass the reduced width of the road and pedestrians have to walk into the road. Most of the parking is selfish and haphazard, blocking cars in, double parking and obscuring views, especially on the corners culminating in near misses. Some of the proposed yellow lines actually go across resident's driveways! What will happen when the nearby proposed Bushey Wood housing development gets started? Currently there is work going on in the layby on Bull Lane near Cork Street, already causing a need for overflow parking. Has anyone actually been to Hawkes Road prior to submitting this proposal or is this another moneymaking scheme due to potential parking fines? As it is, I am not in favour of these changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Hawkes Road, Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/11. There has got to be a better way.</p>
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1	<p>A lot of families own more than one vehicle, this could consist of works vehicles. Also youngsters are staying with parents more often hence more cars. I have lived in Hawkes road for around 15 years and have never had a problem. Maybe sometimes we get an odd vehicle that makes it awkward. no worse than the danger that I have to go through every night down bull lane when cars are parked next to recreational ground.</p>
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1	<p>There is indeed a problem with parking in Hawkes Road but this is not a viable solution. There are residents with multiple vehicles per household, work as well as private. There is no visitor parking. Parking is allocated per household but limited, so there is nowhere left to park on the road and/or kerbs. It is a challenging Sunday morning with the local teams playing on the green. The parking is potentially a major difficulty for emergency services, should they be needed, as cars are parked on both sides of the road and the footpaths, they would not be able to pass the reduced width of the road and pedestrians have to walk in the road. Some of the proposed yellow lines actually go across driveways. What will happen when the nearby proposed Bushey Wood housing development gets started. Currently there is work going on in the layby on Bull Lane near Cork Street, already causing a need for overflow carpark. We are not in favour.</p>
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1	<p>Hi, I have received a letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions for the above road and I would like to make the relevant comments: I am NOT in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Hawkes Road, Aylesford, shown on plan DD/598/11 because I feel that there is insufficient parking in the village and it is already a real problem. When those houses were built they did not allow for several cars per household and therefore residents on that estate and their visitors would not be able to park as they do now with these proposed restrictions due to insufficient parking areas at present per household. It would only cause the overspill for people trying to park their cars to go elsewhere in the village and there are so many restrictions on parking on other roads due to the nature of the roads, ie too narrow to park both sides of the road, yellow lines etc, that it just would cause more problems elsewhere in the village and to other residents in those roads. What should occur is that restrictions are placed on the entrance to Hawkes Road so that when footballers play in both football fields they do not restrict the vision for residents coming out of that road onto Bull Lane, as this is very hazardous. I hope this information is taken into account when a decision is being made.</p>
Eccles	Hawkes Road		1	<p>I have seen details of proposed double yellow lines for Hawkes Road, under consultation plan DD/598/11. The plan shows double yellow lines right across my driveway. I reside at number [redacted] Hawkes Road. I do not wish to have these in place. My mother who is [redacted] and has [redacted] and is in a wheelchair visits and we need to be able to park here in order to get her out of the car. We are unable to park outside my house as this space is regularly filled with other people's vehicles. The yellow lines should be on the main road just before Hawkes Road where people are parking on a blind bend. Very dangerous as you cannot see who or what is coming the other way.</p>
Hildenborough	Woodview Crescent & Brookmead		1	<p>I am fully in favour of these parking restrictions. There has been long inconsiderate parking bordering on being dangerous. We need now is for speed enforcement.</p>
Hildenborough	Woodview Crescent & Brookmead		1	<p>I am not opposed to the proposed double yellow lines on Woodview Crescent/ Brookmead junction. However I am concerned that cars would simply park opposite the junction o/s No73. I am concerned that access to our driveway would be restricted.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>I am not in favour of having to pay to park or my relatives paying to park when visiting me. I understand we are getting more people parking who do not live here, but making us pay for the privilege of parking outside our home is not the answer.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>I have received a copy of your informal consultation document in relation to parking restrictions at the Lakes in Larkfield. I would confirm that I am in favour of the proposals providing that they are policed and result in reduced parking obstructions and nuisance on the site. I would point out that despite the double yellow lines previously installed a number of residents deliberately park on the double yellow lines and obstruct both the road and the pavement on a regular basis and I see no enforcement being carried out. If there is to be no enforcement then I would object to the proposals.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>Trying to reduce the on-street parking around The Lakes is a good idea but we have the following comments to make: - Residents should be issued with FREE permits to park on the roads. We should not need to pay anything for this facility. We assume that these will need to contain the registration number of the resident's cars. - Free guest permits should also be issued to each property owner. The idea of having to pay £12 for 10 one day permits is not acceptable. I find the idea abhorrent that visitors should have to pay each time they visit us. - Any costs of whatever scheme is devised must only be to cover expenses. The suggested fees are unacceptable. - I am not sure how it would be covered but vehicles should only be permitted to park on the road and NOT half on the pavement as this is dangerous for pedestrians including parents with pushchairs. - It is not the Council's business to dictate how many cars each house has. Many of the houses built were only built with 1 parking space per property which was a design of the Council's own deliberate planning approval. Many of these houses are family properties and both parents need to work in order to afford their properties.</p>

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I have never seen any inconsiderate or obstructive parking on the lakes. There is no need for yellow lines as The Lakes is always very free moving and no issues I have ever seen. Putting in yellow lines or permits will restrict the freedom residents have to park or have visitors and will cause obstruction in surrounding roads as well as being an extra expense for permits for those who don't have off street parking in the middle of a financial crisis. The parking restrictions around Holborough Lakes in Snodland has caused no end of issues, devalued properties and made residents lives a misery. Please do not let this happen here. It is very rare I ever see anyone parking on the The Lakes to visit the country park. There certainly is not issue enough to impose such restrictions. Many of the residents of the whole Lakes estate have ample parking. My fear is that imposing these restrictions will also ruin the aesthetic of the estate and devalue our homes as it has already done in Holborough Lakes. This is a beautiful estate with little to no parking issues. Having spoken to my neighbours in Pike Close all of them agree that they have never seen any parking issues and some have lived here 20 years!! Yellow lines are likely to make the parking situation worse in some of the side roads, would likely be costly to enforce (which I am worried the residents would pick up the charge for) and given the limited issues observed by the majority of residents i have spoken to it would be completely unnecessary.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am not in favour of the Borough Council's Proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements. I am a resident of the Lakes living at [REDACTED] Reed Close, Larkfield, Aylesford, Kent, ME206FX and have done so since 2008. My property intersects the Reed Close/The Lake's junction as indicated on your drawing with new double yellow lines proposed around the junction. I am also an advanced qualified driver and operate on the principle of safety first. I do not consider there to be any obstructive parking in Reed Close at the junction area. The very occasional visitors are family members of Reed close which don't extend to the indicated area and those of the adjacent "The Lakes" property. During my time living at this address there has been no occurrence of obstruction or blocking of the junction at all. The junction area highlighted in Reed close is directly outside my property and if there was any inconvenient and obstructive parking I would have raised this with the council— though that is not the case. The Lakes road opposite the Reed Close junction does, of an evening (over-night hours only) provide a level of safe and suitable parking given the traffic bollard system provided for traffic calming, this does not hinder safe junction road use, nor cause a road traffic disturbance. This though is not used for parking all the time. During daylight hours there is no obstruction, due to very limited vehicles parked. As for a permit system to prevent visitors of the Country Park I am NOT in favour of this approach as a resident, this provides a significant loss of freedoms to me and my immediate family as a resident. It provides a level of restrictions on my wider family and friends when visiting and additional cost burdens. My property provides off road parking for two (2) vehicles, it's a 4 Bed house with 3 vehicles currently in my family. In many cases with 4 adults in a single property some will have up to 4 vehicles. My daughter occasionally parks in the road opposite my drive (not in the indicated proposed yellow lines) this is owing to her exceptionally early or late shifts as a [REDACTED], she is already providing a value add service and her nor any of my family should be penalised in living here. In summary this proposal provides a restriction and cost burden on myself and family living here, my ability to have family and friends around flexibly.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Continued My elderly Mother, whom is still a car driver would equally be deterred from visiting which would cause her and me a level of concern and stress and we all know having visitors does help ones mental health considerably too. My recommendation would be to put up more signage, as is already on the residential estate, though not much of it and indicate where parking for the Country Park can be found.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			Strongly support this initiative. Extrenal parking of certain days eliminates almost the entire estate for visitors & residents. The main issue is around enforcement. People already park on yellow lines, blocking access to refuse trucks. And the offences do so with no repercussions. How would the permit system be enforced.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Totally against permits no need for this at all, not needed.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	1	I am in favour of parking permits for residents of The Lakes area and more yellow lines to ensure parking is considerate. What I am NOT in agreement with is any charge for a permit of any description for any resident. This will penalise families with children and those who live within the apartments and this is not fair. It is also unjust to charge for visitor permits for family members who might be visiting The Lakes. Finally, a charge for residents penalises residents who already pay taxes and management fees. I would recommend permits for all residents over the age of 18 (and owner of a car). And, visitor passes available for all but limited and with registration and duration of stay a necessary notification. In response to the proposal mentioned above, I am NOT in favour of the council's changes to on street parking. I believe that ultimately the proposal penalises the residents of The Lakes by proposing a charge for resident permits and believe that is highly unjust that homeowners should be required to pay for parking outside their homes or pay to have visitors. Many families are multicar families and it would not be right or just to incur penalties for that. Some families may have older children that drive and thus have 3 or 4 cars per household. However if one or two free passes were given to residents to use when visitors come or if they have more cars than parking spaces and were allocated the number of passes equal to the number of cars at the household, I wouldn't have a problem with that. We already pay enough council tax and a yearly fee to a management company, we do not need to pay to park as well.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We have lived here for 5 years and feel the parking situation is fine as it is and strongly oppose the introduction of a permit scheme and do not feel we should have to pay for permits for our visitors
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I do not want my family and friends to have to pay for parking when they visit. However double yellow lines might deter visitors to the country park who regularly park opposite my driveway which makes it difficult for me to get out at times.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			No comment
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		This was never brought to my attention, we do not need a resident's parking scheme, just more double yellow lines, extended on right side of entrance fully, and along where bus stop use to be
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I would also request double yellow lines both sides of the entrance to parking bays for 104 to 116 the lakes as very often lorries or vans park close to the entrance making it difficult to see people on the footpath also the rubbish collection vehicles struggle to get in.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		The proposal is a ridiculous scam, we have no significant parking issues, leave us alone we are fine thank you. Go tax someone else, maybe install parking permits outside your house and see how you like it.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We are not in favour of charges for permits. We have no objection to additional double yellow lines at the junction with reed close. We also believe additional yellow lines are needed as marked in green on map.MO summary-DYL on bend opp 7 the lakes.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			There are already too many non-resident and commercial vehicles parked on the roads adjacent to our property. A permit parking restriction scheme will help reduce this congestion.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Totally NOT IN FAVOUR for parking permits on The Lakes development. I live quite close to one of the entrances to the Country Park and having spoken to a couple of my neighbours, no one has requested this to the council. Perplexed where you get "Residents have requested a permit scheme"! It is frustrating for non residents to park up and access the Country Park on this development, but it feels like the residents are being penalised! Should the plans go ahead then I feel the residents should be entitled to 1 free permit per household. AGREE to placing yellow lines at the junction of Reed Close.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I am in favour of the scheme but without enforcement its waste a of time. Parking on double yellow lines outside my property is a regular event which blocks the road but it has neve been patrolled so it continues.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		While I agree that the implementation of double yellow lines at the proposed location may appease one or two local residents, I have never witnessed an issue at this location. The parking in that section of The Lakes has always been reasonable and never blocking access. I am a local firefighter, who drives the appliance, and I have never thought, Oh, I'd never get through there in an emergency. To be fair, the parking layout on The Lakes is actually very sensible for a newer build location, and works for all of the residents. Yes, there's the odd visitor to the Country Park, but nothing making it a problem. Most people use the authorised car park, or Tesco's, while combining a shopping trip. Talking to many neighbours, absolutely no-one is in favour of a permit scheme.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes, Aylesford. Comments - There are on-going parking issues around The Lakes. Parking restrictions at Reed Close will only divert parkers elsewhere around The Lakes. Residents who park on the road rather than use their garages only compound the problem.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			But only if policed to ensure compliance
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I would support additional yellow lines if deemed necessary to avoid obstructive parking at reed close, but see no need for any permit system at present. I have not experienced any issue with country park visitors and would not wish some complicated system impacting my own personal visitors.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			In response to your letter concerning double yellow lines & parking at the Estate I certainly agree with your decision. But it isn't just about non residents parking because a lot of bad parking is done by the residents. For example a resident on the corner leading to Lake walk often parks halfway on the pavement & half on the yellow lines so it is impossible to get through if your walking & in my case a mobility scooter. There are many cars parked halfway on pavements all around the Estate. I often have to go out into the road just to get to my apartment. Also cars park across dropped kerbs so I cannot cross the road where I want. Lake Walk is the worst spot & that is where most people visiting the park are parking. We have two exits to our apartments & can only use one sometimes because there are cars parked across it which is a danger if there was an emergency. There is a no parking sign on the wall of the bin shed but they still park there. The problem is there is not enough parking space for visitors.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		The apartments and houses have at least two cars per house hold. There is not enough parking space for residents already. If we have family and friends vis there is no space to park, without hindering the traffic passing through. Why not register our registration numbers, if my visitors need a pass or pay this will stop them visiting.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Why should I have to pay to park where I live when those parking here to use the lakes will continue to park here for free. There are yellow lines outside our garage area where people continue to park without penalty. Why should we pay if the restrictions are not enforced. Perhaps signage making it clear there is no parking for leybourne lakes visitors could be tried first.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am not in favour. We have no trouble parking on the road and don t have any troubl with people parking to visit the lake which Im right next to. Its just a way of trying to get extra money from us. I do not agree with this.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Who are the residents that have requested a permit scheme? I have never seen any correspondence to this affect. The scheme would preclude my family from being able to visit freely along with my carer. If residents use their drives and garages it would ease the situation.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I strongly object to the borough councils proposals for changes to the lakes on street parking. For the few cars that may park to walk around the lakes does not warant such drastic measures. I don t see why residents or family and friends should have to pay to visit me. I live in a flat with only 1 parking space so they have to park in the road. The only people that benifits are the private companies that are in charge and the council.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Financial
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Financial.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We do not wish to pay extra to park our cars on the lakes development. We alreagdy pay around £800 per year for maintenance of the lakes development and paid a premium of £5000 per space on my property purchase in 2004 for a double garage and 2 parking spaces in front of it. Why should we pay more? Try putting up warning signs around the lakes road stating "residents parking only". To have to pay extra to have visitors at weekends etc. is ridiculous. We pay enough in Council Tax already, we are not paying any more. We have lived here for 19 years and the parking situation is really not that bad. Your letter states residents ahve "requested this permit scheme". Please name me one resident in favour of this as I dont know any.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I am in favour in principle. However I have the following questions. How will they be enforced, and therefore how much will this cost, setting up admin fees, and ongoing monitoring. How will any left over funds be spent.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			No comments supplied
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I will be very annoyed if my family will have to pay to park when they visit me. I rely on them coming. A lot of people use the road rather than their garages or parking places. There should be big fixed signs saying no parking for the country park here.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes	1		I would like to see double yellow lines all of perch close, as emergency services vehicles cannot gain access + the lakes people with garages should use them and not complain.
Larkfield	The Lakes			We would like to strongly oppose the proposal for permit parking. We have one driveway for a 5-bedroom house. Currently we only have one car but, in the distant future, could even need 4. We often have visitors for childcare, house maintenance & social visits. It would be impractical & unnecessarily costly to have to use permits, for the sake of the minor of irritation at the lakes visitors who park outside our house, mainly at weekends. Potentially if there were free passes & guest day passes for resident's vehicles, this would be acceptable but this still seems a lot of admin. We would likely need up to 5-7 passes a week. The yellow lines at Reed Close would cause us no concern.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	Thank you for sending us the informal consultation regarding the proposed parking restrictions at The Lakes. We would like to formally object to this proposal on the following basis; 1. We do not experience any parking challenges and have never witnessed any in 3.5 years of living on the development. 2. We own a 5 bedroomed house with insufficient parking, ie, we have a driveway for one car. Planning permission was approved for many larger houses with insufficient on property parking. 3. We have two disabled members of the family who visit on at least a bi-daily basis as part of their care needs. Due to their limited opportunity to earn, they are unable to afford an annual cost for parking permits. This will have a significant negative impact on their health, wellbeing and care. 4. We moved to the area due to its attraction in terms of space and visitors/family being able to freely visit us. We would no doubt experience a decline in visitors should parking restrictions be implemented. This will have a negative impact on many of your residents wellbeing. 5. Although we have not experienced any challenges with parking, even though we are less than 100m away from an entrance to the lake, we would comment as follows; Surely people only visit the lake for a maximum of 2 hours – is this really an issue? Should we not be encouraging people to be active and access the lake? With the current financial situation for many and the impact of covid on mental health, is penalising people for being active and improving their wellbeing the right thing to do? 6. Perhaps if this really is an issue on our development, residents and their visitors can be provided with free permits. 7. We don't understand on such a small development how some residents are experiencing problems and we're not? As stated above, we are also very close to an entrance to the lake. We walk our dogs twice daily and have never witnessed parking problems despite coming and going through all of the entrances to the lakes.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	The suggestion that residents of the lakes estate should pay to park on their own street is abhorrent. The idea that because a small minority of people suffer from cars parked near reed close, all of the residents have to have a permit which they pay for it totally undemocratic. The problem of day trippers parking on yellow lines on the problem areas as far as I'm aware, anyone can park on the highway unless there are restrictions in place. That's why we pay car tax. We should be charged extra to park near our homes.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1		Great idea! Could you also include lines where I've circled (plan included) People park too close to the pinch point causing blockage.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	I am NOT in favour of the borough councils proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for The Lakes shown on the plan DDD/598/15 Yellow lines: As a resident and the house as you enter Reed Close there are occasionally vehicles parking too close to the junction or opposite. However this is rare, less than once every 2 weeks and usually when residents have visitors. Parking here is inconsiderate but parking in other areas would potentially block driveways either directly or by parking opposite properties in the narrow cul-de-sacs. On this basis yellow lines would be an eye sore and have very limited impact along with adding an enforcement burden for the council. Permit holders: As a resident and a Director of [redacted] that looks after the estate I am strongly opposed to residents parking permits. Visitors parking in the estate for the Lakes is limited and should not be discouraged whereby a much longer journey would be required to drive to the car park on the other site. This may add more journeys to Leybourne way which is already overly congested. All residents on the estate have some off road parking so visitors to the estate or country park parking on the estate is not a problem. This has not been raised by residents as a concern and will add a totally unnecessary financial burden to residents to park their own vehicles and those of genuine visitors to the estate. Please also note that a number of roads within the marked area are Private and cannot be enforced as residents only. This may then mean these areas become a prime stop for visitors parking which will have an adverse impact.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	How many permits per household plus are they free? My neighbour has one car but clarion say they are both his now, his visitors can park on his driveway my visitors have no choice but to park on the road (NOT FAIR) to many commercial vans parking where they want. Who is going to police the scheme. p.s. it would help if you enclosed a returns envelope and a phone number. I am sorry to be blunt but can not put a contact number in place as not everyone is online. Also a returns envelope plus we have approx 2 weeks to reply. Tried to ring TMBC and left hanging on the phone for 20 mins twice. I would like to speak to Mr Andy Bracey (FIHE) but can not get anybody to pick up a phone.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	I refuse to pay for a parking permit for myself, householders or my visitors. Parking by non residents is not a problem as far as I am aware. I also thought these were private roads not owned by TMBC? Please do not charge us any more money, we are struggling as it is.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	We strongly object to the proposals. We have noticed very little lake visitors parking in our area. We don't know who raised this so called problem but none of our neighbours want this.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	I do not wish to have a parking permit system in place where we will have to incur charges for when someone visits us. This will result in more cars in the private car park behind our houses. The car park will become dangerous as there will be an increase in people parking on the corner of the road leading to it causing obstructions and double parking. I have no issue in adding the new double yellow lines around the junction but strongly oppose the new permits. Where will the money for permits go? Presumably not invested into The Lakes development. I hope the permit system does not get approved.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	Agree in principle of permit scheme but not residents have to pay. Also concerned that any scheme will not be enforced by TMBC.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	We actually have not had any issues with parking at all. On our part of the lakes.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		No need/requirement for resident parking permits for The Lakes. Parking is not an issue.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			Trying to reduce the on-street parking around The Lakes is a good idea. - Residents should be issued with a number of FREE permits to park on the roads. We should not need to pay anything for this facility. We assume that these will need to contain the registration number of the resident's cars. - Free guest permits should also be issued to each property owner. The idea of having to pay £12 for 10 one day permits is not acceptable. We find the idea abhorrent that regular visitors should have to pay £1.20 each time they visit. - Any costs of whatever scheme is devised must only be to cover expenses. The suggested fees are unacceptable. - We're not sure how it would be covered but vehicles should only be permitted to park on the road and NOT half on the pavement.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			Hopefully this proposal will go through, and not before time.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			Lots of people park their cars where we live so they can walk their dogs round the lake and when our families come to visit and with babies they have to park way down the road.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		It is unfair that residents have to pay for parking permits because of people using the Country Park. We have lived here 6 years and never seen Reed Close obstructed. Why can't you block the entrance gate next to Bream Close instead?
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I wish to object to the permit parking scheme. The reasons for this are as follows. Firstly with the cost of living crisis we are currently in it's unfair to penalise us residents with the burden of paying for parking in our own area. With no other local street parking available it will be unavoidable for us who have worked hard to own our places to then have to pay to park our cars when this wasn't even thought of when purchasing the property. It's just an extra unneeded expense on already squeezed wallets. Secondly it feels like having a tax on having friends or family who want to visit our lovely area and stay a few nights. The costs of having a gathering or just quick pop ins as they are in the area will quickly add up in cost causing us to once again prop up the money and cause unnecessary squeeze on our wallets. This will deter having friends and family over and cause the local residents a reduction in much need interactions with loved ones after the 2 years of lockdowns. Thirdly the reason people park in our area is because of its free parking. Maybe a suggestion is to make the parking at Leybourne lakes free to attract more people to be fitter and healthier. Finally when buying this place I knew that parking could get busy during peak summer time as it's near the lake's. It has so far never impacted me or my family or friends coming to visit me on parking in the area as there is always spaces available. So the need for this permit parking scheme is unnecessary. I hope you will agree with this objection
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I wish to object to the permit parking scheme. The reasons for this are as follows. Firstly with the cost of living crisis we are currently in it's unfair to penalise us residents with the burden of paying for parking in our own area. With no other local street parking available it will be unavoidable for us who have worked hard to own our places to then have to pay to park our cars when this wasn't even thought of when purchasing the property. It's just an extra unneeded expense on already squeezed wallets. Secondly it feels like having a tax on having friends or family who want to visit our lovely area and stay a few nights. The costs of having a gathering or just quick pop ins as they are in the area will quickly add up in cost causing us to once again prop up the money and cause unnecessary squeeze on our wallets. This will deter having friends and family over and cause the local residents a reduction in much need interactions with loved ones after the 2 years of lockdowns. Thirdly the reason people park in our area is because of its free parking. Maybe a suggestion is to make the parking at Leybourne lakes free to attract more people to be fitter and healthier. Finally when buying this place I knew that parking could get busy during peak summer time as it's near the lake's. It has so far never impacted me or my family or friends coming to visit me on parking in the area as there is always spaces available. So the need for this permit parking scheme is unnecessary. I hope you will agree with this objection
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I strongly oppose this plan - this affects a small minority on this estate in private roads. Signage should be increased in those areas. The issue is only at weekends not the main part of the week. The households affected should perhaps pay for some form of signage. Signage at the entrance to the estate may also help. This issue does not affect our household and we are unwilling to pay to park outside our own houses.
Larkfield	The Lakes				I live at [redacted] The Lakes and we bought the property from new in 2004. Parking on the estate is undoubtedly a problem at times and I daily see people parking outside our house to visit the country park when there is a large council car park available to use. In the summer months this is particularly bad. I've also seen fishermen parking outside, and returning the following morning. Commercial dog walkers are also regularly parking. In light of the above, my husband and I have often commented that parking should be for residents and their visitors as I often find it difficult to park outside the house. Having said that, there is a massive difference between people visiting the park, basically to avoid parking fees, and people visiting residents. I think that residents should be provided with 2 parking permits and one for visitors. Signage also needs to be improved. Why should long term residents be penalised because of the thoughtless behaviour of some outsiders? Should the proposals be implemented, how will they be enforced? I agree with the double yellow lines in the areas shown, one will be directly outside our front garden, as regularly the pavement is obstructed by parked vehicles. (Please note, vehicles currently ignore the current double yellow lines on the estate.) Last week I witnessed the refuse vehicle being unable to reverse from The Lakes into Reed Close to collect the garden waste as vehicles were blocking the junction. I know these are initial proposals but in my opinion they to be need refined. Thank you for your consideration.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>1. I reside at [redacted] The Lakes, Larkfield ME20 6SJ. I have received your correspondence dated 19th May 2023. 2. Your correspondence begins "Residents have requested a permit scheme as visitors....are parking in The Lakes development." Local research and consultation following the dispatch of your correspondence clearly indicates that the vast majority of residents have a preference for the status quo, as opposed to change. 3. It is sensible to first consider whether there is a problem. If there is a problem, then the next question to be answered is who/what is the cause of that problem. Finally, one needs to consider how any perceived problem may be resolved fairly and equitably. 4. There is clearly a problem. The "No waiting at any time" proposal is necessary to ensure safe access to emergency vehicles, the disabled and people with prams. Within the development a problem has arisen over the years with respect to non-residents who take the view that they would rather park for free within the development, than pay to park in the Country Park car park. This situation should not of been allowed to escalate over the years. 5. What is the cause of the problem? Dog walkers, fisherman, ramblers, commercial dog carers and self indulgent families who feel that they can drive in to the development and park for free. This list is not exhaustive. Opposite my property I witness such parking every day. It may be a public road, but it is not a thoroughfare. One has to return the way that one came in order to leave the development. Thus non-residents, with no purpose for visit, should not have any expectation of being able to park. "Residents Only" signs have been in existence for 20 years, but still these drivers have a sense of entitlement to park wherever they may wish. 6. Having established that there is an issue to be addressed, and where that problem lay, the question is simply one of resolution and fairness. To penalise residents who have been parking here for 20 years would be clearly abhorrent. Should any attempt be made to charge the residents for permits this may be open to a legal challenge.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes			<p>Continued A legal argument could be made that an equitable estoppel has been created over 20 years, that prevents the introduction of parking regulations that would be to the detriment of the residents of The Lakes. Any legal challenge would rely upon the dictum and precedent of Lord Denning in Central London Property Trust Ltd v High Trees House Ltd (1947) KB 130. In addition to High Trees, subsequent English case law would be relied upon, as well as precedent followed in Australia, New Zealand and other Commonwealth jurisdictions. Reference would also be made to res ipsa loquitur principles in English law. 7. Residents need to park within the development. The development is not a thoroughfare and, therefore, the parties aforementioned in paragraph 5 have no reason or need to park within the development. The development should become a controlled zone where these individuals can be legitimately ticketed. And it should be enforced with vigour. 8. Residents should be given permits. In no way should there be a financial cost for residents who have had the quiet enjoyment of parking at their properties for 20 years. (Another fundamental principle of English law that would be referenced should the issues ever be argued in an English Court of Law). As previously noted The Lakes are not a standard public road. Why? Because they are not a thoroughfare. The Council would be cynically imposing a money making scheme where it is not necessary. I would also recommend that long and hard consideration is given to the judgement of Lord Denning in The High Trees Case. 9. In addition, a family member or friend visiting a resident should not be penalised in the same way that a casual dog walker would be. Every resident household should have one free visitor's parking permit. 10. I do hope that my views are of some assistance. Do not penalise the flourishing Lakes development. Penalise the dog walkers, fishermen and others that believe they have the right to park on a residential development with no thoroughfare whatsoever.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes	1		<p>Please accept this e-mail as in favour for the proposal for changes to the on-street parking for The Lakes, Aylesford for plan DD/598/15. As a resident of [redacted] The Lakes, we find it quite hard to park outside our house because we are near one of the entrances to the County Park and a number of visitors park around The Lakes to avoid paying to park in the carpark. The often park very irresponsibly, which would mean that the emergency services could not get through, so we also agree with the double yellow line proposal. I'm pleased to see that part of the proposal would mean that the enforcement would be Monday through to Sunday. My only suggestion would be that you would extend the time past 6:00pm, so the enforcement was 'at all times' as often in the summer months, visitors will arrive after 6pm to enjoy the park, well until 10 00pm, which cause issues for us, especially people who live on the development and need the spaces to park their cars.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>I am not affected by visitors to the Country Park parking on my part of the development. I think that the proposed scheme is overkill for what is needed, with respect to permits.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes	1		<p>There are other areas which require double yellow lines, specifically for the turning and entrance to car parks of the apartments. Perch close for example. How vigorously will this be policed? Otherwise, no point.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes	1		<p>No Comment</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>Concerned the private residents car parks will be further abused with inconsiderate parking (parking in non designated areas) blocking garages and emergency services access.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>We are NOT in favour of a Resident on street Parking Permit Scheme as we feel the residence gated car parks will be further abused by vehicles parking in areas where parking is not permitted causing obstruction for other residents accessing garages and more importantly obstructing access for Emergency Vehicles. Also to note, vehicles are ignoring the double yellow lines currently in place.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>The only thing that needs to be sorted is vehicles parking on the pavements. 190 192 194 196 the lakes pedestrians have to walk in the road.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes			<p>In favour of the Borough Council's proposal for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes, Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/15</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>I am in favour of permit schemes for non residential visitors and double yellow lines but not sure about the charges for residents which seem rather hefty to me Agree something has to be done</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes	1		<p>Additional issue similar to conditions at junction of Reed Close, at entrance to the development via the lakes existing double yellow lines should be extended to cover the whole T junction as there is insufficient space for vehicles coming out and into this junction when cars are parked in area marked on attached drawing.</p>
Larkfield	The Lakes		1	<p>I am not in favour of the councils proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for The Lakes.</p>

