List of locations and recommendations

No.	Location	Proposal(s)	Recommendation
EM-01	Stickens Lane	New double yellow lines to prevent	Set aside objections and
		parking on the bend and approaches	implement
EM-02	Middle Mill Road	Changes to existing double yellow lines	Abandon proposals on
	and Mill Street	to provide more parking.	Mill Street (alongside
	(near Elizabeth	New double yellow lines to prevent	Elizabeth Smith Court), set
	Smith's Court)	obstruction.	aside objections and
			introduce other changes.
EM-03	Clare Lane	New double yellow lines to prevent	Set aside objection and
		parking on the bend and the	implement
		approaches.	
EM-04	Mill Street	New double yellow lines to prevent	Set aside objections and
		obstructive parking around junctions	implement
		and the narrow sections of the road.	
EM-05	Mill Street 2	New double yellow lines to prevent	Set aside objections and
		obstructive parking and parking on both	implement
		sides of the road.	
EM-06	The Grange	New double yellow lines	Set aside objections,
			reduce proposal slightly
			and implement
EM-07	Rocks Close	abandoned after informal consultation	
EM-08	Wateringbury Road	New double and single yellow lines	Note comments and implement
EM-09	The Rocks Road	New double yellow lines	Set aside objections,
			reduce proposal slightly
			and implement
EM-10	High Street	New disabled parking bay	Set aside objections and
			implement
EM-11	Chapel Street	New double yellow lines to prevent	Set aside objections and
		parking opposite an access	implement

Statutory Consultee comments

Kent Police responded to the consultation with a standard response and no specific observations.

The Cabinet Member and Portfolio Holder, Mrs Murray responded with no comments or objections.

Nu-Venture (a bus company operating in the area) commented against the proposals for increasing parking in Mill Street (near Elizabeth Smith's Court) as this would create additional problems for buses, but welcomed the proposals for Clare Lane and for the east end of Mill Street.

New obstruction reducing restrictions

Issue

Parking on Stickens Lane on the approach to the traffic calming narrowing causes problems for vehicles driving in and out of Stickens Lane and through to Busbridge Close. Introducing double yellow lines should prevent parking and allow vehicles to pass more effectively.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/01 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	47	Replies received	12	Response rate	26%
In favour of the proposals				7	58%
Not in favour of the proposal				5	42%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses from residents were mixed. A number of those that comments against the proposals, mainly on the basis that the additional restrictions would remove opportunities for them to park, even though they tended to be parking in the areas that caused the obstruction, or related to concerns about parking being displaced.

Accordingly, it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/1 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	47	Replies received	12	Response rate	25%
In favour of the proposals	8	67%			
Not in favour of the proposal	4	33%			
Commented, but with no clear view				0	0%

The formal consultation produced a good level of response, with most being in favour of the proposals.

However, the objections were;

- That the obstructive parking did not occur and that the damage to the verges related to the poor road design and problems for large vehicles when negotiating that layout
- That the area where the obstructive parking occurs is the only location where deliveries, tradesmen and visitors would be able to park
- That the restrictions would displace parking further in to the cul-de-sac, close to residential properties
- That extending the restrictions would lead to an increase in vehicle speeds

Analysis and Officer recommendation

These points need to be considered against the aims of the restrictions – large vehicles would be able to negotiate the road layout if the parking was not there, as parked vehicles impinge on their turning movements.

The proposals do not exclude all parking from that area of East Malling – there would still be areas where visitors, tradesmen and deliveries could park.

The proposals may displace parking in to the cul-de-sac, but this is not necessarily a traffic problem, though it may not be desireable for residents.

Introducing restrictions can sometimes lead to an increase in vehicle speeds, but this is unlikely to happen in this case as there are existing traffic calming measures in place.

As the proposals have a good level of support and are designed to ease traffic movements, it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and implement the proposals as drawn.

Location reference	EM-02
Road / Area	Middle Mill Road and Mill Street (near Elizabeth Smith's Court)
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/02

Increased parking and restrictions to prevent obstruction of accesses

Issue

Residents of Middle Mill Road have reported that parking occurs around junctions and in front of the garages, despite the existing white "access protection" line.

Accordingly, we are proposing to replace the white access protection line with double yellow lines and adjust the double yellow lines around the junction in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

We have also had comments that there should be more parking provided in Middle Mill Road to reduce parking pressures nearby, so we are proposing a reduction in the some of the double yellow lines.

Residents of Mill Street have reported parking difficulties as staff at local businesses use all the spaces, and that the parking is used by the visitors to the local pub.

