Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Committee	
Lead Head of Service	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager	
Lead Officer and Report Author	Charlie Reynolds, Operations Engineer	
Classification	Public	
Wards affected	All	

Executive Summary

Requests have been received by Parking Services for the introduction of parking restrictions at several locations across the borough. These locations have been surveyed and evaluated to assess the impact on parking provision within each local area where significant parking difficulties were identified.

Proposed orders were advertised, and all comments received during the formal consultation were reviewed and considered.

Purpose of Report

Decision

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

That the Joint Transportation Board recommends to the Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Committee and Kent County Council as the Highway Authority that:

- 1. The proposals for West End are not proceeded.
- 2. The proposals for Pattenden Lane are not proceeded.
- 3. The proposals for Church Green are proceeded.
- 4. The proposals for High Street are proceeded.
- 5. The proposals for Sovereign Way are proceeded.
- 6. The proposals for Sutton Forge are proceeded.
- 7. The proposals for Albion Road are proceeded.
- 8. The proposals for Chantry Road are proceeded.

Timetable		
Meeting	Date	
Joint Transportation Board	10th July 2019	
Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Committee.	10th September 2019	

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

1. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	The Strategic Plan objectives are: • Embracing Growth and Enabling Infrastructure	Parking Services Manager
Cross Cutting Objectives	The report recommendations support the community by taking into consideration the traffic issues and managing the parking demand.	Parking Services Manager
Risk Management	Consideration must be given to objections and formal letters of support in relation to each proposal. However, this must be balanced against the risks involved in relation to road safety, free flow of traffic, environmental impact and vehicle migration.	Parking Services Manager
Financial	The costs of the order variation and implementation will be met from within the existing Parking Services budget.	Finance Team
Staffing	There will be no impact on staffing.	Parking Services Manager
Legal	Formal orders will need to be made and signed by Kent County Council as the Highway Authority under their statutory powers	Cheryl Parks Mid Kent Legal Services (Planning)
Privacy and Data Protection	Parking Services will hold that data in line with our retention schedules.	Policy and Information Team
Equalities	The public consultation has identified a possible impact in terms on the elderly population's ability to access village amenities as a result of the changes to traffic regulations. Consideration has been given to these comments and the proposals amended accordingly.	Equalities and Corporate Policy Officer
Public Health	None.	Public Health Officer
Crime and Disorder	None.	Parking Services Manager
Procurement	None.	Parking Services Manager

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Requests have been received by Parking Services for the introduction of parking restrictions at several locations across the borough. Kent County Council and Maidstone Borough Council Officers met Marden Parish Council to discuss the issues raised.
- 2.2 These locations have been surveyed and evaluated to assess the impact on parking provision within each local area where significant parking difficulties were identified.
- 2.3 Proposed orders were advertised, and all comments received during the formal consultation were reviewed and considered.
- 2.4 This report identifies those proposals where objections have been received.
- 2.5 During the Consultation Period, Parking Services received 2 objections and 4 comments in respect of West End in Marden. 8 Objections and 7 Comments in respect of Pattenden Lane, we also received 2 letters of support. 2 objections were also received in respect of Marden proposals in general.
- 2.6 A summary of the proposed action for each proposal is summarised in the table below.

Proposed Restriction in;	Recommendation
1. West End (Marden)	Not to proceed with the proposal.
2. Pattenden Lane (Marden)	Not to proceed with the proposal.
3. Church Green (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.
4. High Street (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.
5. Sovereign Way (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.
6. Sutton Forge (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.
7. Albion Road (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.
8. Chantry Road (Marden)	To proceed with the proposal.

2.7 A full summary of the consultation results are contained in Appendix B.

3. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 3.1 To accept the recommendations will recognise objections made in relation to specific proposals and will allow orders to be implemented to regulate parking to reduce difficulties.
- 3.2 Rejecting the recommendations will result in some orders not being implemented, which are intended to regulate parking to reduce identified difficulties.
- 3.3 To make the orders as advertised would not take account of comments received during formal consultation.

4. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 To proceed with the recommendations will recognise objections made in relation to specific proposals and will allow orders to be implemented to regulate parking to reduce difficulties.
- 4.2 Appendix A provides details of the proposed orders receiving objection, to the Kent County Council (Various Roads, Borough of Maidstone) (Waiting restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Variation No 22) Order 2019 with a summary of the objections and the relevant recommendations.
- 4.3 Appendix B provides a summary of the consultation and responses.
- 4.4 Appendix C provides maps of each of the proposals.

5. RISK

5.1 As part of the legal process to amend Traffic Regulation Orders, formal consultation was undertaken and any objections received considered. As this is a legislative process, the risks associated to legal challenge are reduced.

6. CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

- 6.1 Correspondence was sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees; Public Notices were also posted in the affected roads.
- 6.2 A Public Notice formally advertising the orders for The Kent County Council (Various Roads, Borough of Maidstone) (Waiting restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Variation No 22) Order 2019 were published in the Local Press during the week ending Friday 1st March 2019.
- 6.3 Full details were contained in the draft orders which, together with a copy of the Public Notices, site plans and a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the orders were placed on deposit at the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XX, and at the Gateway Reception, King Street, Maidstone, ME156JQ.
- 6.4 Proposed orders were advertised, and all comments received during the formal consultation were reviewed and considered.

7. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

7.1 The recommendations of the Joint Transportation Board will be presented to the Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Committee for consideration on

- 10th September 2019 and thereafter the Traffic Regulation Order amended accordingly.
- 7.2 The objectors will be informed of the outcome.
- 7.3 Once the formal process has been completed the Has Made Order will be submitted to Kent County Council for sealing.
- 7.4 After the Order has been sealed then the restrictions will then be implemented at each location.

8. REPORT APPENDICES

8.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

Appendix A: Proposed orders receiving objections and recommendations.

Appendix B: Consultation summary of responses.

Appendix C: Maps of each the proposal.

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None