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes			1	Trying to reduce the on-street parking around The Lakes is a good idea but I have the following comments to make: - Residents should be issued with a number of FREE permits to park on the roads. I should not need to pay anything for this facility. I assume that these will need to contain the registration number of the resident s cars. - Free guest permits should also be issued to each property owner. The idea of having to pay £12 for 10 one day permits is not acceptable. I find the idea abhorrent that regular visitors should have to pay £1.20 each time they visit. - Any costs of whatever scheme is devised must only be to cover expenses. The suggested fees are unacceptable. - I m not sure how it would be covered but vehicles should only be permitted to park on the road and NOT half on the pavement. - It is not your business to deter multiple cars per property.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I am not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes. Comments - Devalue the estate and deter buyers - Looks awful - I have a double drive but if I need visitor permits for trades this will cost me money - Its a bit late to deter multiple cars per property - my front garden edges the road and it can be difficult to garden and water if cars are parked - allowing permit parking will not help - Bin collections can be missed if their vehicles can't navigate the parked cars on the road when it is a narrow close. This was the excuse I was given as I am at the furthest end of close.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I am not in favour of the Borough s Council s proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for The Lakes, Aylesford on plan DD/598/15. I do not want have to purchase permits to park my own vehicle at my own property. In this current economic crisis, this is last thing people need to be paying for. We cannot afford any additional outgoings and certainly shouldn t have to pay to park where we live.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I am NOT IN FAVOUR of the proposed changes to on street parking for The Lakes, Aylesford as shown on the plan DD/598/15. Comments - There is no need for the current parking arrangements to be changed. I have lived on the estate for a number of years and the parking of non residents using Leybourne Lakes does happen but it is not excessive and definitely not excessive enough to start a parking permit scheme. From what I have observed, the junction with Reed Close is mainly parked on by residents of the estate. I m not saying there are never occasions where parking may be a problem but that is the case on most roads in the country especially at weekends when people are at home. However it is certainly not happening enough here to charge every resident to park on the road outside their home. The existing double yellow lines are never monitored, the same cars park on them daily and no action is taken. So what is the point of more yellow lines and paying for a permit. Or will we also be charged for a private company to monitor the parking if more yellow lines are put in? Perhaps the council should also look more carefully at whether to carry on granting permission for residents to turn garages into extra rooms as there is such limited parking space on the estate. We already pay a considerable amount in council tax and a separate substantial maintenance charge for the estate. Now residents might have to pay to park on the road outside their homes. I can only assume a non essential charge in a cost of living crisis will not go down well with the majority of residents on the estate.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	Not in favour. We have to pay for permit scheme and will go up every year, so no.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I am not in favour of the proposed parking restrictions. However happy for the yellow lines to be added on the junction of the lakes/ Reed close.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	We do object to yellow lines being painted. We do object to a permit holders scheme being introduced. We live on this estate and value the easy visitor and resident parking on a daily hassle free basis. If yellow lines are painted then the outside cars seeking a space will just move 10 metres down the road. I do not wish to see yellow lines spreading which will happen over a period of years. The permit scheme at any cost is too much and not how normal people wish to live. Suggestion put us some signs on the The Lakes estate " Parking is for residents, and not for the Country Park" Suggestion make the Country Park a zero fee (Free) car park.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I am totally in favour of this My reasons are Since moving here as a new build home in May 2004 we have had to deal with the following parking issues Families pitching up with children and parking on this development to go for the Sunday afternoon or summer evening walk Fisherman, generally on a Friday, unload all the gear then leave the car and don t return until Sunday. Commercial dog walkers pitching up with 4-5 dogs yapping away just so they can save £2 on car parking- not acceptable Summer tourists, that s any randoms just turning up and deciding they will park on this development to save £2 Divers pitching up getting changed on the pavement and going for there diving lesson. Swimmers...usually 3 or 4 youngsters pitch up and decamp. All these people cause extra noise, the slamming of car boots and doors, and usually shouting and balling where dogs or children are involved. Please come down and sit in my lounge you can hear for yourself In simple language it s what we used to call back in the day "Taking the piss" So yes, permits , please bring it on
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	More information needed. Will there be signs up everywhere spoiling the look of the estate. Sounds like a money making scheme for the council. How will it be policed.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		The areas I have marked in red are crossing points and are the only way to reach the path which have to issues: a. Everyday there are people walking to school, going to tesco and they have to negotiate crossing behind parked vehicles which are for the most part large cans. b. Traffic leaving the estate have to pull in to give way to oncoming vehicles which means they have to block off the crossings adding further dangers of crossing whilst determining what the drivers actions might be when crossing. There is not room to get past without stopping over the crossing areas. c. Parked vehicles on the right coming in to The Lakes means they have no access to the path, so what they do is walk in the road until they can walk onto to one of the red entry points. So coming through a driver has to contend with limited view on crossing area, oncoming traffic on the wrong side of the road, pedestrian is the road having parks. We have seen so many near misses that result in confrontation that it is reasonable to assume at some point someone is going to get hurt. 2. The road is the only access to all residents on and off the estate and as such is in constant use, unlike any other road on the estate. 3. The current parking adds further issues with deliveries as the park blocking crossings, they even drive on the actual path, using driveways as access to the pedestrian path. 4. On top of all this we have people parking for access to the lakes to avoid parking charges at the lakes which again blocks this area up. I have put below what it looks like now and put in a very rare image of what it looks like clear, so you can see when people park the route that have to take in the road to the pathway. As you can see from the above the difference it would make to have both sides double yellow and what a remarkable safety improvement it would make. If you drive to this estate I would be surprised if you didn't agree after you experience it for yourself. I have returned with this your form that I agree with the permit proposals and the increased parking restrictions. I would please ask that you just consider what I have highlighted today. (Photos supplied)
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I live at [redacted] The Lakes and you've already put a double yellow line outside my house so I cannot charge my electric vehicle. Also my [redacted] daughter was a recipient of a parking fine the other day. Why not keep the double yellow that is opposite my residence and remove the one outside my residence so I can have the ability to charge my car and allow my [redacted] daughter to visit me without being fined for the privilege. Also more than happy to have residence parking in place without the need for yellow lines
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I own a property on the Leybourne Lakes development ([redacted] Perch Close) and wanted to let you know my views regarding the proposed parking permits. I rent out the property but am returning next year, I have seen the letter and proposal but I don't have the letter in person to respond as I'm out of the country currently. I hope you will take my views into consideration. I lived there for 7 years before renting the property and upon returning will hope to live there for many years. I think the proposal is a really good solution to the parking issues on The Lakes development. The cost for each permit seems reasonable and the permit bundle is a very good solution for visitors. I wonder if it could be added in that permits can only be issued to residents (by providing proof of council tax to that address). So we don't have local businesses taking up the limited parking spaces that residents have. Maybe this was included but I might have missed it. The Lakes car park is very well maintained and should be used by all visitors. It may be useful to assess the signage on the surrounding roads to assist visitors in finding the car park, as I'm not sure this is currently sufficient. I hope you get a reasonable response to an issue that I know residents complain about regularly.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		No comments supplied
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I am in favour of the restricted parking on junctions and corners of the estate. I'm not in favour of proposed permit holders only zones. Am not in favour of any permit to park costs.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I do not think the additional double yellow lines will aid anyone, as people are already parking on yellow lines without any repercussion. The addition of visitor permits is a good idea however the charge for permits is extortionate. The majority of people who park around the Lakes are people that live here. If anything, action is needed against the houses who are using the sign posted visitor bays to park their cars
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			We are fully in favour. Please note we have a lot of cars parking in front of our house of people who visit the lakes, including big work trucks of fishermen who park for the whole weekend and have left rubbish behind on the road that we have had to clear up after. Visitors to the lake should use the car park. I would also be helpful if ticket inspectors could walk around and monitor the estate and issue fines / clamping.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am NOT IN FAVOUR of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes, Aylesford shown on Plan DD/598/15. MY COMMENTS You have proposed double yellow lines at the entrance of Reed Close. There need to be the same at the entrance of Bream Close and also just before Carp Close. (On one occasion I was unable to get to my property because someone had parked so close to the bollard at Carp close that there was not room for my car to safely pass.) In fact, where there are bollards there should be a limit on how close you can park to them. I STRONGLY DISAGREE that residents and their guests should have to pay for a permit to park on our own development. This was not set out in the original covenants when Berkeley Homes built this development.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Do not want any parking restrictions, we do not have any parking issues in this area, so no parking restrictions or yellow lines.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Its just an opportunity to squeeze more money out of residents, shame on you
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Happy with the double yellow lines but I am not happy and do not agree with the parking permits. These are not needed and will no doubt increase each year.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We are not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes Aylesford Comments: Free resident only parking permits would be welcome, however we do not think it is acceptable to charge us to park on the roads where we live. The issue with parking is caused because of the high charges in place at the Leybourne Lakes Country Park and also with drivers from the industrial estate parking their vehicles on the on The Lakes. We do agree with the additional double yellow lines at the junction of Reed Close and would also like to see them at the junction of Bream Close. At present the double yellow lines are not monitored, and as a result are ignored by a minority of residents. Cars are often parked on the pavement across the yellow lines opposite the Lake Walk courtyard.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am not in favour of the borough council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for the lakes DD/598/15. Our estate does not have a parking.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am a resident of the lakes , larkfield and I am totally against the proposal of parking permits, it causes unintended stress and inconvenience to a lot of residence that may have lots of visitors and residents that are elderly and need carers, I understand people that are not residents are parking there for the use of the country park but that is a minor inconvenience compared to a permit scheme
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I can inform you I am in favour of the proposed scheme.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am not in favour. I believe it is not necessary and would look ugly.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We are not in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street Parking arrangements for the Lakes, Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/15. Comments By the pure nature of this estate it is highly populated by elderly residents who rely on family Being able to visit often. We already have to pay an exhorbitant amount for not only our Rates but also for the service charge levelled on our properties. This smacks of yet another money making scheme by the council for something that is not required. The residents of reed close all have their own parking places on their drives an just because most of them have 2 or more cars and have problems finding suitable parking for their extra cars should not affect me.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am NOT in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/15
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I am fully Behind the resident parking permits. We are inundated with work vans parking and people leaving cars parked and jumping in to other vehicles to go to work presumably. People also use the lakes for visiting Leybourne Country Park.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We have recently bought our flat and it included the purchase of a parking bay. If this comes into effect it will just mean more money which is unacceptable. We are not near reed close & do not have a problem with parking so if needed only do the restrctions around the entrance to the country park and not the whole complex.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		We believe it is ridiculous to make 100s of people to pay for parking outside of their home when they have not previously had to. Hundreds of people will be affected because of a few visitors spots. Also if people and parking dangerously these people should be reported and dealt with sepatately.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			we are in favour of the proposed double yellow lines but I would also like to mention that it is extremely dangerous trying to turn right out of forest grove and shipbourne Road. There is no visibility due to parked cars and so many cars have nearly had an accident, is there any way the DYL can be extended her on map indicated. I have also lived long the green bush in forest grove as this becomes a parking zone and our driveway gets parked over all the time. so i fear that my driveway will be constatly blocked, could DYL be extended across my drive?
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		A resident-paid permit scheme seems a backwards approach. The current proposal financially punishes the residents of the estate, despite the problem being no fault of our own.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I object to another fee for residents having to pay. The issue is not that great. Residents should be given free permits for family and friends to visit
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I agree with the yellow lines but definitely not th parking permits. Yet another tax on residents.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am totally against a parking scheme that requires residents to pay for a permit for cars to be parked on the road or restrctions that make it difficult for us to have visitors. This is especially true in the area of phase 1, we never have cars parked to walk around the lake. i have no problems about double yellow lines being added where appropriate.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		Reason being yellow lines will increase people parking in "allocated spaces" in my flats car park. This is already an issue. I assume same elsewhere. We have a very small notice advising private allocated parking bu people still park in them. Don t want the issue to get worse.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am retired and walk around the Lakes (& the Country park) several times a week including weekends. There is always plenty of space to park on the roads and have never seen anyone park and then walk around the lake, although there are clear a few. I am TOTALLY AGAINST a parking scheme that requires residents to pay for a parking permit for cars to be parked on the road or restrictions that make it difficult for us to have visitors e.g. having to pay for visitor permits. This proposal is like using a sledgehammer to crack a nut . This is especially true in the area of phase 1 (to the right of the main entry road), we never have cars parked to walk round the lake. I have no problems about double yellow lines being added where appropriate.
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		As a resident of The Lakes I am trying to find out if even residents who have a designated parking space have to apply, and presumably pay for a permit? There have been times when I have had to leave my car on The Lakes other than in my own space and sometimes my space is used by others (mainly with my permission but sometimes not) when I'm not there. Could you please advise what the proposals regarding the actual permits are?
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am NOT in favour of the Borough Council s proposals to the on street parking at The Lakes. No resident should be expected to pay to park outside their own home. If this goes ahead permits should be free of charge for residents. The only people who should be charged are those who park irresponsibly. Residents already pay a high service charge to maintain the development, it is not acceptable to be expected to pay even more.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			I am in favour of the Borough Council s proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for The Lakes Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/15. The roads were designed narrow and are congested. The situation is made worse by people parking to visit the Country Park, this can result in difficulty entering and leaving my drive; whilst the access points to the pavements are regularly blocked which is inconvenient and occasionally dangerous to pedestrians. The additional noise and litter left by visitors to the park is unwanted and unpleasant. Relieving the pressure on the roads around the area would be of great benefit to the residents whilst the Country Park visitors could use the car parks provided by the Borough Council.