To address this we are looking introducing additional parking outside 103-123 Mill Street.

Residents of Mill Street (near Stickens Lane) have asked that we reduce the existing double yellow lines and extend uncontrolled parking bays to increase parking availability.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/02 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	131	Replies received	15	Response rate	11%
In favour of the proposals	8	53%			
Not in favour of the proposal				4	26%
Commented, but with no clear view				3	20%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses from residents were mixed, but with the majority commenting that there was an issue and supporting changes.

Accordingly, it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Plan revised?	Yes	New plan reference	DD/564/1A
		(if amended)	

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/1 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	132	Replies received	9	Response rate	7%
In favour of the proposals	6	67%			
Not in favour of the proposal				1	11%
Commented, but with no clear view				2	22%

The formal consultation produced a low level of response.

The objections were;

- Against the reduction of the double yellow lines to allow more parking opposite Millbrook House (adjacent to Bone Alley)
- That the reduction of parking restrictions in some areas could lead to more on-street parking by those using the offices.
- That the extension of the parking area in Mill Street (in front of Elizabeth Smith Court) could lead to more obstruction of the road.
- A bus company also commented that increasing parking on Mill Street would exacerbate existing problems when cars park in the narrow area in front of Elizabeth Smith Court.

Additionally there were comments;

- That Middle Mill Road was being used as an alternative to Mill Street, and that the traffic calming in Middle Mill Road should be made more stringent.
- That the (highway) vegetation in Middle Mill Road should be cut back by the Council to allow visibility.
- That the Dial-a-Flight staff should not be allowed to park in Middle Mill Road.

However, these issues are outside the control of the Borough Council. As the road is public highway we cannot discriminate against a particular business that is located in the area as the road is available to all to use. The issues relating to traffic calming and the appropriate maintenance of vegetation would be for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

In light of the comments from the bus company about existing problems on Mill Street, the proposed reduction in restrictions on Mill Street (to allow additional parking) should be abandoned.

The remaining proposals had a good level of support and are designed to provide additional parking and prevent obstruction to properties; it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and implement the proposals as drawn.

Location reference	EM-03
Road / Area	Clare Lane
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/03

New double yellow lines to prevent parking on the bend and the approaches.

Issue

Residents have reported that parking could happen on the inside of the bend near the access to Clare Park and this could be dangerous.

To address these concerns we are proposing new double yellow lines to prevent parking in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/02 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	18	Replies received	2	Response rate	11%
In favour of the proposals				2	100%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses from residents were in favour of the proposal, accordingly, it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/1 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	18	Replies received	2	Response rate	11%
In favour of the proposals				1	50%
Not in favour of the proposal				1	50%

The formal consultation produced a low level of response.

The objection was on the grounds that as a resident the objector was not aware of any accidents at this location, and that introducing yellow lines would disfigure the area and be a waste of money. The resident also commented (verbally) that any restrictions could displace any parking that might occur in to the service road near their property.

The comment in support of the proposal asked that the restrictions be taken further in to Blacklands.

A bus company responded supporting the proposals

Analysis and Officer recommendation

The proposals reinforce the requirements of the Highway Code that parking should not occur on bends and where it can cause an obstruction or hazard. They also protect the entrances in to Clare Park.

The concerns about the visual intrusion of new yellow lines in to the existing streetscene are noted, but it is exactly that, a streetscene, and measures to control and manage parking on the public highway should be expected, as the purpose of the Highway is to allow travel, and not to preserve the visual appearance of the area. However in light of the concerns about the impact of yellow lines on the streetscene, we would look at using "conservation" standard yellow lines unless there is a significant reason to do otherwise.

Accordingly it is recommended that the Board set aside the objection and implement the proposals as drawn.

Location reference	EM-04
Road / Area	Mill Street
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/04

New double yellow lines to prevent parking at junctions and on the narrow sections.

Issue

Mill Street (around Darcy Court and Vigor Close)

Since the re-development of "Darcy Court" and "Vigor Close", the existing parking restrictions no longer reflect the altered road layouts.

Accordingly we are proposing new double yellow lines around the entrances in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Mill Street (opposite Vigor Close)

The existing white access protection marking across the shared access to No.1a Cottenham Close and No.43 Mill Street should be replaced by double yellow lines as an access protection marking is no longer appropriate in front of shared vehicle accesses.

To this end we are proposing new double yellow lines.

Mill Street & Upper Mill

There have been comments that parking around the junction of Mill Street and Upper Mill and through the narrow sections could cause an obstruction and reduce traffic flow.

