

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

Current trends of parking on the corner, especially on the odd numbered houses side of the road, causes safety issues for those vehicles approaching each other round the bend, with some instances of having to mount the kerb to avoid the oncoming vehicle. This in turn endangers pedestrians that may be walking by at the same time. There have also been instances of failed deliveries by lorries coming into the Close caused by the parking on the corner.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your response

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I agree that lines are needed around the bend but they are unnecessary on the straight section. In fact I believe adding them to the straight section would cause more harm than good as cars would be able to speed and cars would be displaced to further into the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

By putting in double yellow lines will stop residents from parking outside their house, which they have been able to do for 30yrs! Why can the double lines go just on the bend?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 05

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Contrary to the opinion of Councillor Roud, the cars which park in the first 100yards of the close act as a natural traffic calming arrangement. The cars which travel from the end of the close frequently travel above the 30mph speed limit, but slow at the bend because of the single lane arrangement caused by parked cars at the end. My pregnant daughter lives where the yellow lines are proposed and by necessity her car parks on the road. Both for her and for me visiting to support her, installing yellow lines will only push the cars which need to park to further down the close, causing inconvenience because of the distance to the house. Cars also park in the proposed area to take advantage of the footpath through to the orchards. Most importantly my view is that the benefit of yellow lines has been completely misunderstood. Cars will travel at a greater speed down the close without the parked cars, creating more risk of accidents, not less to pedestrians and residents exiting their drives with cars. I recommend engaging a traffic specialist to comment rather than acting on the opinion of an individual or a small group of poorly informed individuals. Review the instances of accidents in the area caused by parked cars. The residents are not aware of any. The residents

actually living on the spot have the best informed opinions and are unanimously opposed to the proposal.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 06

I object to the proposals.

Comments

will shunt proposed cars to our end of the close causing obstructions as road is already to narrow for service vehicles to enter without added cars from outside the close we have a drive which has just allowed more cars to park already without the added double yellow lines

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

There is little parking in the village, homes have extended and increase in cars per household, and this is needed space for the local residents

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 08

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We understand that the purpose of the changes is to ensure full access round the bend in Cottenham Close for the larger vehicles. Therefore, why not simply put double yellow line round the bend. It should be noted that most of the cars parking in the first part of Cottenham Close are not residents (nor their visitors) of Cottenham Close. Why not make restrictions on parking similar to Mill Street. Allowing residents only to park on Cottenham Close. Surely that is fair to the residents of Cottenham Close.

It does appear that due to covenant restrictions by Developers on Vigo Close that their residents use Cottenham Close as their parking.

Is this not partly due to Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council giving Planning permission for Vigo Close to be developed with such covenant restrictions in place ?

Now because of non Cottenham Close cars, being parked on Cottenham Close. The issues of access are being resolved by punishing the residents of Cottenham Close, by putting forward such an unfair proposal. Surely Tonbridge & Malling should address the real issues effectively created by them. Please rethink the proposals. Yours sincerely, (REDACTED)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 09

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a visitor it has not caused issues and would further limit available parking

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 10

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We regularly visit friends who live in the area proposed for double yellow lines. If such a parking restriction was imposed we would have to park a long way from their house. I see no reason that yellow lines are needed for such an long stretch.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 11

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a frequent visitor to cottenham close, assisting a friend during a difficult pregnancy, there is already limited parking in the road. The proposed will prevent me from helping, and in all likelihood will cause greater problems with other friends and family attempting to visit.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 12

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Proposed extension of double yellow lines will result in significantly reduced on street parking in the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 13

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Parking is already a problem when we visit our son and daughter-in-law. We agree that parking should not be allowed on the bend itself, but see no reason for stopping residents and visitors from parking outside their own properties on the straight near the entrance to Cottenham Close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 14