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes		1		With reference to the proposal of a new permit scheme/yellow lines at The Lakes, we are NOT in favour of this because of the following reasons:- We already have high monthly maintenance costs, we cannot afford to now pay for parking our own vehicles/visitors vehicles. And the permit costs will only go up every year. The proposal is a discrimination against houses/flats with one parking or no parking. We live opposite a gate to park and have no problem with on street parking with visitors to the park. Vehicles I see parked in estate are residents/families not moving out due to high house prices so more cars No management of the double yellow lines at the moment I am not prepared to pay for family/friends to visit, they have parked with no problem on road Another restriction which isn't great for selling I have not requested this scheme which is expensive and restrictive to the residents We have visitors bays albeit used by selfish residents but at least they are there
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		In response to your letter regarding parking proposals I am not in favour as residents should not have to pay for parking. The scheme will not be reliably enforced or monitored and lake visitors will simply find another way round it. We already pay a management company to look after the lakes, obviously they would not be involved with certain parking issues like this. Most families have two or more cars and should not be financially penalised for choosing to live here. Permit holders only might work with no charge to residents and appropriate signage to deter outside lake visitors.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			In principle I am in support of the proposed scheme as there are many cars parked near the lakes to avoid paying the charges and also, more recently, some of the local delivery vans like Amazon etc have been parking on the estate during the day awaiting their next delivery allocations. But it has to be fair for all. I have a view queries regarding the proposal: are the Current Prices described one off prices or annual prices? It is not clear from the plan shown The one-day visitor permits @ £12 per 10. Is that £12 for 10 one-day visits of 10 visits which may last more than one day? who will enforce it if it comes into play. I would not be happy to pay my dues only for others to not but there be no consequences for them I suggest the first two permits per household are issued free of charge. Subsequent permits to start at £52 per vehicle for first 2 etc etc
Larkfield	The Lakes		1		I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the proposed implementation of parking permits on the Leybourne Lakes housing development, as outlined in the proposals available on your website at www.tmbc.gov.uk/parkingphases , with reference to DD/598/15. While I understand the need to manage parking in residential areas effectively, I believe that this particular proposal raises significant concerns and is not in the best interest of the residents. First and foremost, the Leybourne Lakes housing development consists of many houses with five bedrooms and only one allocated parking space with little or no room to add more to one's own property. This allocation is grossly inadequate, considering the number of occupants and the potential number of vehicles associated with a household of this size. It is evident that such a parking arrangement will result in severe parking shortages, increased costs, and create unnecessary inconvenience and congestion within the community. Furthermore, the recent completion of the long-awaited watersports centre at Leybourne Lakes is likely to significantly increase visitor numbers to the area. This influx of visitors, combined with the existing car parking charges at the Leybourne Lakes country park, already places additional strain on the limited available parking spaces in the vicinity. Introducing parking permits without addressing these underlying issues will exacerbate the problem and impose an additional burden on the residents. It is important to consider the principle of fairness and equity in the implementation of parking regulations. Requiring residents to pay for parking permits on their own estate is highly unjustifiable, especially given the already inadequate parking provided with the properties in the first instance. The residents have already invested significant financial resources in purchasing properties within the Leybourne Lakes housing development, expecting to have reasonable access to parking facilities for themselves their families, and their guests. Charging residents for the right to park in their own community undermines this expectation and places an undue financial burden on them.
Larkfield	The Lakes				Continued. Moreover, the houses within the estate are relatively large, and it is common for families to host afternoon barbecues and gatherings. During such events, it is expected that multiple vehicles from guests will be present. The proposed parking permit system fails to account for these scenarios, leaving residents with limited options for accommodating their visitors' vehicles. This lack of flexibility disregards the social and cultural aspects of community life and disregards the reasonable expectations of residents. In light of the aforementioned objections, I strongly urge Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council to reconsider the proposed use of parking permits with the charges outlined, on the Leybourne Lakes housing development. It is essential that a fair and practical parking solution be devised, taking into account the number of bedrooms per property, the increased visitor numbers from the watersports centre, and the potential impact of family gatherings and events. Whilst I do agree this problem does need attention before residents are unable to park on their own housing estate I kindly request that you engage in a comprehensive consultation process with the affected residents to explore alternative parking solutions that address these concerns effectively. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and inform me of any opportunities for public consultation or further engagement on this matter. I trust that the council will consider the valid concerns raised by the residents and work towards a mutually satisfactory resolution.
Larkfield	The Lakes			1	Please can you tell me, my wife has had [REDACTED] unwell. So we have various people come to the house to assist her, these people are usually at the house for around an hour and come alone. So would I be allowed to have one £52 pass that could be used for whoever was at the house on a single visit.
Larkfield	The Lakes	1			We are in favour of The Borough Council's Proposals for the changes to the on-street parking arrangements for the Lakes, Aylesford shown on plan DD/598/15. Our only concern is how is it going to be regulated and by whom?

Annex 5

Larkfield	The Lakes			1	I have received your letter regarding the possibility for parking permits at The Lakes. I do have questions: It is annoying that selfish commuters and Leybourne Lakes visitors park in the residential street for their convenience. However, a paid for parking permit seems to penalise us who use our own bays and already have to pay estate maintenance costs on top of council tax. Is the permit for on road parking? My apartment is in block 62 (which is bottom right of your map) and the purple outline does not cover our car parking area. I have 2 allocated parking bays with my property, does this mean I would require a permit? If I am in my own bays? Many residents have parking included with their properties yet choose not to use them, especially on the road area between the green roughly number 112 to 56 but instead park on the road outside their homes which seems pointless, here maybe a permit makes sense. I would appreciate more info if possible.
Larkfield	Swallow Road			1	As the owners of [REDACTED] Swallow Road, I am writing to you to actually comment against these new double yellow lines as I object to these being painted. [REDACTED] the parking has got much better along Swallow Road [REDACTED] when visiting would have to park further down the road which isn't always an option. Putting double yellows here would also cause even more issues to the road traffic during school times and more often or not the yellow lines are ignored my parents anyway [REDACTED] time restricted single yellow lines would be much more appropriate along the whole of Swallow Road as double yellows are obstructive to residents along the road. [REDACTED]
Larkfield	Swallow Road				Continued As mentioned yesterday, I am grateful that my initial concerns are being followed up on however I am unhappy about the way it has been done, and that given the length of time no one has contacted me to understand if there are still issues. Like mentioned below, parents of the school park where they like whether there are yellow lines or not and without having a warden everyday this is always going to be an issue, as such implementation of yellow lines in effect only affects residents and home owners of the properties that these lines are outside, myself and my husband being one of them. I would be extremely grateful if someone could please, confirm who and how many of these letters have been sent out to so that I can manage my relationships with those neighbours appropriately and also if someone could respond by return with a suitable way forward that would be great.
Larkfield	Swallow Road			1	The vehicle that parks there appears to be a residents vehicle and isn't causing any problems that we've noticed. All extending the double yellow lines will achieve is moving the problem along. Parking is at a premium as it is in Swallow Road & Cygnet Close.
Larkfield	Springfield Road			1	Thank you for your letter dated 19th May 2023 re no waiting at any time parking restrictions (double yellow lines), Springfield Road, Larkfield. We are in favour of the proposed changes and our comments are as follows: We propose that the area without any lines adjacent to Hanover Green have restricted parking for a maximum of 3 hours. This is due to the fact that this area is used on a daily basis for commuter parking. The vehicles arrive around 6.00 am, and when parked the drivers get into a van and go off to work, returning around 6.00 pm. Vehicles are generally parked half on the path and over the storm drain which prevents the cleaning of the debris and the emptying of the drain. We would be grateful if you would consider this proposal. (photos supplied)
Larkfield	Springfield Road			1	I don't think that parking round the bend in Springfield Road affects any of the residents. It slows the traffic going round the bend which is a good thing. If parking is restricted, the people who park on the bend would just park further down Springfield Road and this would prevent residents being able to park outside their own property and would also prevent visitors from parking near the residents they are visiting.
Larkfield	Springfield Road			1	Thank you for your recent letter. There are three car parking user categories at the moment: 1. Fishermen, 2. Commuters and 3 Residents of Springfield Road and Lunsford Lane. The current problems are: 1. A dangerous, blind corner in Springfield Road 2. Council unable to access all the road for cleaning and maintenance. Suggestion: We prefer the situation to stay as it is but fully appreciate the need for change. We agree with the proposed new parking restrictions but also see the need to create an area by the fishermen's gate to enable fishermen to wait while loading and unloading, for a limited time only. USE SINGLE YELLOW LINE? We feel that the fisherman are all responsible club members and will adhere to the revised parking restrictions.
Larkfield	Springfield Road			1	As the parking at the present it is an accident waiting to happen. My only concern where those people are going to park when the yellow lines are in place. Further down the the road hindering access to peoples driveways & banging car doors early in the morning. with no parking on the bend it will allow drivers to stop more than they do at the present.
Larkfield	Springfield Road			1	We do need double yellow lines in springfield road, as cars are parked where they like, which makes it dangerous for us. We have workers come and park here and get collected to go to work. If we complain to them, we have been told they can park where they like and then we get verbal abuse from them. We have no trouble with the fishing club only their parking.

Annex 5

Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1		Myself and my Husband, [REDACTED] both agree wholeheartedly to the parking restriction proposal at Little Oxley and Cope Hill. There are many selfish people who park on corners and opposite drives severely obstructing views of the road. We also have fast vehicles for the type of road, shooting along Little Oxley up towards Woodlea. This is therefore dangerous for residents who park on their drive, with obstructed views of the road due to parked vehicles and large vans. Just one observation...the vehicles that park along little Oxley at the moment will just move the the side of the road adjacent to the green area, where parking will not be restricted. I envisage numerous vehicles parking along here causing more problems with obstruction of the view of the road and perhaps parking on the kerb?
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1		Overall in favour. The corner between Little Oxley and Woodlea is dangerous, vans park on Little Oxley and cars coming either way struggle to see round the corner. i'm surprised a crash hasn't happened It seems like the yellow lines will force people to park on the "green/grass" side of Little Oxley, which will still potentially cause problems for the corner of Little Oxley / Woodlea Concerns The proposed yellow lines are used regularly, where would people be expected to park instead? Where is it going to push the problem to? Is the proposed yellow lines on Cope Hill needed as these are quieter roads, as above always see it full of parked cars Overall good news, as above the corner between Little Oxley/Woodlea is dangerous when cars park on the corner.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	I think the double yellows directly at the junction are fine, but not along the parts of the road away from the junction where people park. Look at Bridgewater and The Mead as an example where there are restrictions on junctions but not the entire road.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	The yellow lines are only needed on the corners of the roads not all the way along the roads
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	I agree to new double yellow lines on corners and junctions, but all along the road which causes no current issues, in such a large area, will push all these cars in new areas causing problems and possibly lead to cars being parked on the large green area. Only need the double yellow lines at junctions.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	There is no need for this! It ll just encourage people to park at the end of our driveway in Cope Hill which encourages people to park over hanging our driveway which does happen!
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	Do not need yellow lines absolutely everywhere, otherwise the cars that park there everyday will just find other spaces further away from their homes and blocking up nearby streets. Just put yellow lines where the garages are if this is the problem?
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	We strongly object to this proposal of double yellow lines. It is unreasonable and ridiculous to reduce parking spaces. A lot of residents would need to extend their driveways to accomodate this proposal. Have never witnessed obstructive driving across bays. this will mainly impact 2,4,6, 8 little oxley and create problems that do not exist at the present. It would cause wider difficulties. The residents are perfectly happy with the current parking arrangements.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	I struggle to fathom the need to install double yellow lines on quiet residential roads in a village, let alone in a cul de sac. Having lived in my current home for 30 years, I can honestly say that I have never experienced issues with parking. The current road parking facility allows visitors to park uniform and with minimal impact to residents. The imposing of restrictions, particularly in Copehill, will result in visitors having to block drive ways and possibly restrict vehicle movement in the cul de sac. Using public money to fund such an unnecessary task would be an incredibly poor use of tax payers money.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1	We are not sure which residents have complained, but the proposals completely ignore the main obstructive parking that has occurred, namely along Little Oxley immediately across from our property number 2 Little Oxley and our neighbours numbers 4, 6, and 8. The proposals not only fail to address this issue but will in fact encourage such obstructive parking in the future as the double yellow lines proposed amazingly do not continue along this stretch of road. This will then be an opportunity for vehicles displaced from other stretches of road to park "legally" across from our properties. We have never experienced obstructive parking around the bends of the junctions of Little Oxley with either Oxley Shaw Lane or Copehill, where the double yellow lines are being proposed, as this would clearly be against the Highway Code, or indeed even across our driveways where the line are being proposed. The main problem is vehicles parking all along the left side of Little Oxley up to Copehill and the right side beyond Copehill up to Woodlea...which then in effect creates blind spots for vehicles all along this stretch of road and difficulties for vehicles coming both ways. This created a major incident during the winter where numerous vehicles were parked along the road across from our properties and very nearly resulted in a van trying to gain access to our driveway hitting one of the vehicles immediately across the road in front of our driveway. It resulted in no one being able to drive along Little Oxley for 2 hours until the vehicles were eventually removed. Such inconsiderate parking of vehicles immediately across the road from our properties 2, 4 and 6 makes accessing and exiting from our driveways extremely difficult and dangerous as the narrowness of the road means the angle of approach and in particular exiting from the driveway results in our vehicles potentially swinging across the road to the other side, and would inevitably result at some point in a collision with any such vehicles parked there.

Annex 5

Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill				Continued The parking of vehicles across from our properties creates a major highways obstruction and is extremely dangerous as cars turning into Little Oxley from Oxley Shaw Lane will immediately be forced to drive on the wrong side of the road and potentially result in collisions with vehicles coming down Little Oxley or turning into Little Oxley from Copehill. The narrowness of the road does not allow vehicles to safely pass each other when vehicles are parked ANYWHERE along this stretch...and will create further hazards for even the councils own refuse collection vehicles! Such parking creates blind spots. And is particularly dangerous to pedestrians trying to cross Little Oxley to the green opposite which includes children, mothers with prams and elderly people. We are not sure which residents have complained, but the proposals completely ignore the main obstructive parking that has occurred, namely along Little Oxley immediately across from our property number [redacted] Little Oxley and our neighbours numbers 4, 6, and 8. The proposals not only fail to address this issue but will in fact encourage such obstructive parking in the future as the double yellow lines proposed amazingly do not continue along this stretch of road. This will then be an opportunity for vehicles displaced from other stretches of road to park "legally" across from our properties. We have never experienced obstructive parking around the bends of the junctions of Little Oxley with either Oxley Shaw Lane or Copehill, where the double yellow lines are being proposed, as this would clearly be against the Highway Code, or indeed even across our driveways where the line are being proposed. The main problem is vehicles parking all along the left side of Little Oxley up to Copehill and the right side beyond Copehill up to Woodlea...which then in effect creates blind spots for vehicles all along this stretch of road and difficulties for vehicles coming both ways. This created a major incident during the winter where numerous vehicles were parked along the road across from our properties and very nearly resulted in a van trying to gain access to our driveway hitting one of the vehicles immediately across the road in front of our driveway. It resulted in no one being able to drive along Little Oxley for 2 hours until the vehicles were eventually removed. Such inconsiderate parking of vehicles immediately across the road from our properties 2, 4 and 6 makes accessing and exiting from our driveways extremely difficult and dangerous as the narrowness of the road means the angle of approach and in particular exiting from the driveway results in our vehicles potentially swinging across
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill				Continued This created a major incident during the winter where numerous vehicles were parked along the road across from our properties and very nearly resulted in a van trying to gain access to our driveway hitting one of the vehicles immediately across the road in front of our driveway. It resulted in no one being able to drive along Little Oxley for 2 hours until the vehicles were eventually removed. Such inconsiderate parking of vehicles immediately across the road from our properties 2, 4 and 6 makes accessing and exiting from our driveways extremely difficult and dangerous as the narrowness of the road means the angle of approach and in particular exiting from the driveway results in our vehicles potentially swinging across the road to the other side, and would inevitably result at some point in a collision with any such vehicles parked there. The parking of vehicles across from our properties creates a major highways obstruction and is extremely dangerous as cars turning into Little Oxley from Oxley Shaw Lane will immediately be forced to drive on the wrong side of the road and potentially result in collisions with vehicles coming down Little Oxley or turning into Little Oxley from Copehill. The narrowness of the road does not allow vehicles to safely pass each other when vehicles are parked ANYWHERE along this stretch...and will create further hazards for even the councils own refuse collection vehicles! Such parking creates blind spots. And is particularly dangerous to pedestrians trying to cross Little Oxley to the green opposite which includes children, mothers with prams and elderly people.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		This proposal is an ABSOLUTE joke. There are too many cars as it is which need spaces to park let alone if you take away our places to park!! Whoever came up with this idea needs to respect that the unwritten law of parking in that side is good enough. There is enough room for emergency services to access everywhere! So don't see why this is necessary!
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill				This proposal will not solve the perceived issue. All the vehicles are residents vehicles so are not going to go away. Where are the proposals for alternative parking? Do we just park in someone else's road instead or how about we park on the Green spaces I am sure nobody will mind that!! Backwards thinking as usual.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I live in Copehill & have been made aware of double yellows being proposed for Copehill & Little Oxley.... I really think what they are proposing is going to make it impossible to park or drive up towards Woodlea - I live at [redacted] which is in the cul de sac. So parking on the road in front of our house is impossible & also have a street light in my front garden so would be difficult to extend our parking further. Having lived on the estate for over 30 years - there are many other roads that need yellow lines more than ours... most of my neighbours in Copehill park curtesy ... & probably unaware of what is being proposed!
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		All this change will result in is people parking on the Main Road (Oxley Shaw Lane) or further into the cul de sac, with the current proposed changes you will be forcing approximately 15-20 cars to park somewhere other than cope hill when quite frankly there isn't a current problem.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		As indicated above we are not in favour of the full extent of the proposed scheme, however restrictions to parking at junctions would be welcomed.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		Where are visitors suppose to park? It will be impossible to have family round. This will only encourage the "obstructive cars" to park on the main roads which is even more obstructive causing traffic.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1			Yellow lines by access to off street parking beside 31/32 & 35/36 Copehill please
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		Parking is not obstructive in this area. If double yellows are placed here there would be nowhere for visitors and guests of the residents to park.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		It is an unrealistic proposal, that will cause more problems in this area.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I am NOT in favour of the proposed changes to the onstreet parking arrangements for Little Oxley and Copehill. If these proposals were to go ahead, it would make the parking in this area even more dangerous and just push the problem elsewhere. Most of the people presently parking in the proposed area for change are residents of these streets and would still need somewhere to park. The only double yellow line on your map that maybe favourable is the small area near 23 Copehill, although no one hardly ever parks there, it would keep this area clear, should any large vehicles need to access our cul de sac.

Annex 5

Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		We believe this is a good proposal and will prevent dangerous parking on junctions. However, we have some concern... Residents being affected from the change will need somewhere else to park and it will also prevent guests from being able to park when visiting - The concern is that people will start parking in the road we are located in (number 23-43 cul de sac). Also, following the COVID hub parking trend, will people will start parking on Oxley shaw? Could the double yellow be extended past the Cope Hill path entrance to prevent residents parking on the main road for convenience to walk to their homes via the path?
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		If this goes ahead, we will not be able to reverse our cars from our driveway as everyone will park by the green outside our house. There will also be no space for visitor parking in the area which will cause huge issues. If this goes ahead, it will be detrimental to residents. I fully object to this proposal as a resident of Little Oxley.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		If this goes ahead, we will not be able to reverse our cars from our driveway as everyone will park by the green outside our house. There will also be no space for visitor parking in the area which will cause huge issues. If this goes ahead, it will be detrimental to residents. I fully object to this proposal as a resident of Little Oxley.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill			1	Not sure if the lines fix the issues. There is no provisions for visiting families to park else where. Health careworkers and tradespeople need to park somewhere its just going to move problems to elsewhere will there be random enforcement-unlikely. people will start parking in front of drives blocking us in.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		In 34 years of living in Woodlea, Leybourne there has not been a parking issue with Little Oxley & Copehill but to put double yellow lines will actually create a problem to residents in these streets and adjacent Woodlea. I suspect the one resident that has requested the lines hasn't thought it through. In actual fact their supposed problem is that they cannot see from the left as they come out of their drive but in actual fact it is quite often their third vehicle that is causing the problem - I have a photo taken only this morning to prove this. Sometimes they park two of their vehicles in the stretch of road they have a problem with. The cars parked sensibly by residents in Little Oxley opposite the green will be forced to park on the other side of the road making it more difficult when the complainant exits their drive as they won't be able to see to the right and traffic coming from Oxley Shaw to go round the bend and up to Woodlea will be on the wrong side of the road and meeting vehicles coming down the hill. The solution in my view would be to have a short stretch of double yellow lines from 1 Little Oxley to where the brick road starts in Little Oxley. Then the resident who has the issue will be able to see both ways as they exit their drive. The other option for them is to cut their hedge back! If you require the photo I would be pleased to forward it to you. Let's hope sense prevails!
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I can't stress enough how strongly I object to this proposal - I have lived in COPSEHILL for over 25 years and have never experienced or witnessed any obstructive parking and there has always been plenty of space for emergency vehicles, for example, to access all areas. The roads within the proposal are residential cul-de-sacs not thoroughfares and residents and their visitors need somewhere to park as they have done since their existence. If the parking in the area within this proposal is deemed as "obstructive" then in order for TMBC to be non-discriminatory they would need to propose double yellow lines in virtually every other street on the Oxley Shaw estate, as vehicles are parked identically on streets of the same width in many roads on the estate for example and not restricted to Willowmead, Bridgewater Place, Redbank, Baywell, Barleycorn, Roundhay.... The proposal would leave next to no street parking in the affected areas, forcing residents (who are in the fortunate enough position to be able to afford it) to pave over whatever little green space is left of front gardens etc. I implore those considering this proposal to see common sense and reject it in its entirety.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1			100% In favour, there are ever increasing number of delivery vehicles around, the regular refuse collection vehicles and on many occasions I have seen these drive on pavements causing damage to residents properties and to the kerb. The section on the west side of cope hill where double yellow lines are not proposed is likely to become a permanent parking area, so this section will still be reduced in width. Could yellow lines run along the entire length? I have shown on the attached copy in red pen.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		Unightly and unnecessary. Any inconsiderate parkers will simply park poorly on other roads, crowding these and creating a worse problem.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I agree with the lines at the junctions, but lines on the outside of the bend in Little Oxley is ridiculous as it will push all the parked cars to the other side of the road and obstruct vision even more. If you want to do it properly then spend some money and widen the road by pushing the footpath into the field. Obviously as ever no objections will be upheld as the decision has already been made. TMBC need to visit the location and not draw pretty pictures on their pc.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		The proposed yellow lines are over the top and is more than is required. To double yellow both sides of the road will stop people parking outside or close to their home.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		The most ridiculous idea I have ever heard, most houses are multi vehicle homes, where do you think they are going to park. There is no problem, but you will create one by shrinking the available parking, pushing people to park outside their peoples home and creating parking wars. show some common sense and leave it as it is.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		We have not seen evidence of obstructive parking. Most properties only have 1 parking spot but 2+ cars - where do you propose they park? You have not provided plans for additional parking. The proposed plan does not leave a single space for any visitors to the property.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1			We do think that on the corners would be good but the area on the left on Cope Hill after the corner should be left as it is - a good place to park and does not obstruct anyone (plan supplied)
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I feel these changes are far too restrictive. They will make people find any other space to park their vehicles in the close, in front of peoples houses or in turning bays, which are not for those purpose. I understand that some restrictions may benefit, but really only around junctions. I think planning officers need to ascertain where all the vehicles in these areas will go if these restrictions are undertaken.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		My elderly parents live [REDACTED]. If you put yellow lines down they will have to walk a considerable distance to get to their cars and vice versa. Which causes an increased risk of falling over. This is just not acceptable.