Accordingly we are proposing new double yellow lines to prevent obstruction in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/04 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	117	Replies received	24	Response rate	20%
In favour of the proposals	15	62%			
Not in favour of the proposals	7	29%			
Commented, but with no clear view				2	8%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses from residents were in favour of the proposal, accordingly, it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Annex 2

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/1 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	117	Replies received	10	Response rate	9%
In favour of the proposals	8	80%			
Not in favour of the proposal				2	20%

The formal consultation produced a low level of response.

One objection was that there should be an additional single yellow line to prevent all-day parking outside 83-87 Mill Street (to deter parking by those who live a little further away and giving more opportunity to the immediate residents to park)

One resident commented in support of the proposals, but wanted an additional restriction preventing parking outside 83-87 Mill Street, to improve visibility from Upper Mill.

Another objected that they thought the restrictions in front of 84-90 Mill Street were unnecessary, as were restrictions outside 55-79, as the resident had never seen any cars parked there.

Two residents agreed with the restrictions but commented that the proposals should go further in to Upper Mill.

One resident agreed with the restrictions but commented that the restrictions should be extended further into Vigor Close.

A bus company responded in support of the proposals.

There was also a comment about deterring HGV traffic from using Mill Street as A20 signage is very poor and lorry drivers often rely on their satnavs.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

The proposals were broadly supported, though some residents wanted restrictions extended further.

Whilst some might want more restriction, and some cannot see the justification for restrictions in areas where cars currently do not park, we have to take a balanced approach. There are areas where parking does not currently occur that we need to protect in case of displacement, and some areas where parking actually has a beneficial traffic calming effect.

We cannot extend restrictions in to Vigor Close even though it would be normal practise to do so as part of the junction protection measures as Vigor Close (and Watercress Court) are not part of the adopted highway

The comment relating to the poor direction signing for the A20 is outside the scope of this report and the remit of the Borough Council, as this would be an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

TMBC Joint Transportation Board 30th March 2015 East Malling Parking Review – Post Review Amendments Location summaries after formal consultation

The comments about installing an additional single yellow line in front of 83-87 Mill Street to deter parking by those who live further away could translate to a request for some form of priority scheme for residents to park in those spaces. This is outside the scope of these proposals, but a residents' permit parking place could potentially be considered, similar to those further east along Mill Street, though this would need the support of the residents in question, and have to be considered at a later date, maybe as part of a forthcoming phase of the parking plan.

Accordingly it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and implement the proposals as drawn.

Location reference	EM-05
Road / Area	Mill Street 2
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/05

New double yellow lines to prevent parking near junctions and on the both sides of the road at the same time.

Issue

We have also had comments that parking occurs in the uncontrolled area west of the driveway to No.33, causing visibility problems and reducing the road width.

Accordingly we are proposing new double yellow lines in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Residents have also asked that the yellow lines opposite No.20 & 22 are removed to allow more parking.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/05 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	47	Replies received	8	Response rate	17%
In favour of the proposals	3	37.5%			
Not in favour of the proposals	4	50%			
Commented, but with no clear view	1	12.5%			

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses from residents were in mixed, with those who requested changes being in favour of those changes, and those against the proposal on the basis of a loss of parking (though this tended to be the very parking that the complainants had a problem with).

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/05 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	47	Replies received	6	Response rate	13%
In favour of the proposals	3	50%			
Not in favour of the proposal				3	50%

The formal consultation produced a low level of response.

One objection was that the proposals were a waste of time and money.

One was that the restrictions on both sides of the road were unnecessary

One was that the restrictions would reduce parking availability.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

The proposals were again supported by the residents who had reported the problems.

We have to take a balanced approach. There are areas where parking does not currently occur that we need to protect in case of displacement, and some areas where parking actually has a beneficial traffic calming effect, but unless the road width is sufficient we cannot allow parking to occur (or the potential for it) on both sides of the road at the same time.

Accordingly it is recommended that the Board set aside the objections and implement the proposals as drawn.

Location reference	EM-06
Road / Area	The Grange
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/06a

New double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking between accesses.

Issue

Residents on the western side of The Grange have reported problems with cars parking in front of (and between) driveways.

To address this we are proposing to extend the existing double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/06a were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	12	Replies received	5	Response rate	42%
In favour of the proposals	3	60%			
Not in favour of the proposal				2	40%

The formal consultation produced a good level of response.

One objection was that the proposals would reduce parking for the residents of The Grange, though visitors to the church tended to ignore the existing yellow lines.

