

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 01

I support the proposals.

Comments

I would extend the double yellows even further in 3 places 1) To cover the full bend passed the proposed extension up to property no 113 as vehicles parked there (usually a large van) block views as you pull out of the 'T junction' opposite property no 29

2) Also extend lines from the bend on opposite side up to property no 29 again as vehicles (again often a large van) parked there and force you as you enter road onto RHS as other vehicles are trying to pull out of 'T Junction'. I have had several near misses here!

3) On side of loop where property no 10 is either, on road parking bays on one side of the road and double yellows on other to stop vehicles parking on both which often means a tight squeeze for normal vehicles, let alone delivery or emergency ones. This problem down not occur on the opposite side of the loop as everyone there parks on allocated bays or one side of road only!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 02

I support the proposals.

Comments

The proposed new double yellow lines are a great idea, but they should be extended to reach either side of the existing double yellow lines on that part of the road. The bend on that part of the road is not only narrow, but on a slight incline, so it would be safer to have double yellow lines on both sides of that corner of Howard Drive. If a gap is left, vehicles will still continue to park there, and it will still block some visibility for vehicles entering the road. Too many cars come around that corner in the direction of leaving Howard Drive too fast, and anything parked on that corner (right next to no'113) will block visibility.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 03

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the additional double yellow lines on the grounds of safety. I object to these double yellow lines not being replicated on the other side of Howard Drive immediately opposite these new lines. There are three properties protected by the proposal, yet there are fourteen left unprotected on the other side. The new lines protect two exits, with two house exiting one, and one household the other. Directly opposite we have fourteen households effective exiting one, very busy and active, 'driveway'.

This exit is extremely dangerous due to the parking of cars and vans in the unrestricted section to the right hand side - the section where I feel should also be double-yellow - make this a total blind spot for traffic approaching from Norwich Avenue. I accept that there may need to be double yellow as per your initial proposal, to obviate the blind spot for those three dwellings, for traffic leaving Howard Drive. But if that's compelling, then even more compelling is the need to restrict on the immediately opposite side: 1 - the same blind spot issues; 2 - Fourteen households at risk, not merely three; 3 - Traffic approaching from Norwich Avenue inevitably does so at greater speed than that exiting Howard Drive towards Norwich Avenue. I reported all of these key points in the informal consultation phase without any response, although I am unsure as to whether any should have been expected. As this is the formal stage I would hope that a detailed report will be produced. Is it possible to be actively involved in the discussions, face to face, by the body that will decide on these issues? I would welcome the opportunity, as would representatives of many of the fourteen households whose safety seems not to have been taken into consideration within the scope of these proposals.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 04

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

Comments

This is my second communication via this format. I need to correct a factual error in my earlier submission. The dwellings being 'protected by', or having the 'risk reduced by' the proposed extension of the double yellow line are not three (as I had stated) but just two. I have just further checked and measured the driveway 'aperture' for these two dwellings and compared the width with the exit / aperture for the fourteen households directly opposite. They are identical. The proposal I have received is clearly an attempt to limit the obvious risk from approaching vehicles (leaving Howard Drive, heading towards Norwich Avenue) when the view of those two households (when exiting) is restricted by vehicles parked in the currently unrestricted section of Howard Drive on the[ir] right hand side. Directly opposite, we have precisely the same risk due to parked vehicles, currently parking in the unrestricted area immediately to the right hand side (with traffic approaching Howard Drive from Norwich Avenue). The unequivocal point of issue is that on one side just two households would have reduced risk, on the other side fourteen households would benefit from extending the restriction. My case is that both are completely valid but, if you were constrained to carry out just one change, it would be on the opposite side of Howard, presuming that safety is the major generative logic behind this proposal. I would be very happy, as stated earlier, to be directly involved in any 'live' consultation / consideration as and when the decision is actively being made. Eugene

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 05

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

Comments

As previously stated I both support and object to the specific proposals. Further consideration of the planned change shows the intention to extend the double yellow lines past property, and outside the fence boundary of #23 (Norwich Avenue). What I find confusing, if not contradictory, is that vehicles literally never park in this earmarked area - they simple cannot, because vehicles are allowed to park directly on the other side, and to park (where you are proposing to extend the restriction) would completely block the road. So, putting double yellows where no one parks - this seems a little odd, at the very least. My difficulty is that the proposal will protect the exit/entrance of two families/dwellings while, directly opposite, the exit of fourteen families/dwellings (#s 1 to 27) is constantly at risk, because of parking being allowed along that part of Howard Drive running alongside #1 Howard Drive. I continue to wonder, no matter how often I consider this, why you would not protect fourteen exiting households, yet be happy to protect two. My request is that the scheme be altered to protect all sixteen by extending the restriction on both sides of this section of Howard Drive. I believe an accident will happen, not on the side you have identified, but on the very much busier opposite side, where the exit/entrance is adjacent to #1 Howard Drive. Please, I ask you to review, revisit and consider revising your plans.

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 – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 06

I support the proposals.

Comments

Just wanted to respond to the formal consultation with the reference: DD/598/21A Howard Drive. I wholeheartedly approve of the plans to extend the double yellow lines with regard to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive. Please do it!

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 07

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Stop wasting money we do not want it and the council cannot afford it. Send a representative to talk to me. We strongly disagree. My views have not changed. Life is hard enough. Carers will not be able to visit. My daughters cannot visit. The car parks here are empty.

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 – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 08

I support the proposals.

Comments

No comments supplied

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 09

I support the proposals.

Comments

I suggest that the proposed double yellow line is further extended as marked on the enclosed plan (plan enclosed)

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 10

I support the proposals.

Comments

This is an email to confirm that I SUPPORT the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements for Howard Drive, shown on plan DD/598/21A.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Formal Consultation response – Tonbridge, Howard Drive

Response ref: DD-598-21A Tonbridge - Howard Drive - 11

I support the proposals.

Comments

I support the yellow lines and anything that reduces the road width being severely restricted by numerous Twice Recall taxis and the continuous pavement parking outside numbers 10 -18 The worry is where are Twice Recall taxis going to park after the yellow line update The car parks sit empty and cars are parked on their doorsteps-literally.

Response

Thank you for your comments.