Annex 5

Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		The double yellows will mean that people are unable to park outside their homes, increase parking along the main road which will be dangerous as people will be overtaking on the wrong side of the road on a bend. There are also a number of side roads and we will not be able to see to join the main road if cars have no choice but to block the main road. This will be dangerous for children and families who live in the area. Furthermore this is a significant amount of parking being taken away, I am not sure where else people will park apart from the main road. This will cause anxiety for residences who would be coming home worrying about if/where they can park!
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill				Limiting parking will not solve the problem just move it. People will be forced to park in other roads where it is already busy or on the main road itself which I would argue is worse.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I feel that these changes are far too restrictive. They will make people find any other space to park their vehicles. i.e. in the close, in front of people's houses or in the turning bays which are not for that purpose. I understand that some restrictions may benefit, but really only around the junctions. I think planning officers need to ascertain where all the vehicles that are currently parked in these areas will go if these restrictions are undertaken.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		We strongly object to this proposal of double yellow lines. It is unreasonable and ridiculous to reduce parking spaces. A lot of residents would need to extend their driveways to accommodate this proposal. Have never witnessed obstructive parking across drives etc. This will mainly impact 2,4,6,8 Little Oxley and create a problem that does not exist at present. It would cause difficulties to the wider community i.e. service visitors, nurses, carers, friends and families. It would amount to hazardous conditions in Oxley Shaw Lane, with buses, refuse collectors, pedestrians, with the overflow of cars having nowhere else to park. The residents are perfectly happy with the current parking arrangements.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		I believe something needs to be done about the parking next to the junction in these two roads. However if you implement them all along cope hill and little oxley as indicated it will force residents to park outside other houses and block people in. They would also park in the turning spaces opposite my house.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		Off road parking areas such as garages and residential spaces, have been converted or used for other purposes than for parking. Commercial vehicles also account for obstructions during weekends. Most obstructions are of short duration if visitors or trades, such as heating and plumbing. Life will be worse.
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill	1			No comment
Leybourne	Little Oxley & Cope Hill		1		There will be no parking for people that don't have a drive that can fit more than two cars on, meaning cars will be left on Oxley shaw lane or another road and this is dangerous thus can result in car accidents. Also, with the cost of living crisis and the amount houses cost the majority of children stay at home till their early 20s maybe even 27. Meaning with most people passing their driving test by 21 latest most households have more than 2 cars! This will cause unnecessary havoc and more problems than what there currently is.
Platt	Grange Road		1		This is ridiculous and pointless plan, most of the residents park in the road outside their properties, for those properties owners without the privilege of using offroad parking, where are these cars be relocated. There were no parking restrictions when property owners applied for planning for driveways. Why should other property owners be penalized for a few. Maybe they should talk to car owners/neighbours instead of the council.
Platt	Grange Road		1		With no cars parked in the road, this will lead to a rat run situation from comp gardens to A25 Maidstone Road with no adherence to the speed limit. No parking in Grange Road would increase strain on neighbouring road and closes for parking spots.
Platt	Grange Road		1		I am not in favour of the double yellow lines on Grange Road as I think it will encourage cars to go faster down the road, will increase parking in St Marys Close and will restrict access to the pub, which is an important community asset.
Platt	Grange Road		1		Whilst we appreciate that the Blue Anchor pub customers may be causing a problem for residents of Grange Road, surely the simple solution to that is for the pub to extend its carpark off Long Mill Lane into its garden. Not force customers, by installing yellow lines in Grange Road, to park in St Mary's Close, which is a very narrow road with 2 bends, in a residential area which already has access problems when residents and their visitors park in the road or on the pavement at the bottom of the Close. Extra parked cars would cause significant difficulties for access to all emergency vehicles, the dustmen, delivery drivers and most importantly the residents of the rest of the Close. There are several elderly residents at the top of the Close, some of these use mobility scooters and others need constant access for carers, doctors or ambulances. Extra cars parked on the pavements would cause considerable danger and cause the necessity to drive on the opposite pavement, if indeed that is left clear. If this scheme went ahead, all it will do is move the problem onto the residents of St Mary's Close, which is highly unacceptable, unfair and potentially very dangerous, possibly even life threatening.
Platt	Grange Road	1			You may like to instruct the Pub to cut their hedge back, that would increase the usable width of the road by 2ft.
Platt	Grange Road		1		We live at St Mary's Platt close on the single-track road, unfortunately double yellow lines on Grange Road will just push parking up St Mary's Platt Road and cause a hazard for all the residents of St Mary's Platt Road many of whom are elderly and disabled. At busy times we have people parking up the curb and blocking the road when they park and don't bump up the curb. Also, the double yellow lines will cause other parking and blockage problems back up Grange road (towards the main road) where it becomes single track. I'm not sure there is a massive problem on Grange Road (only at very busy times) and St Mary's Platt Close is also affected at those times – weddings, funerals, and parties in the pub. Better signage / directions to the Blue Anchor car park I'm sure would help.

Annex 5

Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>Many thanks for sending the proposals for the proposed yellow line parking restrictions in our section of Grange Road, St Marys Platt. We would like to register the following concerns: My wife and I both need cars for work. We only have a parking space for one car and a second space is not possible due to the telegraph pole at the front of our garden. One car is therefore parked on the road outside the house. Parking in St Marys Close is not an option as it is a narrow road and any parking would obstruct traffic through the road. Where are we supposed to park our small second car? We will not be able to receive visitors. They would have to park in St Marys Close causing congestion or close to the church causing possible obstructions in an already narrow part of the road (and an awkward junction). We face the prospect of visitors (some of whom are not able-bodied) having to park a considerable distance from our house which is unsatisfactory to say the least! St Mary's Church holds many services and funerals. Parking would be greatly restricted if people cannot temporarily park in our part of Grange Road. This will lead to impossible obstructive parking in Long Mill Lane during services and many elderly people having to walk considerable distances from their cars to attend church. The removal of parking spaces would only speed up the traffic passing this section of Grange Road. Both ends of our section of road (St Marys Close and the Church) are narrow and we have seen many irresponsible drivers accelerate through our wider short section of road. If there are no parked cars due to the proposed yellow lines then they will speed even more. This is of particular concern as many school children walk down this part of the road on their way to St Mary's Platt school. In addition, there are many elderly residents who walk daily down this road and would not feel safe without parked cars to stand behind when present traffic (slow moving) passes through.</p>
Platt	Grange Road			<p>Continued The main two problems in our opinion are: 1) Parking outside the Grange Road entrance to the Blue Anchor. Large cars are often parked diagonally across and into the road causing a blockage. We propose a double yellow line outside the Grange Road entrance to the Blue Anchor pub. This would remove the problem and congestion would be avoided for traffic passing through. The pub has ample space to extend its car park at the Long Mill Lane entrance! 2) Inconsiderate people park on the end of Grange Road near the A25. It can often be difficult to see oncoming traffic when approaching the junction. Yellow lines should be on both sides of Grange Road from the A25 entrance to the entrance to St Marys Close. Congestion will still happen as that part of the road is narrow but becomes impossible with people parking outside their properties. We do not understand why our section of the road is being targeted when the main problem is on this very narrow stretch of Grange Road!!! We understand that you cannot respond directly but can you please acknowledge that you have received our concerns/comments.</p>
Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>Thank you for our letter giving me the opportunity to be involved in the consultation process about the parking to the front of the Blue Anchor public house. I have very recently moved into the former home of my parents, so am well acquainted with the area and the surrounding roads. I am writing to object to the proposed double yellow lines in Grange Road. I can fully appreciate the problems that the residents who live opposite the Pub have with parking. I am registered disabled and need to use an adapted car with hand controls. You can hopefully understand that inconsiderate parking can cause me a great number of issues. Since moving in, I have had my front drive extended in order that I can park my car and have off-road parking for visitors. The Blue Anchor Pub has been in the village as a pub since 1742. The people living in the houses opposite will therefore have moved into their respective homes while the pub was there as a pub. I appreciate that with increased car ownership the problem of parking has become more of an issue. Customers travelling by car to eat at the pub (some of whom may not be aware of the carpark to the rear) has turned an inconvenience into a problem to local residents. We also know that parking is worse when there is a funeral or wedding at the Church. When the pub is very busy, we already notice cars parking further into the very narrow, St Marys Close. If yellow lines are put in Grange Road and at the Junction of St Marys Close, this will simply make parking worse. More cars will park further up St Marys close. It will not just be the cars that currently park in Grange Road, but those of visitors for the Grange Road houses and their delivery drivers. I cannot park at the bottom of the road and walk home if the road is blocked!. You can see from the picture that there is insufficient room for two cars to pass without going up on the kerb. People who do not use the close will be unaware of this. Grange road does at least have room for vehicles to pass parked cars. I have a mobility scooter which I use to get about locally, as does another resident in St Marys Close. It is already hazardous trying to do so safely.</p>
Platt	Grange Road			<p>Continued While I empathise with the residents opposite the pub, I would urge you not to go ahead with the proposed double yellow lines. As outlined above, the impact of this will be negative on a greater number of local people and not just those who frequently use the pub as a social hub. (picture supplied)</p>
Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>When our family and friends visit especially with children there will be nowhere to park near our house.</p>
Platt	Grange Road	1		<p>We have twice recently narrowly avoided an accident as we backed out of the drive because we were unsighted by parking cars across the foot of our garden.</p>
Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>The planned parking restrictions will transfer existing problems to St Marys Close. This is a narrow road where vehicles already have to mount the pavement to drive past parked vehicles. This plan will only increase & transfer any obstructive parking.</p>
Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>The Parish Council feels that by putting double yellow lines in this location will only move any problems to neighbouring roads such as St Mary's Close which is a much narrower residential street. The Parish Council is unaware of any visibility issues at junctions. Councillors that use Grange Road have never encountered any parking safety issues. Having yellow lines in this area also causes problems for visitors to the houses as there will be nowhere to park in Grange Road at all. The Parish Council objects to this proposal.</p>

Annex 5

Platt	Grange Road			<p>As a resident (since 2004) affected by the same I am in favour of the proposed plan but feel it very important that I make the following comments: Our property - [REDACTED] - is shown confusingly on the attached Plan of the proposal as being perhaps adjacent to Hill View on Long Mill Lane whereas it is actually adjacent to the Blue Anchor PH and next door to Church Cottage. It is also missing our driveway entrance/exit. Please see attached plan with correction/clarification. (I have also inserted a proposed additional Yellow Line - see below). This is important because from the existing misleading plan it would appear that [REDACTED] is behind and beyond where the proposed works are planned (and therefore we may be unaffected by the same - but see below) whereas in actual fact the front door of our property is actually beside (within a couple of feet or so) the proposed line. It would of course be imperative that any line covered this area (as the proposed plan does indicate) otherwise cars could park literally outside my front door or adjacent area! However, in addition to this, and very importantly I need to point out that we have had great problems over many years with cars parking on the pavement opposite our driveway on Long Mill Lane and on the corner opposite the entrance/exit to the Blue Anchor car park when the drivers frequent there. I have in the past on many occasions reported this to the Police and they have kindly helped to ensure that the cars are moved so that we can gain entrance/exit to our driveway/house and cars/pedestrians are able to safely negotiate the corner bend of the road there. This is a definite obstruction and visibility issue causing safety concerns. As well as our entrance/exit being obstructed, sometimes cars have to veer to the centre of the road (in both directions) to go around parked cars on the corner to navigate around the bend and pedestrians have to walk into the road on the corner to get around the cars parked over the pavement. I have affixed a NO PARKING sign to the railing opposite our driveway belonging to Hill View with the owner's permission. They were happy for me to do so, not least of all because these same cars parked across the pavement outside their front door (and that of the adjacent [REDACTED]!</p>
Platt	Grange Road			<p>Continued I am very concerned that if the proposed lines are put in place on Grange Road, all visitors to the Blue Anchor PH will instead park on Long Mill Lane being the nearest entrance to the Blue Anchor. [The Blue Anchor PH has an entrance/exit from both sides (Grange Road and Long Mill Lane) as does our house]. This would only increase the already problematic situation of the blocking of our driveway on Long Mill Lane and the front doors of Romney House and Hill View by visitors to the Blue Anchor, and opposite the entrance to the Blue Anchor car park, make the corner bend more dangerous to navigate for both cars and pedestrians. If double yellow lines were inserted at the appropriate places on Long Mill Lane (see attached plans) in addition to the proposed ones outlined, this would help resolve the problem for all concerned. (plan attached) I thought it would be helpful to forward a photo taken of an example of parking outside Blue Anchor car park exit/entrance and my driveway entrance on the corner of Long Mill Lane referred to below in said email. (photo attached)</p>
Platt	Grange Road		1	<p>My husband and I live at [REDACTED] on Grange Road and would be negatively affected and impacted by the proposal. We object to the proposal to add double yellow lines to any of the proposed area. We were quite shocked to have received this proposal, as are many of our neighbours, who are also deeply unhappy with it. As we understand it, this has been raised by a single member of the public who claims they are being obstructed by nuisance parking relating to the operation of the Blue Anchor public house. For any avoidance of doubt and to be clear, we have never witnessed obstructive parking across and / or near driveways in the time that we have lived in [REDACTED]. There is ample safe space for other homeowners to pull onto and off their driveways. It is interesting to note that there is only 1 white line painted in front of a driveway (it actually stretches beyond his drive if we're being particular) on the stretch of road, so to knee jerk to double yellow lines seems disproportionate to any perceived issue. We should have a right to park on the public highway, and that right is proposed to be removed by non-material considerations and a non-issue. We do not have a driveway, so would be unfairly impacted. Where are we expected to park? Please see below for some key points relating to our objection: Overall summary 1. The visual impact on a quintessential Kent village 2. No driveway at XXXXXXXXXX 3. Visibility at junctions 4. Road Safety 5. The Blue Anchor 6. Moving the problem elsewhere Visual impact on a quintessential Kent village - significant issue To be frank, it would be an eyesore to a picturesque, Kent village. Our friends and family have said how ugly it would make the village Double Yellow lines would be a terrible mess and detract from the village This is a quiet village. To add yellow lines would prompt vehicles to park elsewhere in the village, simply moving any ill-perceived notion that there is a parking problem onto other members of the community. No driveway at XXXXXX - significant issue We are the only house within the proposed double yellow line area that does not have a driveway How are we expected to have visitors and trades?</p>

Annex 5

Platt	Grange Road				Continued Where will they be able to park? We have one car and are the only household who park on Grange Road day in, day out. We are able to park legally and safely 99% of the time within the proposed area. The one time we couldn't and were forced to park down by the Church on Long Mill Lane, our car was involved in a hit and run and was written off, this only happened a couple of months ago Nobody else on the petition can possibly know how congested it is, or is not, better than my husband and I. Parking by non-residents is not causing an obstruction, visual or physical. Has the original requestor evidenced the regularity of 'nuisance parking' that they experience? Have they indicated the steps that have been taken already? Note that there are no white lines painted around the area. Implementing some lines but not continuing the lines to outside our property would make parking a great deal worse - making any perceived issue greater for us and the wider community. Visibility at junctions and driveways-- there is no such issue A 20mph speed limit is in place with road calming measures on Grange Road, prior to St Mary s Close, when travelling from the North (downhill). The junction is open and visibility is good. Grange Road is a straight road in this section. Visibility is very good. Visibility splays from all driveways are large and so there is no safety issue. It is possible to see all the way up and down the area of the road under question with or without vehicles parked on the roadway. We have never witnessed anyone blocking anyone's driveway. If this has been the case we would assume the home owner would wish to pay for a white line to be painted in the first instance. If this were to continue it would be expected that evidence is gathered and other solutions sought in the first instance to not impact other residents and businesses. Road Safety - no such issue As previously mentioned, visibility is good, the road is straight in this section and traffic calming measures are in place already The junction with St Mary s Close is open and visibility is good for drivers on Grange Road and on St Mary s Close. The yellow lines are proposed to end prior to the narrowest section of road before the Grange Road and Long Mill Lane junction. It is therefore assumed Evidence supports the theory that the wider a road the faster the average driving speeds.
Platt	Grange Road				Continued . Adding yellow lines would be expected to increase driving speeds, regardless of the speed limits. This is on a road where there is no pedestrian walkway. To add double yellow lines could conceivably increase the risk of serious injury and fatality to pedestrians. The Blue Anchor The main car park for the Blue Anchor is on Long Mill Lane. If someone is suggesting there is an issue, it may be easier for the pub to notify (or reiterate to) patrons that the main entrance should be on Long Mill Lane itself as a straightforward solution, and only use the car parking spaces outside of the front entrance were this to be full. Moving the problem elsewhere The village is generally a quiet residential area. Those that live adjacent and near the pub, as we do, need to accept that there will inevitably be some busier periods. The Blue Anchor was here long before most of the residential properties were constructed. It is only generally busy at weekends. Even then, patrons are considerate of the local surroundings when they park. If parking is restricted on Grange Road this will not solve anything. It will move the problem onto Long Mill Lane or St Mary s Close. Even greater congestion will occur as less on-road parking is available. Residents that are affected will then likely put in a similar request. A precedent would have been set with a very low bar (one unhappy resident making the request and an issue that is not an issue). Long Mill Lane near junctions with Grange Road and Comp Lane has been an area of 2 car collisions in the last 12 months. Grange Road has not. Moving the problem would lead to faster-moving traffic on Grange Road and greater congestion and reduced visibility on Long Mill Lane. This would inevitably increase the risk of car on car and car on pedestrian collision in this area. Where would any visitors and contractors be expected to park? Especially those that have limited mobility. Again, this will move the problem elsewhere. The roads are far busier for parking when there is a wedding or large funeral at St Mary s Church. This is to be expected as part of living near the church. So why is this any different to living near a pub? Even when the pub is busy the patrons park either in the pub s car park or safely and considerately on the road. Impossible to enforce and a waste of public money Double-yellow lined areas would require enforcement by the Council.
Platt	Grange Road				Continued. Considering further cuts to council budgets I cannot see how this proposal is in the public interest. We are not in a high-footfall town where the council could potentially find the enforcement costneutral. It seems inevitable that the semi-rural area would also mean ongoing hourly enforcement is not possible. This would be a waste of taxpayer money to move to a further consultation stage, let alone undertake the proposals and to then enforce these and maintain the painted lines. Any costs would be wholly disproportionate to any ill-conceived benefit for local residents I trust that all of the information I have provided is sufficient to not proceed with the proposed parking restrictions. If it goes any further, be in no doubt that we will contest it.
Platt	Grange Road	1			We are very much in favour of the proposals. Our driveway is frequently obstructed making maneuvering in and out of drive difficult and at times dangerous, due to restricted visibility on grange road from junction of A25 is very narrow + the number of cars which regularly park create safety concerns need to be addressed.
Platt	Grange Road		1		The reason I have selected not in favour is because I believe the restrictions will cause drivers to park further up in the front of my property, making exit and entrance into my property difficult and dangerous. If the restrictions continued up to the A25 I would be in favour. I have attached a couple of maps marking where I believe there is always dangerous parking. as can be seen in the aerial map. The restrictions should cover up to the A25 to prevent this. MO -Attached are highlighted areas where vehicles parking dangerously and another area that is very dangerous on a bend
Platt	Grange Road		1		Removing parked cars encouraging even faster through traffic. Dotted line of east side of the grange road could be a footpath quite a few pedestrians use the road. Prevention of speeding is important, obstacles, block road off. I don t think just putting yellow lines going to be much help.
Platt	Grange Road		1		Customers who park in front of pub respect driveways and park responsible. Plus if these neighbours who have complained then have visitors they will use my car parking spots out front of pub, will then lose customers.
Platt	Grange Road		1		With regards to double yellow lines, your proposing for Grange rd. I Object on the grounds that it will necessitate cars being parked in St Mary s close, which is unable to take two cars abreast.

Annex 5

Platt	Grange Road	1			Thank for your letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Grange Road. Our apologies for missing the deadline of 11 June, however, we only returned from a 3 week European trip yesterday. We feel that the parking restrictions are a very good idea, however, we have concerns and strongly recommend that the restrictions should be extended up to the top of Grange Road, where the existing parking restrictions are in place where it joins the A25. Cars already park on this corner just before the existing restrictions, causing a blind spot on the bend of what is already a narrow lane. The only way to pass these cars is so go fully on the other side of the road which is dangerous as you are unable to see approaching vehicles (often at speed). One other major concern is that the small area between your proposed restrictions and the current restrictions will encourage lots more cars to park in that small area and further impede access and visibility to a number of properties, including our own. It is already an issue further up the lane with cars parking in these areas. One other consideration is the abuse of the 20 mph speed limit currently imposed. The current speed humps do not discourage fast driving, which is problematic particularly on a narrow lane with no footpath and often used by young families walking their children to Platt School.
Platt	Grange Road	1			I am writing regarding the parking restrictions (double yellow lines) on Grange Road, Platt. I am in favour of the restrictions you suggest but have concerns about what will happen because of these changes to the parking situation in Long Mill Lane where I live at Romney House. There are regular problems with cars of customers from The Blue Anchor pub (when the car park is full) parking on the pavement in Long Mill Lane from outside my house and round the corner up to the entrance way for the houses Augustus, Mill House and Hill View. These parked cars lead to obstruction and visibility problems: - Pedestrians can't walk on the pavement; - Cars approaching from either side of the bend where the pub is cannot see what is coming because of the parked cars; - I can't see round the cars to pull out of my drive (between XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX); - My neighbour, XXXXXXXXXXXXX, cannot enter or exit his driveway. (He has been forced to call the police before and has had to put up a no parking sign of his own to deter drivers from parking opposite his drive); While you are putting yellow lines in Grange Road, I would also recommend putting yellow lines on Long Mill Lane from outside Romney House to just beyond the bend where the entrance to Augustus, Mill House and Hill View is too. I know that my neighbour, XXXXXXXX, feels the same. Please do write to me if more information or a visit is needed.
Platt	Grange Road	1			I would like to support XXXXXXXXXXXXX proposed plan for for double yellow lines to be extended to the narrow part of Long Mill Lane (as shown on his plan to you) and also I would fully support extended them to outside Church View Cottage, Long Mill Lane but probably no further as some of the cottages do not have driveways and the road widens in any case. Long Mill Lane is frequently used by walkers, farm vehicles and for the school run so that any parked cars in front of The Blue Anchor and further along the lane causes congestion.
Platt	Grange Road			1	I write in connection with the above proposed No waiting at any time parking restrictions (double yellow lines) on Grange Road, Platt. I am not a resident of Grange Road however I feel that the proposed changes are likely to impact the stretch of Long Mill Lane that I do live on. Our address is XXXXXXXXXXXX. When the pub is busy we already have numerous cars parking carelessly outside our house. Because the lane is narrow here they usually park on the pavement rendering it inaccessible to pedestrians and forcing them to walk in the middle of the road to get around the obstruction. They also often park right up against our front gate which not only makes the front of our property inaccessible but also causes our neighbours opposite XXXXXXXX extreme difficulty getting on and off their driveway. If double yellow lines were also placed at the appropriate places on Long Mill Lane in addition to the proposed ones outlined, this would help resolve the problem for all concerned.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			I am in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for the changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Bramley Road, Snodland shown on plan DD/598/19. Having been a resident here for nearly 6 years I am very much aware how difficult it is to park on this road, by the time I arrive home in the evening (on or around 6pm) there are usually no available space on the road and the car park on Rocfort Road is also usually full up by then, which leads to me driving aimlessly around the village looking for a space to safely park my car. The parking problems on our road have been made significantly more difficult since the chip shop has opened on the corner of our road. Although there are double yellow lines painted on either side of the road at the junction there are often numerous vehicles parked there visiting the chip shop or there is the sound of horns and arguments as people jostle for position, or carelessly try to reverse onto the Malling Road. Perhaps these should be changed to single yellow lines instead? Several times I have witnessed emergency vehicles trying and failing to get down our road because of the situation at this end, making them go the long way around the village via Birling Road/Recreation Avenue to enter Bramley Road from the other end, such a delay could potentially cost lives. I am more than happy to provide more information if it is necessary and I would be very keen to receive more information regarding this proposal and its outcomes.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			vehicles to access the grounds of the reservoir. It makes a huge difference just having an extra meter or two in which to turn, especially when there are cars parked on both sides of the road. We
Snodland	Bramley Road				are close to the Tonbridge Grammar School so students and residents utilise the free parking.
Snodland	Bramley Road			1	The hours of the permit means that the road will be available to park on for all non residents at a time when most residents will be coming home needing to park. Bramley Road also does not have enough room to park the residents cars, so you will pay for permit and still not be able to park.
Snodland	Bramley Road			1	I am an XXyr old lady who cares for her [REDACTED] son. If I am ill my children will stay with me until I feel better and look after myself and my son. Also I rely both for me and my son on volunteer drivers for hospitals so getting a space outside in our road is vital. I agree that people who do not live in this road should not park here as they do.