One objection (from a resident whose property had new restrictions proposed in front of it) objected, that they and their friends liked to park in front of their own access.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

The objection about the reduction in parking for residents does not reflect the fact that all the properties have off-street parking and that there is significant additional on-street parking in the culde-sac.

Given the objection from a resident who would be directly affected, but the original request from another residents who has problems with obstructive parking, it is recommended that the proposal be reduced, with the new double yellow lines stopping just north of the dropped kerbs to the access to No.9, the objections be set aside and the proposals be implemented accordingly.

Location reference	EM-08
Road / Area	Wateringbury Road
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/08

New junction protection and long-stay parking deterrent restrictions.

Issue

Parking Wateringbury Road around the Gilletts Lane junction causes problems for resident emerging from driveways and for traffic emerging from Gilletts Lane. Residents also report issues with long-stay parking close to the junction.

The proposal is for junction protection double yellow lines and for a signle yellow line for part of the day to prevent all-day parking.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/08 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	8	Replies received	2	Response rate	25%
In favour of the proposals				2	100%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposals it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/08 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	8	Replies received	1	Response rate	13%
In favour of the proposals				1	100%

The formal consultation produced a low level of response, with no objections.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

As there were no objections; it is recommended that Board note the support of residents and the proposals be implemented.

Location reference	EM-09
Road / Area	The Rocks Road
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/09a

New double yellow lines to prevent parking in areas where it would cause an obstruction and near accesses.

Issue

Parking on The Rocks Road has caused problems for residents, and has obstructed the flow of traffic.

Accordingly, we are proposing new double yellow lines in front of accesses, and also where the road is narrowest, to prevent obstruction in accordance with the advice set out in the Highway Code.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/09 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	43	Replies received	28	Response rate	65%
In favour of the proposals	7	25%			
Not in favour of the proposals	19	68%			
Commented, but with no clear view	2	7%			

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

The responses that the informal consultation drew out were wide-ranging, from requests for additional parking restrictions further along the road, to contrary concerns that the proposals would displace parking further eastwards along the road and so the proposals should be reduced or abandoned to prevent this.

There were also comments that the parking problems were associated with commuters and that if better use was made of the Parish Council's car park by the station, the problems would be significanly reduced.

There was also a difference of opinion between residents who had off-street parking (wo wanted stronger controls) and those with no off-street parking who wanted less restriction or some form of parking priority.

A site meeting was held with residents, Cllr Woodger and Parish Councillor Millson (also a resident) to discuss the problems and to walk through the differing issues, whislt remembering what was possible on the public highway.

A revised proposals was then drawn-up reflecting the comments from residents, as a balanced approach that took on as many of the differing views as possible.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/09b were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	44	Replies received	16	Response rate	36%
In favour of the proposals	8	50%			
Not in favour of the proposal				8	50%

The formal consultation produced a good level of response, though much lower than that previously received. This tends to suggest that the proposals are more in-line with what residents were wanting, as less felt it necessary to object.

One objection was that the residents of The Rocks Road that have no off-street parking currently enjoy a parking area with implied "residents only" status, and they do not pay for such – where other residents within permit parking schemes have to buy permits.

Residents at the eastern end of the proposals objected that the proposals had been scaled-back from their end of the road, though they had originally requested restrictions. This was reduced due to the comments against the longer proposals by a number of residents on the bend just east of the eastern end of the proposal.

Two objections commented that allowing parking on the northern side of the road (opposite 66 and 88) would make it difficult to access properties and for large vehicles.

One objection was against double yellow lines on both sides of the road alongside 91-101 as this would inhibit visitor parking.

One resident commented that the properties that are near Gilletts Lane that have no off-street parking could look to install off-street parking, which would reduce the need for on-street facility.

One resident also commented on the parking regime in the Parish Council car park by the station, that this could be used by commuters, reducing the problems on-street.

One resident objected due to the lack of on-street parking, particularly as they had no off-street parking and that another resident (who had off-street parking) was choosing to park in the on-street parking bay.

One resident was in support of the proposals, but objected to restrictions in front of their driveway, with a preference to having a white access protection line.

Analysis and Officer recommendation

Parking in The Rocks Road is a contentious issue. We have reached what seems to be a reasonably equitable proposal that addresses access obstruction issues, retains as much on-street parking as

possible and maintains access along the highway, especially in areas where the road width is reduced.

The issue of whether the residents with no off-street facility should pay for a parking permit was not part of the consultation. It may be that in time we might consider introducing a more stringent control at this point that may require paid-for permits but not at this time.

The associated issue about residents being encouraged to install their own off-street parking is problematic – there planning reasons why this should not be taken forward, as well as the problem that the Borough cannot require residents to alter their property in such a way, nor subsidise such a change.

