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Recommendation:
That the Board endorses the proposed course of action for each site, namely:

I. **Camden Park** – drop the current proposal pending consultation on a permit parking scheme.

II. **Byng Road** – Implement the proposal as advertised.

III. **Culverden Down** – amend the proposals advertised to allow on-street parking to continue to take place on the southern side of the road.

INTRODUCTION

1. Following complaints and requests from a number of sources, a draft traffic regulation order was advertised in April. The proposals covered 17 locations within Tunbridge Wells, Southborough and Langton Green. 56 objections were made to proposals contained within the draft order, with 3 locations having more than 5 adverse comments. The Board is requested to endorse a course of action for each of those 3 sites.

THE PROPOSALS

2. The draft traffic regulation order covered 17 distinct locations, these being:-

- Barnetts Close, High Brooms
- Camden Park/The Meads/The Shaw
- Credon Park/Yew Tree Road, Southborough
- Culverden Down/Culverden Avenue/Reynolds Lane
- Culverden Park/Culverden Park Road
- Denbigh Road/Silverdale Road
THE OBJECTIONS

3. As per agreed practice, locations receiving up to 5 objections are referred direct to KCC Highways for a decision, whereas those with more than 5 adverse comments first need referring to this Board for a recommendation.

4. Because some comments were quite wide ranging, covering more than one location, only those where specific points were raised in respect of a particular proposal have been brought before members for consideration.

5. The three sites where more than 5 objections were submitted are as follows, including details of the comments made:-

- **Camden Park/The Meads/The Shaw** – Double yellow lines had been proposed to ease movement along the spine road (Camden Park) and at junctions, but objectors – 6 in total plus 4 who expressed qualified support – stated that what was proposed was insufficient and would simply concentrate any problems on the unrestricted sections. 3 respondents indicated support although two of these were received after the consultation closed.

- **Byng Road** – Here the proposal was for a single yellow line along one side of the road with a restriction in force between 10am and 11am during the week to prevent long stay parking on both sides of the road which currently creates a narrow central running lane. 30 objections to this were raised during the consultation plus one just after the deadline. 4 declarations of support were submitted together with one qualified response. It should, however, be noted that this proposal was instigated by a petition with 58 signatures from 36 addresses in Byng Road. The objections, whilst acknowledging the issue in Byng Road all considered that the issues in the wider residential area should be addressed holistically and not in a piecemeal way which, it was felt, would simply transfer long-stay parking by non-residents into other roads – i.e. the problem would simply migrate elsewhere..

- **Culverden Down/Culverden Avenue/Reynolds Lane** – Double yellow lines were proposed on both sides of Culverden Down across the two side turnings together with the same restriction for the first few metres of each side road. This followed concerns about highway safety through obstructed visibility at
the junctions. Objectors said this was too much and would lose parking space on street and cause traffic speeds to increase. 9 objections were made with one letter of qualified support.

RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDED COURSES OF ACTION

6. In the cases of Camden Park and Byng Road there are similar underlying issues with commuters and/or local workers parking in residential streets and creating problems for those who live in the area. In both cases more work and wider ranging proposals are under consideration but it was felt that the restrictions as advertised could be implemented in the shorter term without significant detriment elsewhere. Objectors clearly felt otherwise in both cases.

7. It should be noted that in neither of these cases did objectors feel that the restrictions being proposed were fundamentally wrong, simply that they were either premature or did not go far enough in dealing with perceived problems.

8. The choice therefore rests between implementing the restrictions as advertised and accept the fact that there may be some negative impact until more wide ranging proposals come to fruition or, delay their implementation and include them in a larger overall scheme.

9. Camden Park - problems only began to appear when AXA PPP occupied the old Land registry building. If that parking could be prevented, it is reasonable to assume that the situation would revert to its previous state. An option is, therefore, to restrict the three roads (Camden Park, The Meads and The Shaw) to permit holder parking during specified hours, either for the whole estate or selected areas.

10. Since that was one option being considered for these roads, it is recommended that the current proposal be dropped in favour of promoting a permit parking scheme subject to the results of further consultation.

11. Byng Road - problems being experienced have been steadily increasing over a long period of time and, whilst a permit parking scheme is likely to be considered for the area as a whole, the outcome of that process is far less certain than for Camden Park. In view of the nature of issues being raised in respect of Byng Road, it is recommended that the proposal be implemented as advertised.

12. Any consequential effects could be considered as part of the wider review of parking in the area.

13. Culverden Down - objections covered two principle issues, one being the loss of on-street parking space and the other questioned whether there was any need for restrictions at all and that introducing them may lead to an increase in traffic speeds.

14. On the loss of parking, it needs to be understood that there is no right to park on a highway and that a highway authority is under no obligation to provide parking facilities. Notwithstanding that point, parking is normally only restricted where there is demonstrable harm either to safety or the local environment.
15. In respect of this particular proposal it is accepted that the proposal as advertised may be more than the minimum necessary to preserve safety – which was the basis of the original request. To address both the initial concern and the concerns about parking it is recommended that the proposal be adjusted to only provide the restriction on the northern side of Culverden Down across and to each side of the affected junctions – Culverden Avenue and Reynolds Lane.

16. Details of these three proposals and suggested amendments are shown on drawings included at Appendix A
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