Annex 5

Snodland	Bramley Road		1	As POA for [REDACTED] I have attached the form regarding parking restrictions. I am also a carer for [REDACTED]. I also have other people who help me care for [REDACTED] as I am also carer for my [REDACTED] Daughter. Also if you have the same rules that other councils have where there is only one permit allowed to a house which does not have a car register to the house my mothers care would stop. [REDACTED] has never been able to drive and does not have a car. [REDACTED] also lives at the address alone which means due to her dementia she requires care, myself and the other people who help care for my mum live miles away so we require our cars to get to the property to care for [REDACTED] so they would require permits. Also why are you charging over double the amount of money that Maidstone borough council charges for their parking permits. This is brutal. If you can't afford to put the scheme in place, why should we have to pay the price?
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		Parking permits will be good due issues parking at night after work and having to drive around to find a parking spot, not on my road. Suggestion: Parking bays to stop inconsiderate parking down this road.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	Due to the cost during a cost of living crisis
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		The permit needs to be effective for 24hrs a day 365 a year, and will only work if it policed regularly, otherwise people will still take advantage and park for shorter stays meaning residents will still miss out parking in their road. The evenings are far busier due to the fish and chips shop, this is when it is most needed.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		I am in favour if residents get permits for visitors also because otherwise when our friends and family visit where do they park.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	Well where do I begin with this proposal! I guess that I strongly object to it, and would like to head wobble the residents who have allegedly requested it. Firstly the proposed mon-fri 8am-6pm restrictions are outside of the peak time parking nightmare that exists in Snodland. People want to be able to park close to home at the end of their work day which for many of us shift workers is after 6pm and at weekends. Secondly there are 66 properties in Bramley road and 17 properties in recreation avenue, I would say nearly half the households have 2 vehicles and half single vehicles with just a few not having any vehicle, then there is the addition of works vans/national rail trucks parking here over night or for days on end, taking up more than a car length in space. Their simply isn't enough spaces for the amount of vehicles that live here so the residents will end up paying for something that won't even guarantee them a place to park anyway let alone taking account of cars from adjoining roads. Those people from say malling road, Birling road etc that park here would be forced into other roads, causing congestion in other areas, still all the while not actually solving the problem...just pushing it elsewhere, leading to a nice money making scheme for the council to rake in money for essentially useless parking permits. Thirdly are any concessions going to be made for those who can't afford to purchase a parking permit, like the elderly/disabled/single parents/single income homes. Not everyone has the luxury to be able to afford these extra expenses in the current cost of living crisis. How is the council going to police this potential permit area? Parking attendants? The double yellow lines at the bottom of Bramley road next to zeldas fish bar for instance always have cars parked on them throughout the day and evening, the lines at the top of Bramley road and recreation avenue have cars parked on them most evenings as do the lines at the top near the recreation grounds. Nothing is done about those.
Snodland	Bramley Road			Continued Driveways are often obstructed by other vehicles, vehicles are parked on the curbs due to frequently being hit by large vehicle ignoring the width restriction signs at either end of the road, the two disabled bays close to my property, have vehicle parked in them every evening not displaying disabled badges and nothing is done about those either. Allotment owners, school run parents, dog walkers etc all frequently park in recreation avenue for ease of access to the park and beyond, how are they going to be policed? In summary it's a terrible idea that will solve nothing in the long run and cost the residents money for something that they won't be able to use anyway due to lack of space. The end.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	Price is too expensive. I already pay road tax to have my car on the road and doesn't guarantee parking outside my house. It doesn't stop large goods vehicles using the road. They are constantly driving up and down the road, damaging our cars because they are too big & we are not given any reimbursements for this. Also the street is empty during the day so timings won't work!
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	In response to your letter regarding the possible introduction of permits along Bramley Road and Recreation Avenue Snodland I have huge doubts this would be of benefit to the residents of Recreation Avenue if permits were introduced. Currently down Recreation Avenue there is very limited parking and tonight 26/05/23 9 spaces are occupied by residents of Bramley Road. Leaving Recreation Ave residents to park along Birling Road or a 5 minute walk away in the car park. I would be made to pay and still not be able to park one of our vehicles down the road we currently pay council tax on. I propose and would be happy to pay if residents of Recreation Ave have sole use of the parking down the Recreation Avenue and not down Bramley Road. Residents down Bramley Road who have a drive, park a car which does not move on Recreation Avenue. Another resident saves a space daily for her daughter who lives on the next road even though they have a drive. People continually park dangerously on the double yellow lines and fines are not enforced. How will these permits be enforced? My main concern is this will not benefit residents of Recreation Avenue at all. We will be forced to pay and still not be able to park as the road is full of vehicles from Bramley. If separate permits were offered for each road this would be of a huge benefit to us. I don't think forcing the working residents of Recreation Avenue to pay on top of a cost of living crisis is fair, beneficial or stop the selfishness of residents. Please keep me updated on the progress of this case.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	Permit also needed between 6pm and 8am cannot park after 6pm, work vans take up 2 spaces and people with drop kerbs and drives park on the road anyway. People using allotments and play park during the day need to have permit 24 hours.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		Also there are 2 disabled spaces. I believe that they are no longer in use for any of the residents. Please Confirm. Thank you
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	How does this help the parking situation? The people that park in these two street live here. The only time non residents park here is to use the rec. what would really help the problem is to implement parking bays so that the same number of vehicles would be parked every night. far too often vehicles park badly leaving large cars but not large enough to park in. in theory all you are doing is charging us to park nothing will change.

Annex 5

Snodland	Bramley Road		1		What a ridiculous idea where are people meant to park, are you making a new parking area for all those who live on Malling road? Why should any resident want to pay for a permit when they live in Bramley road. Most people in Bramley road would not want extra expense. We all pay road tax, council tax, income tax, where is the extra permit money going to appear from? Also what about those without cars ie the elderly now their visitors cant park nearby or the carers? If you work nights and need to sleep during the day you will have to have a permit is that fair? Most people work all day and lots dont get home till after 6pm (when anyone can park in the road How is this helpful. If every house in B.road had a car there still isn't enough room for them all to park. So how is having a permit going to help. This idea has not been thought through and is an appalling waste of time and expense. Is this what you tget for having a Conservative Council in this area why oh why can't someone relaise this proposal will not help any one except the council who will have extra money in the bank. Which ever residents suggested this I can only assume they thought the permit would be free.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			An excellent idea, However, different coloured permits for Recreation and Bramley. No more dropped kerbs.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		I object to the proposed changes, even though I have a driveway for one vehicle we are in actual fact a two car family. I do not believe the proposal will be adequately policed, as the existing double yellow lines are not policed effectively, as it is. Therefore I do not want to pay for the privilege under those circumstances. What about Sunday? Presumably it is anyone can park between 6pm Saturday and 8am Monday? Some examples off parking in Recreation Ave.. How are you going to police users of the allotments who park in Recreation Ave.? How are you going to police users of the Recreation Ground? How are you to police mums who park in Recreation Ave and walk the children to Roberts Rd and St Katherine's schools. We already have several vans and larger commercial vehicles parking overnight in Bramley Rd and Recreation avenue which are taking up a lot of room. There are 66 properties in Bramley and 17 properties in Recreation, there will simply be not enough spaces to go around if they all purchase permits and households will be paying for a privilege that they may not be able to use. I assume the intention of 8am to 6pm is that residents should be home and parked before 6pm after which anything goes. This does not allow for NHS and other workers who work long hours and do not finish until 8-9pm. would it not be better to have permit only parking overnight from 6pm to 8am?
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			Road has got so much worse/difficult for many reasons... Most of the elderly residents have moved on and new younger families moving in and bringing more cars Residents and visitors park thoughtlessly. The new cafe and the long established Fish and Chip shop bring people to the area and they often park without care, making it very difficult to drive from Malling Road into (and out of) Bramley Road. One of the worst things of living here is the road being used as a cut off and cars travelling too fast, drivers getting impatient and extremely rude with residents who are trying to parallel park or unload shopping. To protect the businesses in the area it is important to keep the Car Park open and free. I often have to park in the car park overnight as there is no room on the street after 5 o'clock in the evening. I am not sure that there will be room on the street even with this scheme. How will the council enforce this? A warden? We don't even have the street cleaner down Bramley Road now. I don't have high hopes of this making any difference, it might make car owners more aware of the space they take up. There are a couple of cars hardly ever used on Bramley Road.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		The road has 40 parking spaces with 3 additional disabled bays serving 60 plus houses. There is not a great need for parking permits during daytimes as the majority of residents are at work. Parking after 6pm is more of an issue, due to the residents returning from work unable to park, and also struggling to find spaces in the car park at Rocfort road. From Monday to Thursday 10am - 6pm there are 12-18 spaces available during this period, with Friday slightly lower 10-15 spaces from 10 am - 4pm. Just before 6pm from Monday to Thursday there are 3-4 spaces available, and at 7pm 0-1 spaces. Friday is normally full by 5pm. Cost involved to residents during the cost of living crisis and no parking spaces after 6pm, doesn't give the residents any benefit for paying for a permit when spaces cannot be guaranteed unless this was resident parking from 6pm to 6am. As it currently stands we are not in favour of permit parking as there will be no benefit to the residents.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		I am not in favour of the Borough council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Bramley Road shown on plan DD/598/19. The map you sent out needs updating about parking bays. In Recreation avenue #1,1a only have two parking bays,#1b only has one parking bay. #4 has a white line/ dropped kerb(which we paid for and got permission from yourselves) to allow mine and my husband's car to be parked outside our house or a member of my family. Also the same for #8. Bramley has also got less parking bays. Holborough lakes ban commercial Vehicles why not do that and make them park in the car park. I've had to complain to network power over a commercial vehicle that was being parked illegally (on corners, across peoples drives, on pavements). They seem to have sorted but more traffic wards should be out ticketing them! It shouldn't be my job to complain. If you give permits out the elderly that have cares won't be able to see them or will have to carry around equipment. We need more parking areas as the one in Snodland is too small. Instead of building more houses. Why should I pay for parking outside my house when I have already paid for a white line and drop kerb!
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			I think this is a good suggestion as long as it is policed properly. However, I recall a few years ago we voted for a one-way system which was passed but a minority number claimed not enough had voted and so it was cancelled. Will this be the same?
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		I am not in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Bramley road, Snodland shown on plan DD/598/19. This is a terrible idea, restriction times proposed are also not the times when parking is an issue!
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		Not in favour. Would be in favour however I'd like a designated parking spot e.g. numbered spot I'm at work during the day so paying for time I'm not parking. The parking problem is at night time 5pm to 8am not 8am to 6pm I live here for 30 years no problem parking during daytime only at night time
Snodland	Bramley Road	1			The concept of permit parking will not be of any benefit because after 6pm it becomes impossible to park in Brimley road and on Sundays many visitors fill the road with extra vehicles. Object to having to pay in the road we live in.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1		We shouldn't have to pay for a permit to park on our own street. Permits should be free for one car per household with proof of address. Seems like the council is trying to take more money off people who are already struggling.

Annex 5

Snodland	Bramley Road	1		I write in relation to the proposed residents permit scheme in Bramley Road, Snodland, of which I am resident at no [redacted]. I am not in favour of the proposal for the change of on-street parking by the council. As a resident of this street for over 10 years, I do not believe that this will achieve anything. The vast majority of the vehicles that park here do belong to residents. The parking issues are most prevalent of an evening, after 5pm, when residents return home from work/school etc. A permit will not reduce this issue, all it will do is cause a further strain on peoples finances in a time where people are already struggling.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		I approve of the parking permits and would be happy to subscribe but a couple of points I would say are- No works vans, no transits as they take up more than one space. Only allow one permit per household.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	Not in favour, comments not relating to proposal but rather requesting permits in Snodland carpark.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	My grandparents have been sent a letter regarding a new permit parking area in Bramley Road, Snodland, Snodland East & Ham Hill Ward. They have lived at [redacted] Malling road for 54 years now and have always parked there car in Bramley road, does this mean if the permits go ahead then my grandparents will receive one or is it just the people that live on Bramley road that will only receive one as there back garden leads onto a alley that takes u to Bramley road, my Grandmother is very unsteady on her feet so my Grandfather parks the car in Bramley road so my Nan can walk up the alley into their garden and she can't manage the steps outside her property.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		I think its about time due to the amount of cars using the roads(Bramley/Recreational avenue) when they live on the other roads also maybe consider the size as they are not fitting in the parking lines.
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	I am NOT in favour of parking permits. Reasons: If I pay £52.00 for my one and only car, When I get home after 6pm, I will definitely not be able to park if: - residents from other roads park in my road - you provide numerous permits per household - traffic wardens are not visible between 6pm and 8am. if I use my car on Sundays, I will have nowhere to park on my return. Suggestion: - permits for residents only, 6pm to 8am, 7 days per week. This is generally the only time the road is too busy to park. Unfortunately your plan is not beneficial to one car households, workers, people returning home after 6pm. If you later introduce car parking charges in Rocfort Road, my permit could be unstable and I'll have to pay car parking charges as well! I hardly ever see a traffic warden in Bramley Road, during the day or in the evening. People park on yellow lines and on corners. Nothing is done about it. I doubt you will be able to provide extra staff and I doubt residents of other roads will obey.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		am in favour of the borough council's proposals for the changes to parking in Bramley Road. I have a question Is there a plan in place for paying for a permit and still not being able to park? Also, the selfish parking of many residents who don't care that they put their car in the middle of a space that could fit 3 cars, as long as it is outside their window, or those that park 3 or 4 feet from the end of the bay lines so no one can park there either.
Snodland	Bramley Road	1		I am in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for Bramley Road, Snodland shown on plan DD/598/19
Snodland	Bramley Road		1	I m just emailing with regards to a letter that I have received where permit parking is being considered down Bramley Road in Snodland. I would like to say that I have not in favour of this and do not wish to have to pay to park down my road as I do not see there being a current issue
Snodland	Nevill Road		1	It will make parking a lot harder and cause more trouble, defo not
Snodland	Nevill Road		1	No comments supplied.
Snodland	Nevill Road		1	The disabled bay outside No.24 is no longer there-it was removed some time ago. Yellow lines opposite our address would only cause parking to worsen. The grass areas you want to yellow line would be better utilised as parking spaces as residents park on the grass anyway! We are fortunate to have a driveway so yellow line opposite us would not be of any benefit.
Snodland	Nevill Road		1	if you remove the trees and grass as highlighted on the map this would create appr 8-10 more spaces. There isnt enough spaces now which is why I park inconsiderately
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1	I do agree that the parking is terrible on one side off the road, And some yellows would be good on the bends and one side road to allow bigger vehicles emergency services to be able to pass. I m NOT in favour of the parking permits I have to park out on the road at the moment as the trees are leaning and branching right over from the other side fence so I cannot park in my bay, I have contacted council many times still nothing has been done about the over growing trees as we can only park sideways away from the branches
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1		I'm in support. I'm fed up of selfish parking by residents and non residents. Residents park where they like, don't park in their space. Allow their visitors to park behind their car (not a parking space) and then you're unable to get in and out of your space. There are 2 visitor car parking spaces and residents use them as their own personal spaces. Will we need a permit to park in our own space? Will this stop people parking willy-nilly?, if not then we need yellow lines in the carpark to stop people parking selfishly. Residents are fully aware of how many carparking spaces come with the house. Who will enforce any new rules? So many questions and noone to answer.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1		Can I have double yellow line around the driveway at [redacted] Howard Drive please, I am fed up with coming home and find cars parked across the driveway, even while I am at home, people parked in front of driveway. On one occasion we had to wait 10 mins for the driver on the car to return so that my daughter can leave out for work, enhance she was late for work.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1		Regarding the reference above, we are IN FAVOUR of the Borough Council's proposal for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive, Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/21. Comments: Living at [redacted] Howard Dr, we have always had concerns about access and visibility. There have been numerous occasions whereby Fire Emergency services would not be able to access Howard Drive due to cars parked adjacent on the stretch of road marked yellow on your diagram.