The eastern extent of the proposal reflects were the current parking issues reduce, as the road gets slightly wider. Extending the restrictions further may be to the wish of some residents, but is likely to be against the wishes of many more.

The proposal is not to allow parking on the north side of the road between 66 and 88, but it isn't to prevent it either. Residents requested the minimum restrictions possible and we were asked to leave out the restrictions on the north side, save for the areas where there would be obstruction. It may be that we have to re-visit this at a later date if parking occurs here, but it does not at present.

The objection relating to restrictions on both sides between 91-101 are necessary as this area attracts parking and the road is narrow at this point. The parking also tends to be half-on-half-off the footway which causes problems for pedestrians.

The issues about the management of the Parish Council's car park are outside of our remit, but I understand that these concerns have been raised with the Parish.

The Borough has no means of intervening between resident about who has priority to be able to park on the public highway, and even if there were a permit parking scheme in place, all the residents in that area would be equally eligible.

The comment from the resident who did not want yellow lines in front of their driveway, with a white line instead is disappointing, but we can accommodate this without diluting the rest of the proposals.

Accordingly it is recommended that the objections be set aside, save for the objection for the yellow lines in front of the driveway to No.74, which can be replaced with a white access line, and the proposals be implemented.

Location reference	EM-10
Road / Area	High Street
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/10

New disabled parking bay.

Issue

A resident of High Street that meets Kent County Council's criteria for a disabled parking bay on the public highway has applied for an on-street disabled bay near their property.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/09 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	43	Replies received	8	Response rate	18%
In favour of the proposals	2	25%			
Not in favour of the proposals	5	62.5%			
Commented, but with no clear view				1	12.5%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

There were a number of objections at this stage, mainly relating to the inferred applicant, and the level of disability of that person and their suitability for a diasbled parking bay.

It is not the Borough Council's role to carry out physical or medical assessments of applicants for disabled parking bays – this rests with Kent County Council's Social Services and the County's Blue Badge Team.

The Borough is satisfied (without going in to specifics that are covered under the Data Protection Act) that the applicant meets the County's criteria for a disabled parking bay, and the need for this has also been confirmed via correspondence with their GP.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/10 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	43	Replies received	6	Response rate	14%
Not in favour of the proposals	5	83%			
Commented, but with no clear view				1	17%

The formal consultation produced similar responses to the informal consultation, and whilst anyone has a right to object to a change to parking restrictions, we also have to consider the mobility requirements of members of the community.

It should be noted that there was also an objection from the applicant, not against the provision of a disabled parking bay, but asking that it be provided directly outside their property (rather than at the end of the run of parking bays, about 10m away)

Analysis and Officer recommendation

From the consultation responses, parking in this area is an issue between residents. However the proposal to change part of the existing parking to a disabled parking bay would not significantly alter the number of vehicles parking in the area, as the disabled resident already parks there.

Accordingly it is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be implemented.

Location reference	EM-11
Road / Area	Chapel Street
File Ref	OSP-14
Plan reference:	DD/566/11

New double yellow lines to prevent parking opposite an access.

Issue

A resident of Chapel Street has asked that the parking bays opposite their access be removed to ease access to their driveway, particularly when manoeuvring a trailer.

Prior to informal consultation - Officer Recommendation - Proceed to informal consultation

Informal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/11 were taken to informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of the restrictions, which started on the 4th June and closed on the 6th July 2014.

The response to the informal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	22	Replies received	6	Response rate	27%
In favour of the proposals				6	100%

Following informal consultation - Officer Recommendation

As there were no objections to the proposals it was agreed that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

Formal Consultation

The proposals shown on plan DD/566/11 were taken to formal consultation between 21st November and 19th December 2014.

The response to the formal consultation was as follows;

Number of properties consulted	22	Replies received	5	Response rate	23%
In favour of the proposals	3	60%			
Not in favour of the proposal				2	40%

The formal consultation produced a good level of response.

Both objections were that the objectors didn't think that difficult to get in and out of the property in question, and that on-street parking in the area was at a premium.

There were also comments about the traffic calming work – that the narrowing at Rats Castle Hill seemed pointless and the existing parking arrangements in the village were sufficient traffic calming.

Whilst I understand the comments relating to the traffic calming,

Analysis and Officer recommendation

Whilst we would not normally look at adjusting parking arrangements opposite an access, the applicant's issue relates to problems turning with a trailer, combined with the gradient of the access, which reduces the turning movements available.

Accordingly it is recommended that the objections be set aside, and the proposals be implemented.