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to putting double yellow lines on the straight entrance to Cottenham Close, as this is unnecessary and not in my view a safety concern. If this proposal was just for double yellow lines around the bend I would understand, but it is not. I visit this area regularly to visit my sister for child care purposes and need to park on the road outside their home. There is no where else within 100m safe for me to park most days. I cannot see the purpose of restricting parking on the straight as this will offer little benefit but cause huge inconvenience to residents and visitors.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 15

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I find it amazing that you are proposing to limit parking even more in Cottenham Close. Residents and visitors should have the right to park outside their properties except where it would be dangerous to do so. There is a case for double yellow lines actually on the bend but to extend them any further is unnecessary.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 16

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I strongly object to this grossly restrictive proposal. Parking space is already very limited in the village. Where are residents supposed to park?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 17

I object to the proposals.

Comments

As a regular visitor to the close to see friends, we have never had an issue with poor or dangerous parking within the close. By extending the double yellow lines along the straight part of the close up to the bend you are will be seriously reducing the amount of available parking for friends and family. This will mean that we would have to park further up the road causing more issue for local residences further along the close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 18

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We object to the proposed extension of double yellow lines on Cottenham Close for the following reasons: Safety Risks Amplified: The current double yellow lines on Cottenham Close effectively prevent access blockages to and from Mill St. Extending them may encourage faster driving around the blind bend leading into Cottenham Close, putting at risk children playing, dog walkers, and elderly and disabled individuals using the public footpath where it crosses the road. Natural Traffic Calming: The parked vehicles currently serve as an effective traffic calming measure, ensuring drivers navigate cautiously. Their removal in favour of double yellow lines might necessitate future council expenditure on additional traffic calming measures, such as chicanes or speed bumps, which would be a waste of council money and resources as this issue is not currently present. Essential Access for Vulnerable Residents: A number of elderly and infirm individuals reside on this road. Maintaining clear access for delivery vehicles, like shopping deliveries, is vital to their independence and well-being. Problem Displacement, Not Solution: The proposed yellow lines will merely displace parking further into the road, leading to a more congested parking situation in the heart of Cottenham Close.

Emergency Vehicle Access: The potential clustering of parked cars deeper into Cottenham Close could obstruct rapid access for emergency vehicles, which could be life-threatening in an emergency.

Environmental Concerns: Prolonged searching for parking due to increased density may lead to increased idling and emissions, adversely affecting local air quality. Decrease in Property Value: The perceived inconvenience of parking restrictions and denser than expected on-street parking may deter potential home buyers or renters, resulting in a decline in property values. Community Disruption: Tighter parking restrictions could lead to increased competition for limited spaces, causing stress and potential disputes among neighbours. Visitor Inconvenience: Extended yellow lines can hinder visitors, friends, carers or family from easily parking when they visit, hampering social interactions. Increased On-street Parking Density: This proposal could result in a congested parking situation deeper into the close, challenging the navigation and parking of all vehicles, as well as decreasing road visibility for those who are using driveways. Potential for More Vehicle Movements: The restriction might increase vehicle movements as residents reposition their cars or move them for others, increasing potential accident risks. Considering these substantial concerns, we wish to object to these proposals as we believe this is the best option to prioritise the safety, well-being, and harmony of the residents of Cottenham Close.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should

already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 19

I support the proposals.

Comments

I have seen many near miss accidents waiting to happen on the bend where the parking has reduced the road to single track. On occasion I had to wait whilst a food delivery was unloaded as I could not pass, which gives concern to anyone needing an ambulance or fire service.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 20

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Cars are not often parked on the bend. I do not want yellow lines any further up than they are at the moment. We don't need double yellow lines.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 21

I object to the proposals. **(NOTE - This is a duplicate comment - more than one response has been received from this household.)**

Comments

No double yellow lines. This is not needed. I as a resident do not want double yellow lines.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 22

I object to the proposals.