Annex 5

Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I wanted to voice my opinion and concerns regarding the permits and double yellow lines that have been proposed. Myself and my husband agree that it would be beneficial to put double yellow lines on the main road for safety aspects. We do not however believe that permits are necessary and are very much against them. These properties were built for families and as such it is inevitable that the households will have more than one vehicle over the years. I am very surprised that any resident would feel it necessary to introduce them. I personally, have never witnessed an individual using Howard Drive to park when they do not reside here. Again to confirm, we are against the proposal of permits in Howard Drive.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I'm not in favour of you restricting the parking even further. The residents will then park around the corner taking up more people's spaces!!
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	I will start with the positives. I am fully in favour of the yellow lines being extended to allow better access into the road. Regarding the idea of permit parking I am fully against this as is every resident within the road I have spoken with. We have a good community and through discussions no one has requested these. During the day the road is nearly empty of vehicles (please come and survey this and do the correct research). Of an evening it is only residents that park in the road. The road was built full of family homes and therefore maybe in hindsight more thought should have been put in by yourselves at the time of approving the plans regarding parking? People will respect the yellow lines and only park where allowed therefore any sort of permits of an evening would also be totally unnecessary. No other persons park in the road and then go elsewhere (there is no where to go), therefore meaning the only people this would benefit would be yourselves as a money making scheme. We would never have purchased a property on a road with permit parking. I know most residents will be writing very similar responses and we very much hope you will listen to the wishes of those that live here.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1			I have previously, over a period of considerable time, expressed great concern about the positioning of double yellow lines on Howard Drive. My expressed concern has been, and continues to be, road / driver safety. In this regard Your recent letter has only heightened this concern. Where you are planning to extend the yellow lines does not take account of the actual issues of access and egress. These lines would potentially give a slightly clearer view to the exit/entrance drive for two residences. The exit facing this, on the other side of Howard Drive, serves not two but fourteen residences, so at least seven times busier than that outlined or covered in your initial proposal. I say 'seven times' but, with the regular activity of delivery drivers, who pull in and out this access/egress opening, the multiple is considerably higher. This means that vehicles allowed to park beside No 1 Howard Drive, where there is a gap in the marking, can completely block the view of drivers wishing to exit onto Howard Drive. This is particularly dangerous, and has already led to multiple near misses, when they are turning to the right to exit the development via Norwich Avenue. On previous occasions I have sent photographs to illustrate and exemplify the safety issues so caused, and would be happy to forward images of this daily situation and forward to you again. If you ultimately insist on extending the yellow line to accommodate the less busy entrance-exit as illustrated, then I would strongly petition, with my thirteen neighbouring households, for the same double yellow lines to be continued on the opposite side to safely facilitate and protect the much busier, and more dangerous, entrance-exit on this side. I have attached an illustration to clarify where the double yellow lines should be extended.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1			I live at [redacted] howard. I believe that every household has an allocated parking spaces. Some households have more than which I appreciate but there are plenty of v spaces on the estate. I do believe that in my opinion that the whole estate should be made double yellow lines. Residents and Non residents are parking their vehicles and obstructing other residents drives, in front of back gates. No emergency services would be able to get through due to lack of consideration of other people and erratic parking.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1			Whilst we broadly support this initiative it will only move the problem elsewhere. Have you already considered the implication of this as the nearest available parking is opposite Coventry Road where there is already congestion. Furthermore, the people from Coventry Road already use this location due to congestion in Coventry Road evidenced by the fact that some people park completely on the pavement. The second point I d like to raise relates to the monitoring and adherence to a new policy. There are already areas marked with double yellow lines which people regularly park on. Whilst some parking patrols do patrol the area they only seem to be around at what one would describe as office hours when many people are at work. There is no point having new restrictions, old or new, if it s not monitored appropriately.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		Happy with yellow lines, not permits another cost we cannot afford I should not have to pay to park on my road. Disgusted you are proposing this on a road used by residents. No where near a station or town. Non residents do not park in our road, this is not an issue. the poor design, lack of allocated spaces per property. More Comments - Contiunes about not enough space and the we should visit to see the problems if any.
Tonbrige (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements, I will detail my comments below; 1. I do not believe the majority of residents have requested a permit scheme, this is the general consensus on the street's Facebook group. Although we do feel the current parking situation and the difficulty of entering Howard drive due to cars parked either side does pose an issue in an emergency situation. This would not be improved by a permit scheme as the same people parking would be fighting over the permit spaces - at an expense to the residents, which will cause neighbourhood issues/arguments, whereas currently it is a pleasant street to live on. 2. The permits would be a money making scheme as opposed to improving the parking situation. The increase of double yellow lines on one side of the road would suffice, leaving enough room for emergency vehicles. 3. I am not aware of any non-resident parking. Howard drive is not central to the town centre, shopping centres or station, therefore non residents do not park unless visitors of residents. 4. When I first moved to Howard drive, 12 years ago, the houses were allocated parking spaces (some allocated 2 spaces/some allocated 1). I do not feel it fair to now have to pay for the privilege of paying for a space through a permit scheme at the expense of the resident and the gain of TMBC when council tax rates are already sky high. 5. The permitting of Howard Drive will push vehicles to park in further estates/roads - simply moving the issue rather than solving it.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	I have attached a scanned copy of my response to the proposed parking restrictions. I am against the permit parking and oppose them fully. You should be aware there is a Howard drive group and no one is currently for the parking permit so should these be introduced there will be further investigation from the residence. I am fully in favour of the extended double yellow lines and feel these should also be extended through the inside of the ring on the centre part of Howard Drive meaning cars can only park on one side along the whole street.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1			I am in favour of the Borough Council's proposals to the changes to the on street parking arrangements for Howard Drive, Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/21. Comments: I would say it does not go far enough. There are huge moving vans that would obstruct an ambulance on the narrow close (and have). They also make it difficult to park under to coach houses, where designated parking is, sometimes blocking it due to how narrow the street it. I would argue, considering how narrow it is on Howard Drive, cars should just park in the giant car park, where hardly no one parks, and double yellows should go around the close so you can't clog up the close.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I cannot afford anymore outgoings also I have friends that visit that would not be able to pay the cost. Also its unfair my world is small enough without having friends to visit.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		It is not save to park in the carpark behind our house in the carpark because you get the kids playing in the carpark and the cars are not safe. I don t trust leaving my car in the carpark at all.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am not in favour, my carers cannot attend me if they had to pay 12 per visit. My daughter cannot visit from birmingham as she could not afford 12 per visit. I cant afford it and parking here is not a problem. Cars parks here are empty.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am not in favour of the proposal of parking permits. Why should we pay to park on the drive. We have had 12 years with nothing, then this proposal. What we need is to stop all commercial vehicles parking around the estate. The double yellow lines to be extended is a good idea. But why permit Howard drive only. What about surround area's. Seem to me that the council are penalising just Howard drive residents. We pay enough on rent and council tax. With the cost of everything else going up this is not the right time to asked for more money. If you only permit street parking and not the driveways all that will do is move those cars on the these driveways. Again I think this is just for the council to raise more funds for them self's. How's about not paying ridiculous bonuses to the boss's. If this does go through I will not be paying for it.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		Firstly, I am not opposed to the new double yellow lines. In fact, I believe we need more of them in our road. Particularly on the side of the road from no' 10 to no'18. This is where the parking is its worst, as cars park on both sides, making it extremely difficult to pass. Also, the new proposed lines should be extended to the whole corner of that side of the road (all the way to meet the current lines next to no'113. This is another problem area for vehicles parking on both sides of the road, which also restricts the line of sight for cars coming around that corner. Secondly, I am VERY OPPOSED to the idea of making our road part of your permit scheme. My reasons for this are below: 1. Parking permits will not solve the current problems. People will buy their permits and still continue to park wherever they wish. 2. The problem with parking in our road is not due to constant non-residents. It is caused by many people not using their designated drives, because they wish to park in front of their house. If they have 2 cars, they don't wish to park away from their home, so they park in front of their property, regardless of who is already parked near-by. 3. We are currently in a cost-of-living crisis - to ask residents to start paying more money simply to park in their own road is very unfair and inconsiderate of current affairs. 4. I rely on relatives to assist with my childcare, so that I can work. I cannot afford to keep buying visitor permits, just so that I can work and pay my ever-increasing bills. 5. Residents need to be encouraged not to park on the existing double-yellow lines, including their visitors. I see this happening on a regular basis, and it's basically because they know we rarely have visits from parking wardens. The council could make a fortune in permit fines if they visited our road regularly. 6. Residents need to be encouraged to use the existing 'V' spaces dotted around the road. I see these empty very often. 7. If possible, you should pay a visit to the 'Howard Drive Facebook Page' and view the recent comments about your proposals. Many residents are amazed that apparently "Residents have requested a permit scheme". I think you'll find this is highly disputed. Please don't hesitate to contact me for any clarification needed on the points I have raised. I would appreciate being kept up to date with the status of your proposals.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	Please can you confirm the proposed parking permits will not apply to my privately owned spaces In corner car park down the side of 69
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive	1			I AM IN FAVOUR of the Borough's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive, Tonbridge as shown on plan DD/598/21 as it is desperately needed. I myself sometimes struggle to get through and I drive a tiny car!!! so any emergency vehicles would have problems getting through as it stands at the moment.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am emailing as I am NOT in favour of the proposed parking arrangements. The idea of having a permit scheme is so irrelevant and to be honest I just see that as the council trying to make money from us! We live in North Tonbridge, there is no need for permits at all!!! I do know the parking is terrible in certain areas and cars are parking on both sides of the road, leaving very little room for normal cars to get through let alone any potential emergency services. However surely this can just be solved with yellow lines. Some residents here have 2 parking spaces and don t use either of them! We only have 1 but have 2 vehicles. Why can we not get a second allocated space? To make clear, I am totally against permits. I am in favour of yellow lines.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I appreciate that there has been some pretty dodgy parking, especially at the very beginning of the road. Some of these vehicles parked there are either not residents, or are residents who have parking spaces and do not use them! I fear that introducing permit parking will just move the issue elsewhere and poor parking will continue further along the road. Would it be better for TMBC to fund traffic wardens for a period of time (in the evenings when the issue is at its worse) to effectively catch the few perpetrators who continue to spoil it for everyone else. Hopefully with fines being issued or even cars being towed away then that would give warning that TMBC are serious about dealing with people who frequently cause a problem. I believe parking on a pavement could be illegal - so there is your first port of call. At the end of the day I feel that some of this parking is anti-social behaviour. It would also help if TMBC did not allow residents to build a hairdressing salon in the postage stamp sized garden whereby clients are frequently coming and going. This not only uses up valuable spaces but clients are now parking in Resident parking bays. It is just just a few people causing the parking issue and it could be quite easily solved. I am requesting that you do not consider making it difficult for those of us who do park legally and do not cause these issues.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I do not believe this to be the answer to the roads problems. All vehicles down this road are Owned by residents. I believe maybe having like they have in westerham! Where you park on one side of the road one day and the next the other side and then parking wardens check. That works very well on there roads and I believe much better than permits
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I understand from my neighbours that there is a proposal that Howard Drive in Tonbridge will soon be permit parking? Apparently this is a request from residents due to frequent parking by non-residents? I can assure you this has not been requested by the residents of Howard Drive, we are a small close miles away from any commuting facilities and no one would need to park in our road if they didn't live here. We do not want parking permits. Please can you let me know how residents can oppose the proposed permit parking and make a complaint?
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am not in favour of the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/21.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1	1	I just wanted to clarify the following if possible. I have a designated parking space, so does this mean I will not need to purchase a permit should it come into force? Does this also mean that if I have a visitor who parks in one of the car parks they will not need one either? The permits will literally be needed if a car parks on the street? It's just that I have a carer who visits daily, will she be ok if she continues to park in the car park?
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I've decided that I am not in favour of the proposals to create parking permit restrictions on Howard Drive. This is because there have been a couple of occasions when somebody I do not know has parked in my designated parking space. If this happened under the permit scheme then I would have to pay to park on my road, either via a permit or visitor permit. I also believe that it is possible that such incidents could increase. This is because people without permits may choose to park in other people's designated spaces.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive		1		I am NOT in favour of the proposal for parking permits in Howard Drive, Tonbridge. We have just received a letter through the post as an informal consultation to introduce parking permits for residents of Howard Drive to 'stop non residents parking in the street' I have lived here for 11years and other than workmen and visitors to the houses on the street, I have never been aware of non residents using our road to park on so this is just an excuse and seems like a money grabbing scheme in a time of financial crises by TMBC. We are the opposite end of the town to the Train Station and not close enough to any amenities that people would use our road to park at whilst visiting anywhere else. There are issues with parking on certain parts of the road at certain times of the day, mainly in the evenings. However this is residents parking on both sides due to the poor design/foresight and need to cram as many houses in as possible with glitter thought to parking when the estate was built. Each house has 1 space allocated to it and there are various visitors spaces. A lot of households have 2 vehicles, so once the spaces are used up (by residents!), you have no choice but to park on the road. Under the scheme, I would be forced to shell out £52 if not £104 to park in my own road AND £12 per 10 visitor permits. So what is happening is after a complaint or two instead of coming down to see what is happening, TMBC are going to penalise the whole road for some inconsiderate parking by some Residents in some parts of the road mainly at night when everyone is home. Maybe if you/the landlords/came round and actually looked at the problem and then first communicated with the residents who live here asking them to stick to terms of tenancy, (r.e.commercial vehicles), to be respectful of others and use a bit of common sense when parking and then fine any individuals who were causing a parking nuisance rather than penalising the whole road? I agree that some amendments to the yellow lines would help with this and would actually go further than the proposed. Maybe a 'we understand here is a parking/access issue, how can we help resolve it' consultation rather than a 'give us your money!' to solve the problem one would have been better received? I am quite honesty disgusted that TMBC are even considering this.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive				Continued As I said, it smacks of a money grabbing scheme and I very much doubt the money directly to improve our street ...like properly fixing the constant potholes at the entrance to Howard Drive on Norwich Avenue that keep getting temporary fixes that fail regularly. I have passed a similar email to our local councillor Anna Cope as have several of my neighbours who are also extremely angry about this proposed permit plan. I look forward to hearing that this ridiculous proposal is binned and we can work on sensible ones that will work.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	I agree with the double yellow lines but not with the permits. A lot of residents around here are on low incomes so may not be able to afford a permit. Therefore they and visitors will end up parking in nearby roads then creating issues there. We shouldn't need to buy a permit for our allocated parking spaces only if parking on road. Double lines also need to be put in place all the way around Howard Drive on one side to stop double parking and people parking on kerbs. So many residents don't use their allocated spaces, this needs to be enforced some how and this will free up a lot of road space.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	I understand parking is a big problem within this road and I would support double yellow lines but would NOT support parking permits as I feel it is unnecessary to charge residents who are already struggling to pay their bills. I agree something needs to be done as emergency services would have great difficulty getting around the road. My views and are opinions are as follows. 1. The housing estate was built for families and the children of those families grow up and learn to drive so when planning and building the estate this obviously was not taken into consideration. 2. Three bedroom houses were allocated 1 parking space and 4 bedrooms allocated 2, which is a shortage of parking straight away. My parking space is at the side of my house and that could be made into 2 spaces. 3. Car parks often have rubbish in that the residents leave there until they get it picked up. 4. Green areas could be turned into parking areas. 5. Residents saying police advise them to park in front of there house for security reasons. 6. Residents using other residents parking area. 7. Residents visitors are often quick visitors to pick up or drop off and are often inconsiderate and park anywhere. But residents who have friends or family visiting normally park properly. My opinion for parking would be make residents aware of their allocated spaces are and that they use them and offering a space for their additional household car/s. Allocate a central visitor parking area (I m not sure where) but it doesn't have to be many spaces. Also if you charge for permits residents would park elsewhere causing obstructions in other roads.
Tonbridge (Cage Green)	Howard Drive			1	I writing to respond to the proposed parking restrictions in Howard drive. I feel that parking permits will not work, as this will not stop people parking either side of the road blocking access. I think yellow lines all around either side of the road will give access to emergency vehicles and residents
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road			1	Following a recent letter sent out to residents of Lawrence road about proposal of yellow lines I'd like to state that I'm not in favor of the proposal. The reasons are, Currently there isn't enough parking in the road for the residents as it is, this is hampered by other residents of adjoining roads using our road when there isn't parking in their road. Also it would seem that vehicles parked in adjoining roads are also untaxed, and, or mots expired too. We can also find that the caravan in Hunt road, hasn't been used, moved or worked on this year and has even been put up for sale by the owner on Facebook marketplace. That in itself should be removed with these other cars to allow residents of Hunt road to park near their houses and not in Lawrence road. Although I agree with the use of yellow lines to make junctions safe, they aren't needed in Lawrence road. Putting yellow lines in, will reduce the parking even more within the road. The entrance to the garages hasn't shown to be a problem with me. Also the idea of yellow lines down one side will look awful too. I feel that implementing yellow lines isn't the solution but moving the problem somewhere else. I'm happy to discuss with someone from highways at the roadside if required.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road			1	Thank you for getting in contact with the residents of Lawrence Road to inform us of the proposed new double yellow lines to be instated on the right-hand side of the road. (DD/598/22) I am sorry to say that I strongly object to this proposed idea for the reasons stated below. There are 34 houses listed under Lawrence Road, plus 2 houses (3 & 4) along the pathway between Lawrence Road and Higham School Road who have the right to park in Lawrence Road. I have myself counted a maximum of 27 car spaces currently available to park on the left-hand side of the road, less under your new proposal. I fully appreciate that there are a number of driveways, predominately on the right-hand side of the road, but this still isn't a sufficient number of available parking for all 34 (plus 2) houses. When this road was built in c1955 I appreciate the car situation wouldn't have been a consideration, but in 2023 most people now have cars, with some even having 2 or more (myself not included, along with at least 3 other residents who all only have 1 car each per household). This does not include the fact that residents of Hunt Road also park multiple cars and larger vehicles along Lawrence Road. The number of vehicles; cars, vans and larger, has increased over the years and has led to parking in places that might not be appropriate or safe, such as the pavements and grass verge. I myself have on a number of occasions had to park on the pavement opposite. My working hours do not fall into a neat 9-5 job and, whilst I feel guilty and worry about parking on the pavement, there really isn't any other choice. Hunt Road and the top of Whistler Road are always full too. I do however make sure I never park in front of other residents' houses or driveways. The introduction of double yellow lines will only exacerbate the parking issues that currently plague Lawrence Road – made worse by the proximity to the school and its use by staff and parents either at peak school times or throughout the day. Rather than putting double yellow lines in, which from an economically point of view I guess is the cheapest option, I would like to work with you to come up with alternative solutions to solve the parking problem that Lawrence Road currently has.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road				Continued Your cheapest option would of course be to do nothing (which is better than your proposed solution). Having spoken to a long standing resident and neighbour in Lawrence Road, I understand that cutting into the large grass area on the left-hand side has been suggested in previous years. I am led to believe that this was declined due to services being underneath. In this day and age where services are now easily moved, and with careful thought and consideration on logistics, I feel this should be a viable option. To not consider it, would suggest another underlying reason is the real reason for this not being considered. Other options: 1. There is a rather steep gradient to the grass area, but I wonder if being able to tarmac over the top and add bay parking between the trees might be an option. 2. Rather than a cars length being cut into the grass area to make a bay, would you be able to push this back a cars width? Rather than cars just parking down one side of the road, this would allow enough room to have cars parked down either side of the road with the main thoroughfare, one cars width, in the centre. Having lived in Baltic Road before moving here, it works really well and is demonstrated on a number of other roads in South Tonbridge. Not only is there the main grass area on the left-hand side of the road, but there could also be usable space for a couple of cars on the right-hand side along the fence line of 178 Hunt Road and before 2 Lawrence Road. Please take this communication as a very strong rejection to your proposed plan of adding double yellow lines to Lawrence Road, and I look forward to hearing from you in the future with regard to other more workable solutions.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		Further to your posted letter regarding the informal consultation for the proposal to restrict further, available parking in our cul-de-sac, Lawrence Road in the Higham Wood area of North Tonbridge we are writing to strongly object to this proposal. Firstly, the text of the letter seems to have been taken from previous letters in a similar strain as it mentions that you are seeking the views of "immediate residents and businesses" this is an entirely residential area with a primary school and no businesses. Secondly, we have not met any resident in our road who is seeking, or even believes, more restriction will benefit our community. The resounding desire certainly is for more parking facility, which has not been effectively addressed for decades, by Clarion and its previous incarnations. We joined a waiting list in the mid-1990s for a driveway and, when we exercised our right to buy in 2016, we were still no closer to that being realised. Finally, with the ever-closing requirement for electric vehicles, driveways are absolutely the more urgent need, notwithstanding the huge disparity of cost between a driveway and yellow paint. Perhaps you could pressure Clarion for some serious estate investment, rather than their headlong investment programme in building new housing (which is far more lucrative for them) and rather than focussing on disrupting further our road which is already suffering from inadequate parking. The big issue we suspect, is driven by the melee, twice a day during term time, caused by a huge variety of cars (and drivers with differing levels of competency and who seem to ignore all types of restrictions in any case) visiting our road to drop off children to Woodlands School causing a potential safety issue for children and/or their parents walking into the road around parked cars that would be illegally parked if there were double yellow lines in place. However, there is a perfectly adequate footpath on the other side of the road well away from parked or moving cars. We have copied our MP Tom Tugendhat into this email, primarily to alert him to this very detrimental proposal and also, so that he may offer help to TMBC in brokering a sensible conversation with Clarion, at the highest level, for an improvement in parking facility.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road				Continued We find it unhelpful that no timescales have been informed to us through you communication, simply that there will be further stages – although we sincerely hope this will be dropped, in lieu of Clarion stepping up with a swift roll out of additional driveways, along with EV chargers.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		What will double yellow lines achieve, where do you think these vehicles will go ?, what about a permit scheme, or use the 6 meter deep grass verge on the left hand side of Lawrence Rd. (odd numbers side) for extra parking.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		In favour of Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street-parking arrangements for Lawrence Road, Tonbridge, shown on plan DD/598/22
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am in favour of double yellow lines in Lawrence Road.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		Following receipt of TMBC's proposed parking restriction for Lawrence Road, I have the below comments. Although we as a household acknowledge that there is an issue with parking on the footpath and unsafely on the road, we feel this plan doesn't show how TMBC propose to provide alternative parking? After all the vehicles will need somewhere to park. Furthermore, will there be a permitting process implemented to increase parking on the road for residential use.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am very much in favour of the proposed line painting. I work as a nurse and come home late in the evening and it is awful to get up my road in my little car. The emergency services would have no chance, putting residents at risk.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am in favour of the borough council's proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for Lawrence Road, Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/22 This is a very good, long over due idea. Over the years of living in Lawrence Road we have suffered with many cars parking with all four wheels on the path right outside the gate and the hardstanding. If you ask them to kindly move you normally get some kind of abuse from them. I don't know how disabled people, or people with prams are meant to get by a car parked with all four wheels on the path. There has been many a time when we have had to walk on the road and have in matter of fact have nearly been knocked flying by impatient drivers. We have witnessed kids nearly been knocked down. I really don't know how emergency vehicles manage to get up the road. Some thing really does need to be put in place and give the police some more power to get the vehicle's shifted.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		As in every road parking is at a premium and with your proposal you are taking parking away which will make things worse. Looking at the map, how about taking some of the grass away to make residential parking as we contend with school parking as well.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		Having lived in Lawrence road for 13 years I have never been obstructed from or had any difficulty in accessing my property and our property is the last house on the left. Where I do have an issue is where vehicles park opposite the entrance to Lawrence road in Hunt Road making it difficult and dangerous turning in and out of Lawrence road. The highway code advises drivers not to park within 10 metres of a junction. It is not unusual to face oncoming vehicles on my side of the road.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am in favour of the proposals for changes to the on-street parking for Lawrence Road Tonbridge as shown on plan DD/598/22 Comments: Problems occur with parents driving and collecting their children to/from school and parking in the bay and on the pavements, maybe this could be monitored on a regular basis and warnings issued, this would ease congestion in the road, and ensure the safety of the parents and children using the pavements.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		Very much in favour but would need to be properly enforced.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road			1	I'm not against the proposal, but it would help if you could make the garages available to rent as it appears no one can rent them, even though 3/4 of them are empty.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am not in favour of the double yellow lines due to; There is barely any parking as it is People park on our road who doesn't even live on the road School mums/dads park on our road and when we have to drop our children off else where and then come home there's no where to park Having small children and I know there's a fair fee elderly people living up this road begin able to park outside your home is a life saver. Either we need permit holders for people who live in the road and the road only! The right side of the road all need double drive ways so that then the left side of the road can park in the road and the right side have their own drive ways so there is enough parking for everyone The garages that are on our road that do not get used need to be turned into parking spaces and only permit holders so only the residents can use them There is not enough parking on this road as it is and it doesn't help that people work different times etc so the time some people get home there is no where to park It is outrageous that you can even consider double yellow lines maybe if you was to actually come out and count how many houses there are to how many parking places there are you would understand especially when people are using the road for school runs and people that don't even live in our road! As there is only four people on the right side that don't have drive ways
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I am not in favour of the borough councils proposal for changes to the on street parking. reason against is I live in Lawrence road and find it extremely hard to park now when I come home late from work .So many Tennant's have three cars and driveways which leaves very limited parking for everyone else..most times the only option we have is to park up on the pavement leaving enough room still for people to walk by .In addition to this we also have residence using our road to park that actually live down hunt road. Adding double yellow lines would only restrict my parking more and as a older lady with back problems and other health issues do not want to be carrying shopping or walking in the winter parked somewhere else because I can't park out side my own property.One idea would be give parking permits to residents of Lawrence road
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I'm writing in response to the proposal of double yellow lines on Lawrence Road. I am NOT in favour for these to be put in place as this will essentially make parking much worse than it already is. No one currently parks along the right side of the road so these yellow lines will make no difference to that side. This directly impacts myself as I live at number [redacted] Lawrence Road. This will take a few essential parking spaces needed on Lawrence Road and make parking worse. There is a caravan parked on hunt Road which has sat for over 2 years with nothing being done with it taking up a valuable parking space for residents on hunt Road which impacts us on Lawrence Road as they end up parking on our road. I hope you take this into consideration when making your decision.
Tonbridge (Higham)	Lawrence Road		1		I would like to state that I am wholly against the proposals for double yellow lines. There is already insufficient space to park for the 34 houses in the area. The road is also liable to people parking from Hunt Road as there is insufficient parking available to them as well. Removing alternative parking options without supplying any extra spaces, would result in large numbers of residents not being able to park anywhere near their home. I have lived on this road for around 10 years and people have always parked on grass verges etc, but without any issue as this is a quiet road without any through traffic. People just walk around obstacles without any issue.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		I am NOT IN FAVOUR of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Royal Rise, Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/23 and comment as follows:- 1. The existing "No waiting , Monday - Friday 9 am - 4 pm" (single yellow lines) have had little effect but are sufficient and in my opinion are preferable to double yellow lines. Parents dropping off and picking up their children still park up and wait despite the restrictions in place. Every single day a parent parks up outside my house and waits for at least 45 minutes to collect their child. This will still happen regardless of whether the lines are single or double as traffic wardens do not patrol the area at the peak times of the parking and waiting and so no enforcement occurs 2. Despite a reminder on the Hillview School for Girls Newsletter distributed every week to parents asking for consideration and courtesy to residents in the roads within the immediate vicinity of the school and asking them not to park and to drop of their children away from these roads this reminder is ignored and cars still enter, park and drop off. 3. The inconvenience of dropping off and picking up only occurs during a short period time from approx. 8 am - 9 am and 2.30 - 3.45. It is to be expected living within close proximity to two schools. 4. I am concerned that the implementation of double yellow lines will impact greatly and have an adverse affect for the residents of Royal Rise. Family and friends visiting at any time during the week or weekend will not be permitted to park in the road at all. Would the Council provide visitor parking passes/permits free of charge for residents to use as and when required? 5. The Existing "Access protection" marking (white line) and existing "No waiting, Monday - Friday 9 am - 4 pm (single yellow lines) need to be renewed and traffic warden patrols need to commence by way of further deterrent. Your consideration of the above points would be appreciated.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		We have had single yellow lines for years no parking from 9am to 4pm Monday to Friday. Which has stopped the students parking during school hours. It's the parents that wait from 3pm ish waiting for students that's annoying. It is very rare and I mean very rare to see a traffic warden policing this so I can't see this changing in lieu of installing double yellow lines. It would be nice to see the current restrictions in forced. Weekend where do our visitors park if the restrictions are in place 24/7. So I objected to double yellow lines completely.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		We already have parking restrictions which are not regularly enforced so what is the point. Also if we have double yellow lines where are visitors or contractors to park.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		Changing the current line to double yellow lines will not prevent the obstructive parking if it is not monitored. It will also mean the home owners will be unable to park on the street or in front of our own driveways. What is needed is monitoring of the current restrictions, which if followed by the obstructive parkers, will be perfectly suitable.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		In general, I am in favour of having double yellow lines "No waiting at any time" in Royal Rise. However, those of us who have family and friends visit at weekends where will they park? Would it not be possible to restrict "No waiting at any time" from Monday to Friday? Monday to Friday are the worst times when parents and friends pick up their children from Hillview and St. Stephens Primary Schools, they park anywhere. I would also add that a sign reminding drivers that the speed limit is 20mph be erected.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		There is a constant nuisance Monday to Friday due to cars being parked on the single yellow lines. Whenever people park on the other side of my property I cannot access my parking bay easily and I need to do manoeuvres.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		I am NOT in favour of changing the on-street parking restrictions in Royal Rise Tonbridge. I feel the current restrictions of no waiting between 9-4 on week days are adequate. This still allows residents to park overnight and their visitors at weekends. Parents wait illegally on the current yellow line for 20/30 minutes to collect their children from school so I can't see that increasing to double yellow will make any difference at all to their behaviour. All it will do is make it much harder for the residents.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise	1			I am in favour for the changes shown on this plan
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		Drawing DD/598/23 is wrong - existing Access Protection marking is in front of drive for 24 Royal Rise and is to remain as such. Existing No Waiting Mon-Fri to remain but consider extending to 6pm - school and commuter traffic is the issue. However, parents collect children from school and already park on the existing No Waiting and existing No Waiting At Any Time areas. There are no consequences for school parents actions therefore the proposed changed will have little to no impact on them. Proposed No Waiting At Any Time is detrimental to residents having family and friends visit at weekends and evenings.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise	1			Whilst, I have no objection to the proposal, I am surprised to see that my drive entrance is shown as double yellow lines, whilst it should be "Existing Access Protection ie a white line. This was an error in the past which was corrected however, the white line has faded and the double yellows are showing through now. Please can you correct the council records and should this proposal go ahead, can my white line be repainted to avoid any further confusion.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		I strongly object this proposal. The current parking restrictions of the single yellow line are more than ample for the small inconvenience that the local schools cause at drop off and pick up time. Changing these single yellows to double lines would only cause problems to the residents of Royal Rise, predominantly at the weekend when visitors are more common. Furthermore, I would not be able to use the one permissible space of parking across my driveway (white line) due to the location of my opposite neighbours driveway. If a change must happen, please consider alternative options: a parking attendant at the relevant school drop off/pick up times; or parking permits for residents.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Royal Rise		1		This will not solve the concerns about the dangers posed by the traffic caused by the parked cars at school end. It is currently against the parking regulations to park there at that time but as it is not monitored during this time (3-3.15pm) it will remain a problem and then cause issues for people parking there outside of school hours when it is not a problem. Having spoken to many other residents they agree that this seems to be aimed at residents rather than the waiting cars at school exit. The only way to stop this from happening and avoid any incidents is to monitor the existing single yellow between 3-3.15pm if this was to happen once a month in my opinion the issue would be resolved.
Tonbridge (Medway)	Mill Lane		1		My partner [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED] Hadlow Road, Tonbridge, TN9 1NY. We have received the informal consultation letter of a proposed amendment to the parking restrictions which is essentially to create additional parking space outside of/adjacent to our property. we are generally in favour of creating more parking spaces in the area, however, we do have particular concern as to both the safety and potential liability that comes from extending this particular parking space. We have a very large oak tree in our garden that overhangs the road. As the tree is in the conservation area it is protected and thus anything more than pruning requires approval. We are thus not able to pollard the tree or remove the tree (the tree has caused subsidence to our property at a rectification cost of £200,000). As an old oak tree, it does have branches fall onto the road below and, when this occurs, I remove them. There was one substantial one last year that fell. I attach images below taken of someone unknown parking in the proposed area to give an example of the overhang of the tree onto the road: (photos provided) As is evident, the tree overhangs the proposed parking space(s) considerably and thus we have concern both to the safety of people parking under the tree and the liability for any falling branches or debris from the tree onto either people or the vehicles. As people are not allowed to park here at present, I have no concern for that liability (they are illegally parked) but that liability would transfer in the event that the parking was made legal. I object and am not in favour of extending the parking arrangements in this instance on the premise of the health and safety of those parking in the proposed extended areas and on the basis of any legal liability that may arise from such extension with a protected large tree that overhangs the proposed parking space. I should, however, add that in the event that my objection is not successfully taken into account and TMBC proceed with the parking space extension proposed, I will be seeking indemnity from TMBC for any liability that may forthcoming in the event that damage to persons or property occurs from falling debris and branches from the protected tree on our property.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase	1			The junction of The Chase and Trench Road should be included.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		There is not enough parking space at present and this will only cause further issues and bad feeling amongst neighbours. Where exactly are residents meant to park. We park one vehicle on the hill and 2 if we can't get outside our house. Plans for safety are great, if extra parking is provided in another location for residents.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		Lack of parking already. Where else can we park. Households from forest grove also use the chase to park. So definitely not enough spaces if yellow lines extended. The reason seems to counteract what actually happens. Because cars are parked down the hill actually slows traffic rather than endangering people. The chase is a run through for trench road, where cars speed, however have to slow down for parked vehicles. This surely is a positive point for the vehicles not a danger.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		Yellow lines outside 37,39 and 41 are completely unnecessary as parking outside by essential visitors (trades etc) do not cause any obstruction to oncoming traffic. There are existing lines across the road on the bend. These are abused regularly as no regular enforcement takes place. This causes potentially risky situations as drivers who overtake in middle of road have no view of oncoming traffic. Start the lines beyond 41-where you have posts indicated. Has any consideration been given to where all the cars will end up being parked? There have been altercations between residents about existing parking, such is the problem. Forward planning would be to liaise with Clarion re the grassed areas at start of Severn Close. Several safe parking bays could be put in place. I am somewhat surprised that the very dangerous parking situation at start of The Chase has not been considered and cannot understand your wish to deprive three responsible households (37, 39 and 41) of road parking which is completely unnecessary and would result in distress to those concerned.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		We do not want yellow lines outside houses no.41, 39 & 27 as we do not have any parking issues here. We suggest yellow lines finish at the alley post and yellow lines are extended at The Chase junction with Trench Road. Also adopt grass areas for extra parking.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		If this were to be implemented, the restrictions would need to extend further than the current proposal. If the proposal were to be implemented, then people would simply park further up the road, which is already dangerous to navigate given the amount of parking on the road. From 46 the Chase, and the lower numbers leading towards Trench Road, no parking restrictions have been proposed, which will cause problems for the residents in that part of the road. It would also be dangerous, because the parking on the top half of The Chase is already sufficiently dangerous - it is difficult to get a car past some parts and there is a lack of visibility due to parked cars blocking views. Therefore I reject this proposal, and suggest if the council wishes to implement parking restrictions on The Chase, that they should be extended further up the road in order to avoid dangerous parking, and to also avoid creating problems with parking for the residents further up the road.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase	1			Although agreeing in principle with the extension to the double yellow lanes proposed for The Chase, Tonbridge, it appears that no consideration has been taken as to where the cars that already park in the affected area will park in the future. Therefore pushing those cars and the problem further up and down the road and into an already congested Avon Close. A possible better solution would be to extend the yellow lines only on the inside of the bend (going uphill) and also around the corners of Avon Close on the opposite side. Then extend the lay by in The Chase adjacent to 1 Avon Close all the way up the road to Severn Close. This would both allow the safe and free flow of traffic up and down The Chase and cater for all the cars that currently park there. The grass verge on that side of the road is approx 20 feet deep and would therefore easily cater for the space required by the lay-by and still leave a sizeable grassed area for aesthetic purposes. In the short term this may be a more costly but with more and more cars on our roads perhaps it is a better longer term solution. Costs may also be saved by the reduction in mowing needed by the grass cutting contractors.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		I have lived here for almost 30 years and parking in this road has definitely got busier as households increase the number of vehicles they need to park but there are many more roads where that poses a safety threat. To my knowledge there has never been an issue with accidents due to parking obstructions or lack of visibility in this road so I believe these parking proposals will just make parking in other areas more challenging. I believe the issue here is more about speed of many drivers who do not live here but use the road as a cut through. I would much prefer speed restrictions to be imposed....slower driving would immediately reduce the risk of future issues. Alternatively you may wish to consider creating parking areas by reducing the grass verge area opposite thereby widening the road.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		where are the residents going to park their vehicles is the council going to provide alternative parking as not everyone has a drive or can afford to have one installed
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		here are the residents going to park their vehicles is the council going to provide alternative parking as not everyone has a drive or can afford to have one installed
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		the possibility of not being able to park near my property fills me with dread where would I or my children when visiting park, with the current anti social behaviour in the area parking a distance away would cause me great anxiety and im getting older so having to carry shopping further between car and home would be an issue. in the 20 years i have lived at no. I am not aware of obstructive parking outside and i believe the parking restrictions would devalue my property.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		There is not enough parking here for the residents as it is, a good idea would be to insert drives on all houses down The Chase as these homes are able to accommodate them, the streets coming of The Chase have no options of driveways so why isn't the grass verges from Severn Close to the bottom of the Chase turned into two spaces per household for Avon Close
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase			1	I cannot say whether I am in favour or not in favour the reason being where are they going to park, possibly in our road of avon close, which takes our parking away, suggest make the grass verges into parking area that should help a lot.
Tonbridge (Trench)	The Chase		1		I am not in favour of these proposed double yellow lines. I have lived in Avon Close for 2 years and have not known of any major traffic collisions in The Chase since I've been here. I regularly drive on The Chase and have not found it to be unsafe or affect my visibility. If double yellow lines are put in place this will cause major disruption with parking to adjoining roads, such as Avon Close, Severn Close, Trench Road and Derwent Road. Avon Close is at full capacity with its residents cars already. I have two young children therefore being able to park as close to my house as possible is imperative to their safety. I hope these proposed changes will be scrapped.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		I am not in favour of the proposals for changes to the on street parking for forest grove and Shipbourne Road. I am the only house i think that doesn't have a drive way, I would like to know where I could park my car if u put double yellow lines outside my house i have two children one with and one with . So I would need my car near to my home. The obstructive parking is on Shipbourne road when the black Range Rover and a white van are parked you can't see to turn right safely. If you were to put double yellow lines in the whole of forest grove where would we park our cars ?
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		Limited parking available not suitable for double yellows around the green maybe one side of the road when you enter
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		Firstly I have not seen any obstructive parking around the centre Island of Forest Grove and both I and my visitors have been able to drive around it. Not everyone has off street parking so where do these residents park their cars without obstructing access to their property as we don't have pavements here? This will only cause more parking issues in the street. As someone who leaves the street at around 2:40am to go to work, the issues I see are with main access from shipborne road to the end of the pavement part of the of the street and at times there are vehicles double parked around the area of number 7.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			Will benefit refused collectors as they often cannot access road. Most residents have off road parking available.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			This needs to be done. Its horrific to think emergency vehicles wouldn't be able to attend my house because of completely selfish parking on both sides of road

