

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 01

I object to the proposals.

Comments

I object to the Borough Council's proposals for changes to the on-street parking arrangements as there is not enough parking spaces as it is. I am disabled and regularly struggle to park on West Street as it is, without adding double yellow lines which will only cause more stress to park my car. It will also cause more friction within the community as residents already fight over car parking spaces. Where you are proposing to put the double yellow lines the resident that lives on the corner knocked the wall down to his front garden and Russett Homes was going to take him to court for damaging the property but KCC decided to put a dropped kerb in for him along with TMBC and he is now reversing over a pedestrian walkway.

I think it would be wise if the Joint Transportation Board of councillors came in the evening to West Street to witness the parking problems themselves.

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.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 02

I object to the proposals.

Comments

With reference to the above proposal I'm disagree with your plans. If a car is park behind the disabled space it doesn't stop the person at number 37 gain access to his property. There is not enough parking for the rest of the property's to park as it is. As the resident from mountain close (who have parking behind there property) park there.

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.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 03

I object to the proposals.

Comments

Good morning, in response to the decision to go forward with proposed “no waiting time” restrictions on west street I would like to strongly disagree with this proposal. I am (REDACTED) and already it’s hard to park near my property. The tenants across the road at mountain view(some of who have two vehicles and others have garages) park where they want thus we tenants in our 5 bungalows are already unable to park. This is extremely ill thought out and would squeeze even more vehicles down in an already congested area. Thankyou for the chance to object and I look forward to your reply.

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.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.

Formal Consultation response – Wrotham, West Street

Response ref: DD-598-32 Wrotham - West Street - 04

I object to the proposals.

Comments

In response to your proposal to paint double yellow lines at the address in west street wrotham I along with other neighbour's strongly object to this proposal on the grounds it will do away with two much needed parking spaces. Already there are more cars than parking spaces.

Why not stop yellow lines at the end of dropped curb. As for disabled bay shown it definitely needs re defining to make it clear as none blue badge holder's use it all the time. One vehicle has not moved out of it for the last few weeks.

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.

Parking between the vehicle crossover and the existing disabled parking bay affects visibility for the user of the access and also for vehicles emerging from the garage block. The minimum requirement for this is 10m, and this would not then leave space between the disabled bay and the end of the yellow lines. The disabled bay cannot be relocated due to the road hump.

Whilst there may be some element of parking displacement, the aim is to discourage parking in the areas where parking should already be prevented.