Comments

The recent proposal to apply double yellow lines to the entrance to Cottenham Close should be abandoned. Double yellows, if deemed really necessary could be included to the corner bend of the Close for a short distance. However, it is the case that because it IS a bend nobody parks cars there anyway. At this present time with cars parked at the beginning of Cottenham providing a restriction in traffic flow and a natural reduction in any possible excessive speed. Remove these cars with double Yellow lines and this will become a pedestrian hazard as many walkers to the area beyond Cottenham cross the road somewhere between Mill Street and the footpath entrance to the right by the bend. Please stop interfering with our roads.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 23

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Placing parking restrictions from Mill St junction to the outside of No.14 & No.3 will push vehicles that currently park outside No.1 further up into Cottenham Close whilst there is a need to restrict parking on the bend, maintaining the existing parking outside 1a/2 would make more sense!

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 24

I support the proposals.

Comments

Strong support

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 25

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I don't think there is a significant issue at the moment and the vehicles that do park on this section of road will just cause a parking problem elsewhere.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 26

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We already have residents from Vigor Close parking here. They will therefore park further up the cul-de-sac. Nothing will be achieved by this restriction but to increase congestion in the Close. This is probably a hidden pre-cursor to residents parking permits!

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 27

I support the proposals.

Comments

I do not own a car, but I can see that sometimes traffic is forced on the wrong side of the road on the bend. The proposal will cause parking problems further along the road but safety must come first.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 28

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We have 2 cars, which we need. When planning permission was given for this development the Council allowed builders to put smaller than average garages in. If we put our smaller car in the garage we cannot get out of the car!!! We have 1 provided parking space. Originally we were able to have a permit to park on Mill St (our property faces on to Mill St) That is no longer the case so now we park opposite our house on Cottenham Close, along with several others from this development and any guests we may have. Where are people to park if these yellow lines are placed on a perfectly safe, straight piece of road????

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 29

I support the proposals.

Comments

I've today been made aware of the plans to extend the double yellow lines into Cottenham Close. Whilst I agree with the proposal to introduce double yellow lines on the bend, a spot where parking can be dangerous, I object to the proposal to then extend these double yellow lines to the intersection with Mill Street. Double yellow lines on the straight between the corner and Mill Street is unnecessary from a safety perspective and will cause parking problems for residents along the entire road and could lead to customers speeding down the start of the Close.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 30

I object to the proposals.

Comments

- 1. It will add more parked cars & congestion furthre up the close.*
- 2. It will be harder for residents to park near own home.*
- 3. It will increase speeding at the entrance of close and round the bend.*
- 4. From a personal point of view, yellow lines go beyond No.14, we are unable to increase off-street parking due to lamp post on the corner of our drive and water hydrant 1/2 way along front. As we are elderly and as time progresses will probably need help to manage it would make it more difficult for this help to park in order to assist us.*

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 31

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on street parking arrangements for Cottenham Close East Malling, shown on plan DD/598/07.

COMMENTS As a long time resident of Cottenham Close I feel there is no need for further parking restrictions on the entrance to the close. What I would prefer to see are the existing double yellow lines, marked in red on the plan, to be rigorously enforced by regular visits of a traffic warden or police officer.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 32

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the councils proposal for changes to the on street parking

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 33

I support the proposals.

Comments

100% agree with the new proposals = stop people parking on the bend as very hazardous - many near misses have witnessed as cars moving fast passing bend. Also pulling off from drive can be hazardous too. Blind bend for pedestrians who step into road as cars parking on the bend!!!

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 34

I object to the proposals.

Comments

People coming into the close drive far to fast and with no cars parked at the beginning of the close they would drive even faster!!! P.S. Maybe a speed camera?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 35

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I do not support this plan, it's a small residential street which is already busy with cars. This plan will increase the congestion further up the road which isn't necessary.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 36

I object to the proposals.

Comments

We do not need or want double yellow lines where shown on the above drawing. At the moment vehicles do not park on this corner.