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			Good afternoon Andy. Please excuse my email format. A while back I spoke to you with with reference to double yellow lines across our disabled access driveway. We are right next to the bus stop that may have a new bus stop clearway soon. We are at XXXXXXXX. We are still having many problems with school parents and neighbours parking across or obstructing our driveway. We are very worried also that if the new bus stop clearway comes about that it may obstruct our driveway even more. Please could you look into adding double yellow lines across our driveway at the same time that the proposed works are done here and Forest Grove. My husband and I live at XXXXX. My husband [REDACTED]. I did put a request to you with reference to having double yellow lines across the disabled driveway. For a long time now we have been having problems with neighbours and school parents from Cage Green school parking across our driveway. It is a very busy road and a real problem to get in and out of our driveway at the best of times. There is Cage green road exactly opposite us and the bus stop right next to us to contend with. We are not against the bus stop clearway proposal but ideally we would also like there to be double yellow lines across our driveway to prevent further obstructive parking. This issue has worsened since the double yellow lines were installed on the Shipbourne Road opposite our house.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			But perhaps set out the green as a parking area by removing the grass for visitors & people with more cars can be parked in front gardens.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		I am NOT in favour of the council's proposal to the changes of on street parking arrangements reference DD/598/26 in Forest Grove. As a resident of living here for over 4 years parking has always been an issue when the road is busy, i.e bank holidays and weekends, however, I, like many others in the road, have no driveway therefore we park alongside the green to access our houses. With yellow lines in place, residents, and their visitors will have nowhere to park and will either proceed to park on the yellow lines, or alternatively block in driveways so they are able to park close to their houses! I sincerely hope many other residents feel the same way and you strongly consider the negatives of this action.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			As it is a small cul-de-sac emergency services and collection of waste have difficulty in having access also can i point out the entrance to seven close trashing grass verge and blocking disabled rear entrance hope you consider this in your plans thank you
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		As you can see I'm very much against this plan you have suggested. I would like someone to ring me as soon as possible please. Emailing and comments on paper are not enough for this very big argument we are all going to have about this stupid and careless thoughts on this (No Through Road) with bright yellow lines ect. Come up to Forest Grove and face all the tenants ans to those who have brought there homes and havent got parking! What bright spark who has no idea of all the consequences of this stupid project!! for one have never been so angry and thinking what idiots proposed this!. Yes, we are very angry. I've had people knocking on my door. And as I've lived here 48 years I expect my say! We all expect our say! If you are not coming to us then maybe a face-to-face meeting could be possible. Yu are wasting money on such a unnecessary pointless task. Why dont you fill in all the potholes surrounding us!! Thats necessary all the way through Tonbridge. And also wheres my family and friends going to park! on my roof? Builders, electricians ect... going to park when doing work up here? Take notice for a change of what people want who have to live with changes in a very small road. its not harming anyboy so is it possible that you listen for a change. Its not your road is it? Its my road and our road! Please ring us all and find out for yourselves!
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		No comments supplied
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road			1	Where are we meant to park our own car if we don't have a drive very wary of parking elsewhere with the likes of cars being burnt out or damaged. Maybe parking wouldn't be as bad if people only had one vehicle or do away with the green and use for parking.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		I am currently [REDACTED] and having double yellow lines around the whole green will be very difficult for me to park somewhere and juggle a baby. Also everyone around the green drives so would have nowhere to park and will make it extremely difficult.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road	1			We are in favour of the proposed double yellow lines but I would also like to mention that it is extremely dangerous trying to turn right out of Forest Grove onto Shipbourne Road. There is no visibility due to parked cars and so many cars have nearly had accidents. is there any way the double yellow lines can be extended here, and along where the green bush in Forest Grove is as this becomes a parking zone and our drive gets parked on all the time. I fear that with the new double yellow lines our drive will become blocked.
Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1		I AM AGAINST THE PROPOSAL I have lived in Forest Grove for 29 years we have never had any problems with parking. We all have our own parking places and all respect each other. If you go ahead and put double yellow lines in, where do you suggest I park streets away from my house, when I have family and friends round it would mean they cannot park near my house. In your letter it states that residents have reported problems with obstructive parking. If you took time to come round you would clearly see that it is only on the first part of the grove when you first come in, we call this the straight. This is because people do not use their brains and park one side of the road they park both sides. We do not have a problem and never have had a problem around the horseshoe part. When you stand at the top of the road no one parks on the left-hand side of the road, it is only on the right and no more than 8 cars park there at one time. This is what I suggest you do 1, take 1/2 of the green away and put parking bays in righthand side, you would get around 12 cars which gives us a few spaces for families and friends 2, get residents to clean their drives up and park on them 3, put drives in for everyone 4, people who live on the right-hand side of the grove, as you stand at the top of road could park around the back of their property's, this is because they have gates into their gardens. So, they could park in the garden. I think you really need to listen to us as residents we live here not you. What about the elderly & young families who have babies

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Trench)	Forest Grove & Shipbourne Road		1	In response to your letter of in terms of New double yellow lines and bus stop clearway, I am in favour of some elements, not in favour of others. I have broken them down below The double yellow lines proposed as you enter Forest Grove, so going past House No. 1, I am in favour of these The double yellow lines proposed on both sides from house 16 to 18 to 32, I am in favour of these. The double yellow lines proposed around the 'island', I am not in favour of these double lines. I believe there are a number of residents who do not have driveways, and they need somewhere to park. There is a risk that if all of this is implemented in Forest Grove, there will not be enough parking for all of the residents. Not everyone has a driveway, or a driveway large enough for two vehicles. I don't particularly understand what you are proposing re the bus stop on Shipbourne Road, but I am not in favour of a bus stop clearway, I don't see what the benefit to this is. Hopefully this helps with your decision making.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Baltic Road		1	These is already limited parking with cars being pushed up from further down the road because of the very large vehicles and the new development at the Kent optic site at the bottom of the road, it will cause even more people being pushed up the road to find parking.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Baltic Road	1		We fully support the double yellow lines being extended. We have seen how difficult it can be exiting their driveways from the rear of these properties. We often suffer the same problem as we are next to their driveway. The 20mph speed limit is seldom adhered to on this short stretch of Baltic Road, so by extending the double yellow lines, it will allow more visibility and will make entry onto Baltic Road much safer! Some people park right up to, or slightly over the designated parking areas making a right turn completely impossible for users of this communal driveway. I would also suggest extending the yellow lines across the road to the left of the access of Bloodshots Reservoir - I have watched as they struggle to turn in with sometimes large maintenance vehicles to access the grounds of the reservoir. It makes a huge difference just having an extra meter or two in which to turn, especially when there are cars parked on both sides of the road. We are close to the Tonbridge Grammar School so students and residents utilise the free parking.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	As far as I know none of the residents are in favour of all day permit parking and no 123 has yellow lines so I am sceptical that there is any problem to reduce. The current system works to deter commuter parking but allows occasional visitors, work vans etc to visit during the day when the road is not usually full. proposed changes would just be inconvenience residents and cost us more money.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	This would be a very bad idea. It is important that we residents can use occasionally visitors and traders etc who can short stay park without us having to provide a permit. I am not seeing what problem this solves.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	This is a totally disproportionate reaction to a non-existent problem. We are really not clear why this is being suggested. We have lived on Woodside road for 18months, we have never experienced any issues during day time hours. Indeed extending the hours would create more problems when residents need work done or trades people or carers visit properties. The big problem is parking in the evenings. We already have double yellow lines and it is not clear from the proposals where these would be extended. In addition the planning permission for 123 Woodside Road did set out the closure of the parking space outside that property but with the commitment that a space would be created on the other side of the road to compensate. To date this has not been created. Please could this be attended to before any further proposals are suggested.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Following the letter we received at Woodside road, TN9 2PB. We would like to comment that we are "not in favour" of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangement for Woodside Road As a road we do not suffer from commuters parking in the hours outside the permit as there are plenty of spaces available during the day Increased permit hours would be an inconvenience and would seem unnecessary to have to spend more money on visitor badges etc.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Proposals will mean residents will have to buy more visitors/ tradesperson permits if the restrictions applies all day. This proposal may be fine for those with off street parking but not for the vast majority of woodside road.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	I strongly object to change. The current restrictive period, which is 9.30-10.30, not as stated in your mail, is adequate. However, the point surrounding parking outside 123 Woodside, is inaccurate as Parking bay has been removed thus creating less parking space in an already over subscribed road. I did ask for a Member of the Parking Team to visit, this alone would have ensured the factuality of the information given. Sadly this has clearly not happened. I cannot believe that any resident wishes to change the current situation, as would be nonsensical in every way. Thankyou for this opportunity to Once again express views and to reiterate...Woodside Road is not, and should not be viewed as a Cash Cow for TMBC.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	I would like to submit a vote not in favour of the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodside Road, Tonbridge, shown on plan DD/598/28. Firstly, I note a couple of errors in the plan itself: a) the proposal states that this plan is to "deter non-resident parking and that obstructive parking is taking place outside number 123". As of earlier this year, the parking bay has been removed and there are now double yellow lines outside number 123, and so there has been no parking outside number 123 at all. b) the markings on the plan are incorrect, as the light blue line depicts an existing restriction of Mon-Fri 8:30 - 9:30am Permit Holders Only restriction for the whole road, whereas the current restriction is actually 9:30 - 10:30am Mon-Fri, in line with surrounding roads. Importantly, the reason I do not support this proposal, is that there are not often issues with parking during the day. We do not often feel a detrimental impact of non-resident parking during the day, and it is instead in the evenings when residents return from work that parking becomes an issue. As such, the current permit restriction is fine, as it deters early commuter parking. To implement an all day (8am - 6pm) restriction is therefore only going to be detrimental to residents themselves, as it will be our visitors / tradespeople attending our homes during the day who would be impacted. Given residents already have to purchase parking permits to park in Woodside Road, we feel that this would be an unfair imposition. It feels that this proposal is an unfavourable solution to a problem which does not exist, and is only disadvantageous to the residents of the Road. To note, the only part of the proposal which would be supported, is the addition of the two additional spaces at the South end of the road, which would be welcomed given the aforementioned removal of the parking bay outside number 123.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Ludicrous. There are yellow lines o/s 123, and no parking there, obstructive or otherwise. There is absolutely no need to change restrictions times the current system work well. It aint broke don't fix it. Total nonsense the whole thing.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Your proposals are ambiguous. Many years ago yellow lines were introduced to discourage unauthorised parking. Now you are proposing to remove double yellow lines and introduce permit holders in front of driveways. Double yellow lines should remain. If you eliminate DYL vehicles will park on either side of Woodside Road and service vehicles will not have access to households. You make reference on your action plan that households can apply for more than one permit, which in my opinion defeats the object of improving a parking plan. Surely the houses that do not have a driveway should have a restriction of one per household.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposals for Woodside Road. I have to say I am quite surprised by them and would like to make a couple of points in support of some of the ideas and object to others. Firstly, I think it is fantastic that additional car parking spaces are being proposed as the road gets full very quickly after working hours. So any additional car parking spaces are welcomed with open arms. I see no issue with the two additional spaces provided. Can I clarify something regarding the bay outside 61 Woodside Road - this is not double yellow already, rather it is an existing bay. Please can this be changed so this is correct - or are you proposing to remove this bay? If so, I would strongly object to this. There is another issue outside what is now 123 Woodside Road. There was a car parking space outside which has now moved. The planning application for the new house required that a new bay was put on the opposite side of the road. Now as far as I am aware, neither can be done without consultation and so this plan should replicate the position that there is still a bay outside the house. I would strongly object to this bay being moved and not replaced with commensurate parking at the top of the road for a new household which should not take things away from existing residents. If the design of the property prevented that - well that's the builder and purchasers fault only. The impact should not fall to others. Lastly the permit parking restrictions change is bizarre and object quite strongly. I don't believe there can be many people who would suggest that this parking arrangement is a good idea. Fully appreciate the need for parking restrictions at an odd time during the day to prevent all day parking but to have a long window of time stopping parking between 8am and 6pm is crazy. The road during those hours is not overly busy and I don't believe Woodside Road is attractive enough for commuters to park in to walk to the station and there are no businesses up in this part of Tonbridge that would need employees to park on street in residential roads. Other than a single resident making this comment, what evidence is there that this is the case?
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road			Continued If the Council is minded to support this, could I suggest that as an alternative similar parking restrictions to St Mary's Road i.e. permit holders only between 8.30-9.30 and 1-2 Monday and Friday. Again thank you very much for sending through the consultation letter. Can I ask for the errors to be corrected and for the consultation to be restarted.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	I object to adding double yellow lines. there is no where near enough parking as it is. Secondly yes extending the permit hours to 6pm is great news however it is not good enough!! Parking during the day is not the issue here so I am not sure why this has been raised. There is always parking available during the day. The problem is for anyone who arrives home from work from 7pm onwards has nowhere to park. It is impossible to find parking if you arrive any time after 6pm. the permit hours should be extended to 10pm!!! Lastly in the past 12 months there has been a significant increase in permits given to large work vans/transit vans. this is completely unfair given they alone take up 2 parking spaces. There is no where near enough parking so why is the council allowing permits for work vans! Yes the permit may cost more but those owners dont care as it would just fall under work expenses for them. And if they dont park close up against the car in front / behind thats easily 3 spaces gone for 1 vehicle when there is already not enough! I have bought and own a house on woodside road, I pay for a parking permit, and I pay a huge amount in Concil taxes, I should be gaurenteed a parking spot when I return from work in the Zone I live. The permit hours should brle revised to 10pm!
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road	1		No comments supplied
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	1. Increasing restrictions would effectively prevent the many care and health workers from making their frequent necessary visits to my [REDACTED] wife. 2. Availability of parking spaces outside the current restricted hours is generally good and spaces are usually available on weekdays.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Because there's no need for any changes. Wasting money on a pointless exercise.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Parking during the day on this road is never an issue and therefore we do not support the changes to making it permits all day long. after speaking to many residents on the road not one person seeks to support these changes so it s a mystery as to who the residents are that requested these changes! Our road is not used for general parking so it s really not an issue. One visit by parking attendants during the day would see that. We do support removing the double yellow lines to add spaces outside the now unused garage after house no 1. That seems like a very good idea!
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road	1		No comments supplied
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	I am NOT in favour of the Borough Council s proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodside Road, Tonbridge shown on plan DD/598/28.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	Object to extend to 8am-6pm. The current timings do not cause problems and must be retained.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1	We are already a crowded road for parking due to residents, not commuters. To have extended parking restrictions would cause many problems for visitors and tradespeople needing to visit. Please do not do this in woodside road, I definetly oppose the proposal.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		Thank you for consulting with residents around the proposed changes to parking restrictions on Woodside Road. The proposal is in three parts and I would like to respond to each in turn - Introduce double yellow lines outside 123 Woodside Rd - this has already happened so no resident feedback required. Remove the double yellow lines outside 61 Quarry Hill driveway - I support this part of the proposal, as the driveway has never been used by the occupants of 61 Quarry Hill. The driveway has also recently been built on with a one storey dwelling so there is no intention of parking a car on it. Releasing this space for residents of Woodside Rd would be welcomed. Extend permit parking to 8am-6pm - I object to this part of the proposal as it is trying to resolve a problem that doesn't exist. In my experience there is not an issue with non resident parking during the day Mon-Fri. There are normally parking spaces available during these times so all this would do is mean that residents have to purchase more visitor permits if we have guests or tradespeople visiting our properties after 9.30am. Visitor permits are expensive and if the proposal is accepted I'm sure that other residents would simply advise guests to park on Quarry Hill, Quarry Rise, or Springwell Road rather than Woodside Road. This in turn would increase parking stress on nearby streets.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		Not only am I a resident of the road but I am also a community nurse in which I know there are a number of patients that reside in Woodside Road. Restrictions will affect our services. A lot of our patients are unable to provide myself and colleagues visitor permits and it is unacceptable that parking restrictions mean that we have to be faced with penalty charges for carrying out our job roles. Our trust don't pay for this. We do. We want to be able to carry out our jobs without having to worry about being fined for a days work. Not only this but the current restrictions of 9.30-10.30 are fine. We do not have problems with commuters parking in the road during the day. It's never been a problem. Parking is awful in the road - yes, but you don't need to make it worse. Some residents of the road aren't able to source visitor permits, so you will cause problems for those that are unable to source them.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I am not in favour re extension to restricted times for parking permit holders. This will hugely impact residents who will incur increased costs for visitor permits for carers/friends and family. Also to my knowledge there is not a problem with unauthorised parking as people generally avoid this road at all cost.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I strongly object to the plan to make 8-6 residents parking only in Woodside Rd. Parking is not really a problem weekdays during the day Weekends and evenings it can be difficult to find a space I no longer own a car and arrange for tradesmen etc to come after 10.30 when there are usually lots of spaces. Maybe add restrictions from 4-6pm to prevent commuter parking but I really do not see a problem as it stands at the moment. I believe there is no need to alter anything it will just make things difficult for me and could prove costly
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I don't have a car and it would be costly and a nuisance when friends and tradesman visit.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I received a letter regarding an informal consultation regarding parking on Woodside road in Tonbridge. I am writing to strongly object to the extension of the time zone for residents only parking. However I do more than agree with the two additional spaces on the proposed plan. We have recently lost the space outside #123 which has had a big impact on evening parking on the road. It doesn't seem to have appeared on the other side of the road which I believe was the original plan? So the new additional parking spaces proposed are very welcome. In terms of the extension of the parking restrictions to all day rather than the current 9:30-10:30 is ludicrous to put it mildly. We have very few issues with parking spaces during the daytime - it is the evenings that are an issue where we don't have enough space. All this proposed action would do is cost us more money in visitors permits as both visitors and tradesmen would be more restricted and the knock on effect of these on surrounding roads would probably be huge as people avoid having to purchase visitors permits for Woodside road. So to summarise totally agree with the proposed additional spaces and fundamentally disagree with the extension of the residents only time zone.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I am not in favour of the proposed changes to extend permit parking to between 8am-6pm mon-fri as I believe this is unduly restrictive for visitors and tradespeople. As a resident I am happy to provide visitors permits in the current restricted times but feel that moving this to cover all normal working hours will deter much needed tradespeople from visiting and issue we already find challenging. I strongly oppose this suggestion.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I am not in favour of the extended restriction times on Woodside road. It will have the effect of moving more drivers to park on Quarry hill where it is often impossible to park anywhere near your own home. I would be in favour if all of the local restrictions were changed, including Quarry hill. I would also suggest some sort of bollards marking the entrance to the access points on Quarry hill to stop people parking over the access and making it difficult and very dangerous to drive out. I would also suggest bringing back the barriers to stop driving all the way up Quarry Hill on the footpath as this is also very dangerous and people go too fast up there. Its also meant a deterioration to the green areas as lots of delivery vans and lorries as well as cars cut corners and drive over the grass which is now just mud baths in places.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		This is completely unnecessary, the road does not have parking issues during the daytime and the 9:30-10:30 permit requirement stops commuters. By extending this it just adds another cost for visitors permits for residents who already pay to park on their road. Please do not extend the times.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		This proposal would make short stays for visitors and tradesmen difficult, and delivery people.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I object as proposed. I would support the changes subject to one minor adjustment. The existing double yellow between #1 Woodside Rd and #3 Woodside Road should be extended by 50cm at either end, but particularly towards #3. At present access to the offstreet parking for #1 can be blocked by poor parking. The access is only gained by reverse parallel parking. The changes proposed may compound this problem and limit access to our property. By modestly extending the existing double yellow for the drop curb outside #1 it would guarantee our car could be off street freeing up parking for others and facilitating a change to an electric vehicle consistent with the councils objectives for climate change. With this amendment we would fully support the wider proposal.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I would like to express my objection to the proposal to extend the parking permit controls to Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm. This would cause more problems than it solves., Actually, I do not believe there to be a problem with people parking during the day. There are usually spaces. It would just cause more problems for having visitors and anyone doing work at my property, not to mention the additional expense of visitor permits. I do welcome the additional two spaces that have been proposed
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I object to the plans to increase the parking restriction times and I also am frustrated that the removal of the parking bay outside no 123 has not been balanced with a corresponding bay being introduced elsewhere. As a resident at Woodside Road I find that the current parking restrictions work well enough. If anyone visits me (especially my elderly parents) then I am satisfied that they can park near to my house without fear of being penalised. I strongly suspect that you will not entertain giving us residents a generous number of visitors parking permits each and every year as compensation (or free parking permits) and so cannot support this proposal. Your assertion that this is to deter non-residents is spurious - this is not the easiest street to negotiate; nor is it close enough to the town to encourage non-residents to park here. It is also not the easiest of streets on which to live, given that two sides of the street only have one side on which to park, some households have multiple cars and there are precious few parking spaces in the vicinity. This last point must be obvious to you given the sheer extent of red lines and lack of light blue/green lines on your drawing. Your proposal seems vindictive and money-orientated. It strikes me as another attempt to extract money from council tax payers because of budgetary constraints caused by central government. I also suspect that you are giving us a really bad proposition in the hope that we will be happy with just a bad proposition at a later date. Finally, I doubt that residents (plural) have complained about the current situation and if all of the facts and options were laid before us residents then the vast majority would probably choose to continue with the status quo. As for the parking bay removal, there is a space outside 1, Woodside Road that is now available, having been kept clear for access to a garage belonging to 61, Quarry Hill Road that no longer exists. Please investigate making use of this space since no 61 clearly no longer needs the access.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road				I am writing to communicate that I am strongly not in favour of changes to parking on Woodside road. I am quite confused by the suggestion to extend restrictions to all day as a way to deter non-resident parking. There's already restrictions 9.30-10.30 to deter commuters. We aren't close enough to town for people to use the road for that purpose and there's plenty of spaces during the day. It seems like this solution will do nothing to deter non resident parking but will mean I have to pay more for visitor parking on top of my parking permit which has increased significantly. I have heard there's a proposal for double yellow lines on quarry bank. I'd strongly oppose that as well given the parking situation in south tonbridge. I believe spaces on st Mary's road were recently reduced. If the number of spaces we can park decreases, then perhaps that should be reflected in the cost of the permit next year.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		I have lived in the street since 2005 and in that time, the parking situation has steadily worsened. Principal issues: People parking on the double yellow lines at the top of the street and blocking access for emergency vehicles People parking on their front garden with the vehicle significantly encroaching on the pavement Number of households with multiple vehicles Size of vehicles - as house prices have risen, there are may more enormous SUV s on the street that are too wide for the bays and either protrude into the road or the pavement Local businesses and tradespeople parking commercial vehicles on the street overnight without a permit as they leave before restrictions apply People using cones or barriers to prevent other residents parking. People damaging parked vehicles trying to park their own Changes to the provision of temporary permits The proposed changes do not go far enough in my view and the parking in the zone needs significant revision. The proposal to extend the restrictions from 8am to 6pm during the week will not address the large transit van from a Maidstone-based landscaping business leaving their van on the street all weekend. It won t stop those parking on the double yellow lines at the top of the street from parking there because there are no spaces left on the street. It won t deter people acquiring multiple vehicles and large vehicles. I would prefer parking restrictions in place at all times except for perhaps two weekday daytime exclusion zones - as with many residential streets in Tunbridge Wells and London. To coincide with this, a new process for purchasing temporary permits is needed. It used to be simple - you provided a sheet with the permit. Then you bought additional sheets. Now the process is unwieldy and ridiculously complicated. I also think permits should be more expensive for multiple vehicles and larger vehicles - SUV s, vans, camper vans should all incur more cost as they take up more space than a standard car and are worse for the environment. There is also a question to be answered about the number of permits issued as well. We are now at a stage where if I come back from work after 8pm I cannot find a space anywhere in the zone and instead must drive past commercial transit vans filling the bays and cars parked across double yellow lines.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road				Continued In an environment where car ownership is being actively discouraged due to the climate emergency, it strikes me that a total reform of the parking provision, where residents can purchase one reasonably priced permit per property for a standard vehicle, perhaps incentivised for smaller/electric/hybrid vehicles, and supplement that with easily attained visitor permits should be the baseline, with parking restricted in the main and only unrestricted for short periods. Additional vehicles, larger vehicles, commercial vehicles should a I pay a premium for park. I understand from my neighbour that most people are in favour of leaving things as they are, but given how ineffective the current arrangements are at stopping illegal parking, something definitely needs to change.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road		1		This is to confirm we are not in favour of the proposed changes to permit restrictions outlined in the proposal.

Annex 5

Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road			1	With reference to the above, I am writing to object to the proposed extension to restricted times for existing permit bays. I do not think that there is a problem with non residents or non visitors parking during the day. The existing restriction is already problematic for arranging visitors and tradesmen. Extending the restriction will cause further problems and further expense. I do not think we should have to pay to have visitors to our home! I do welcome the addition of the two spaces. In fact, I proposed these changes. We do not understand the point in your letter regarding the "obstructive parking is taking place outside number 123". There are double yellow lines where we used to have a space. I don't think anyone is parking outside the off road drives. I would like to point out again, as I did to the local Councillor, that the off road parking at this location has not fundamentally changed since the new house was built. I understand that it was a condition of the planning permission, but it was not necessary. Nothing has changed, except that we lost a precious parking space! Can I make a formal request that this space is reinstated? Do I need to do this separately from this response to the current proposals?
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road			1	Please take this email as an objection to the proposed changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Woodside Road Tonbridge on plan DD/598/28.
Tonbridge (Vauxhall)	Woodside Road			1	Firstly, I am not sure which residents have requested the all day parking permit controls this proposal refers to but any residents I have discussed it with are also against it too. We are already paying for resident parking permits which don't guarantee that you can park due to multi vehicle households and I can't see how all day parking permits will make any difference to this at all. The same vehicles already seem to regularly park on the existing yellow lines which does make you wonder how effective any current monitoring of the current scheme is and how that would change if the all day parking permits proposed did go ahead. Under the current parking permit scheme, we are able to arrange for any visitors, whether tradesmen or personal, to come after the end of the morning permit period and before the start of the afternoon one. Obviously, this is not always possible with trades but then you don't mind using a visitor permit as that is what they are meant for but I personally have friends and family who pop in to collect me for shopping and may be here for less than half an hour if I am not quite ready or they may stop for the similar length of time afterwards to help put shopping away and have a quick coffee. Currently they come after 10.30 so I don't need to use any of my visitor permits. If this proposal does get passed then it will mean we need more visitor permits which will mean more expense for us at what is an already difficult time financially and will put more money in the coffers for TMBC. It will also affect people's social life and maybe their mental health too. As for the obstructive parking outside number 123 Woodside Road, this house was built knowing that the kerb AND the parking space on the road were already in place and planning permission for this house had previously been refused. The parking space on the road has already disappeared under new yellow lines meaning one less parking space. Number 123 has its own drive so should think themselves lucky. I ask you to look at this proposal from the view of the residents who do not have the luxury of their own drives and also the ones who stick to the rules and arrange their lives around the current permit scheme as much as they possibly can.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place	1			Double parking, particularly outside number 10 Woodbury Road, is often a problem. Many times it's a squeeze getting a car through. Let alone delivery vehicles or most importantly emergency vehicles. However, I suspect the proposed additional double yellow lines will simply often be ignored. Much like the ones introduced a few years ago around the mini roundabout. Often cars are parked on these yellow lines overnight and during the day. I have never seen any parking enforcement agents or any parking fines attached to these vehicles either. I can imagine the proposed restrictions often being ignored or moving more vehicles further up and down the road, making access harder at those locations. The problem simply being moved along. Solution would be to provide more parking areas or restrict how many cars can be linked to one household.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place	1			Current parking has caused endless issues with waste collections and deliveries as vehicles can't turn into Falkland Place. Only time before a problem arises with emergency services.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place			1	I refer to the recent correspondence from you regarding a proposal for double yellow lines. I have major issues with this; I did respond last time when you recently put Double yellow lines on the corner of Woodbury and Walsham. This went unanswered and as I quoted things have already become more dangerous for a few of us. I live at number [redacted], I have to drive in and out of a shared drive onto Woodbury Road, located with a bend in both directions. Already there are parked vehicles all along the side of the road. We are completely blind pulling out of this driveway, cars drive fast up and down Woodbury Road and I have had several near misses, not to mention irate drivers who have to slam their brakes on. Your new proposal will once again make this worse, forcing cars and vans to park alongside our drive. I am not against yellow lines but please consider putting them on our side of the road as well. As I say this is an accident waiting to happen. Your feedback would be appreciated, as I may take this matter up with my local MP.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place			1	Not in favour as I rely on parking where yellow lines will be and this has already been made much harder with the yellow lines on Walsham Road and Woodbury Road. Visitors will have no chance to park. Are residents who requested double yellow lines still residents or moved? Residents have been made aware about Monday rubbish day and have since been much more considerate.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place	1			Good idea as residents further down in Falkland Place fed up with not having refuse collected as bin lorries cannot get round because of vehicles parked inconsiderately
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place			1	I have lived at this address for 26 years and it hasn't been an issue. All this will do is create more parking issues in an already densely populated area. If you want to do something about the speeding and amount of commercial vans you have my vote.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place			1	There is already a severe lack of parking on the street, by introducing these double yellow, there will be nowhere for residents on the road to park their vehicles.
Walderslade	Woodbury Road & Falkland Place			1	I strongly object to double yellow lines being placed there. There is already insufficient parking in our area, some houses have two or three cars. If the lines were in place there would be nowhere to park.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			Thank you for this proposal, I am fully in favour. However to ensure no new parking obstruction opposite Longhurst Drive I request/recommend additional yellow lines between 34-38 Tunbury.

Annex 5

Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			Hi very happy for you to go ahead with this proposal. Buses are constantly outside our house with engines running, were they cant cant get past due to vehicles parked in the road. Go further up the road if you like.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			For safety reasons and the junction is very close. This is a very busy street in rush hour.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			In a ideal world it would be good to have double yellow lines all the way along tunbury Ave. Thus keeping the road clear for buses and emergency vehicles.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			I am responding to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Tunbury Avenue, Chatham shown on plan DD/598/31. We are in favour of the proposed plans on the condition that the double yellow lines come up as far as and outside of 75 Tunbury Avenue. There is obstructive parking on a regular basis outside of this property, from many cars including relatives and visitors of the residents (on Tunbury Avenue) who have requested the no waiting at any time parking restrictions. My first and major concern is that the current situation makes it very dangerous for my partner and I to leave out of our drive as the parked vehicles obstruct the vision of traffic approaching from the left. I know my neighbour at 77 experiences a similar issue when driving out of his drive, but for traffic approaching from the right. The proposed parking restrictions will exacerbate this hazard especially as this is a very busy main road with a bus route. Secondly, when turning onto our drive parked vehicles have on a number of occasions obstructed the entrance of our drive making it impossible to turn into our drive when approaching from the left (from Robin Hood Lane end of Tunbury Avenue) I am happy to discuss or provide further information should you wish to contact me at this stage of the process.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			Can you please extend the above proposals to include yellow lines from no 79 to 63 we have a lot of people parking all day commuters making it difficult to emerge from our property, also extend the proposals from no 46 to 42 thank you.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			I am in favour as the parking is definitely an issue especially with the forever increasing traffic during peak times (Schools ETC) As well as buses adding to the mayhem. My car was it by a bus.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue		1		I have received the proposal for double yellow lines to be implemented outside my property. I am not in favour of the changes proposed. I would be in favour of single yellow lines restricting parking at peak times to help with the flow of traffic. Having double yellow lines is very restrictive for us residence as with growing families within the area places to park are needed, especially over night. Another restriction that would pose a better alternative would be to implement speed bumps to stop motorists excessive speeds, I know this is a main bus route but this would not have any adverse affects on the route. We also have a busy doctors surgery in the middle of the road which causes more obstructions than motorists parking outside our house. I hope my comments are considered for the changes as this will directly affect me and my family.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			No Comment
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			Our concern is that people will park on the grass verge/pavement instead and make things difficult for pedestrians, especially with mobility vehicles, pushchairs etc. however it would certainly help a car out of our driveway as they would be obstructing our view of the traffic coming along the road even more.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			No complaints. Will need to be policed as people currently ignore the existing no waiting at any time double yellow lines and nothing is done about it.
Walderslade	Tunbury Avenue	1			Thank you this is much needed along the rat run.
Wrotham	West Street		1		There are 13 bungalows in mountain close to my knowledge there are 8 blue badges we need more parking not less.
Wrotham	West Street		1		I am not in favour of your proposals as you are making it harder for tenants that are disabled and did not consult the tenants in the past as you are a law unto yourself. So no matter what tenants say you will do what ever you want as there is a lack of parking.
Wrotham	West Street		1		The proposed double yellow lines will do away with two much needed parking spaces. I believe double yellow lines should stop at the edge of dropped curb. That will still allow clear access to driveway and garages. As for disabled parking adjacent to proposed yellow lines i and others would like to see the bay more clearly marked as anyone parks in this bay. As in the four years we have lived here we have never seen a warden policing the disabled bays. As a blue badge holder i would like the opportunity to park closer to where i live.
Wrotham	West Street		1		No I don't think we need double yellow lines outside no 37 west Street. I park my car behind the disabled space as it is not some where outside my house I don't see any one obstructing no 37 I think the bit of land in front of 38-40 should be turned into parking space for them to park as we have people from all over parking, also a lot of them take up 2 spots. you have already put CCTV up outside my home, without letting me know.
Wrotham	West Street		1		In my view yellow lines are not required as they will take up parking space.