The problem is the 5 cars from Vigor Close who have no parking outside their premises. Who decreed this planning? I am given to understand that this can now be reversed allowing the residents to park in their own road. The yellow lines will create a rat run, vehicles already drive too fast around this bend.

My suggestion would be to create three bays 'resident parking only' out side No1b Cottenham Close, suitably marked. This will create a chicane and slow traffic substantially. If double yellow lines are installed where shown on TMBC Drawing No DD/598/07 where will Vigor Close residents park then? Not further up Cottenham Close we hope, which is already full with Cottenham Close residents cars, some parking on the pavement.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 37

I support the proposals.

Comments

Many residents seem to park their vehicles in the road instead of their drive. As to why, is one of life's mysteries. This is nowt so strange as folk.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 38

I support the proposals.

Comments

I would have preferred a 20mph limit to have applied to the whole area shown on plan DD/598/07

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 39

I support the proposals.

Comments

As per my previous comments (not supplied)

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 40

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 41

I support the proposals.

Comments

Of course, parking restrictions are only effective if they are enforced occasionally!

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 42

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Our view on the proposed yellow lines are still the same as our original response. Lines on the bend are required as it is dangerous, but we still feel it is not necessary to have the lines continued from the existing lines at the entrance up to the bend. (your letter dated 19th May 23 state that Councillor Roud reported obstructive parking only on the bend not from the entrance of the close. This will cause many problems for us, visitors, or tradespeople if we need them in our home. We've had this problem with double yellow lines many years ago and had them evoked to where they are now. The 18 in favour of this proposal is because its not going to effect them anyway. (Plan enclosed)

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 43

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Yellow lines only around bend. Allow residents to park outside own homes.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 44

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I agree yellow lines on bend might be needed but a section between existing yellow lines (red on plan) at entrance to close, past 1A should remain for parking. Cars need to be parked somewhere! And in my experience this slows traffic.

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 45

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I just don't understand why! Where do visitors park?? We only have one parking space to if we have a visitor they park in the close. No other parking around!!! Make it residents only, Mon-Fi. What do we do for parking?

Response

The Council's proposal echoes the requirements of Section 243 of the Highway Code which requires drivers not to stop or park close to a junction or where it would cause an obstruction. Drivers should already be abiding by this requirement. Where parking is still a problem due to drivers ignoring the Highway Code we have to consider measures that allow for parking enforcement.

It remains that there is no right to park on the public highway - parking is tolerated where it does not cause a problem, but residents cannot automatically assume on-street parking will be available, and some properties are situated in places where parking is not permitted.

This has become more of an issue as car ownership increases and with denser housing development, but the purpose of the public highway is to provide a safe facility for travel, and road space cannot be increased.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement to areas where parking is not wanted, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 46

I support the proposals.

Comments

The problem is motorists that mainly park on the road are non-residents to the station to go to work making it dangerous and difficult to get out of our drives.

Response

Thank you for your comments

Formal Consultation response – East Malling, Cottenham Close

Response ref: DD-598-07 East Malling - Cottenham Close - 47

I support the proposals.

Comments

Reference DD/598/07 Cottenham Close I support the Borough Councils proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Cottenham Close, East Malling shown on Plan DD/598/07. I fully agree your proposal for double yellow lines as per Parking Action Plan Phase 14. The proposed plan features/shows a very dangerous spot to have vehicles parking on road or partly on the pavement. I should like see the lines extended as all residents of Cottenham Close have a driveway to park on or a frontage area on which to park a vehicle so as to keep pavements & road clear. My wife who is registered disabled sometimes has to drive her electric buggy into the road to avoid a pavement parked vehicle. Not only private cars are parked on the road / pavement but also commercial vehicles. There have been instances when Ambulances, Fire Brigade & Refuse Collection vehicles have had problems getting through. My proposal being that if you have a driveway or frontage then it should be used for parking vehicles on.. Hope that this note will help in solving our Cottenham Close problem.

Response

Thank you for your comments