

# STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

10 November 2015

Is the final decision on the recommendations in this report to be made at this meeting?

**Yes**

## Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

<b>Final Decision-Maker</b>	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
<b>Lead Head of Service</b>	David Edwards Director of Environment and Shared Services
<b>Lead Officer and Report Author</b>	Jeff Kitson Parking Services Manager
<b>Classification</b>	Public
<b>Wards affected</b>	All

### **This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:**

1. That the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee agree to the Joint Transportation Board recommendations in relation to Waiting Restrictions Variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11 and agree to make the Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 .
2. That the Committee recommends to Kent County Council as the Highway Authority that the various Orders be sealed as outlined in this report.

### **This report relates to the following corporate priorities:**

- Keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all.  
By managing parking demand and regulating dangerous and antisocial parking.
- Securing a successful economy for Maidstone Borough.  
By ensuring traffic flow, easing congestion.

### **Timetable**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>
Joint Transportation Board	14 October 2015
Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee.	10 November 2015

# Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Identify proposals which are intended to resolve parking problems and improve traffic flow by reducing localised congestion; this is in accordance with the Borough Council's priority to improve access across the Borough through better roads.
  - 1.2 To enable the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee to consider the recommendations of the Joint Transportation Board in relation to Waiting Restrictions Variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11.
  - 1.3 To enable the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee to recommend to Kent County Council as the Highway Authority that the Orders be sealed and the proposals implemented as outlined in this report.
- 

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Various requests from Councillors and the public have been received by Parking Services for the introduction of parking restrictions at several locations across the Borough. These 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.
- 

## **3. AVAILABLE OPTIONS**

- 3.1 To consider the views of the public and the recommendations of the Joint Transportation Board and agree to make the Orders.
  - 3.2 To agree to recommend to Kent County Council as the Highways Authority that the Orders be thereafter sealed
  - 3.3 To not proceed with the recommendations contained herein, which would result in some much needed Traffic Regulation Orders not being implemented, which are intended to regulate parking to reduce identified difficulties.
- 

## **4. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 That the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee consider the views of the public and the recommendations of the Joint Transportation Board and agree to make the orders and then recommend that they be sealed by Kent County Council, as set out in Options 3.1 and 3.2 above.

- 4.2 This will result in some much needed Traffic Regulation Orders being implemented, which are intended to regulate parking to reduce identified difficulties.
- 

## **5. CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK**

- 5.1 Correspondence was sent to statutory and non statutory consultees. Street notices were also posted in the affected roads.
- 5.2 A Public Notice formally advertising the Orders for Waiting Restrictions Variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11 were published in the local press during the week ending Friday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015.
- 5.3 Full details were contained in the draft Orders which, together with a copy of the Public Notices, site plans and a statement of the Borough Council's reasons for proposing to make the Orders were placed on deposit at the Main Reception, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XQ, and at the Gateway Reception, King Street, Maidstone, ME15 6JQ.
- 5.4 Proposed Orders were advertised and all comments received during the formal consultation were reviewed and considered.
- 5.5 The proposals and results of the public consultation were formally presented to the Joint Transportation Board on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2015.
- 5.6 Orders not receiving objections to Waiting restrictions variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11  
(DYL means waiting to be prohibited at all times by double yellow lines; SYL and loading restrictions means no waiting at the times prescribed).
- 5.7 Waiting restrictions.
- 5.8 MAIDSTONE; Ashburnham Road and Downs View Road;  
To introduce a 30 minute restriction from Mon-Fri 1.30pm -2.pm with amendments to the DYL to help alleviate congestion at certain times and allow free flow of traffic and safe passage. Although no objections were received, we did receive correspondence which suggested some changes to the scheme and raised concerns in relation to vehicle migration.
- 5.9 MAIDSTONE; Brunswick Street, George St and Orchard St;  
Amend the current restrictions from a SYL Mon-Fri 9am -5pm to a DYL in some locations and introduce additional resident parking bays due to a change from commercial to residential properties.
- 5.10 MAIDSTONE; Tarragon Road and Tarragon Road (Exit road from Maidstone Hospital) Hermitage Lane and Coriander Drive;  
To formalise the existing restrictions due to the adoption of the road by Kent County Council.
- 5.11 MAIDSTONE; Heathfield Road;

To extend the existing DYL due to inconsiderate parking to allow free flow of traffic. Two letters of support and one comment received raising concerns in relation to vehicle migration and increased speeds.

5.12 MAIDSTONE; Waterlow Road;

To introduce a small section of DYL to preserve access/egress.

5.13 MARDEN; Church Green;

To amend the current Mon-Fri 1.30-2pm to Mon –Fri 10.30-11am, at the request of local councillors and the Parish to review the parking restrictions in the Village.

5.14 Loading Restrictions

5.15 MAIDSTONE; Earl Street and Week Street;

To formalise the existing restrictions.

5.16 Residents parking.

5.17 MAIDSTONE; Brunswick Street, George St, Orchard Street;

Introduce additional resident parking bays due to a change from commercial to residential properties and amend existing bays.

5.18 Designated disabled persons parking places.

5.19 MAIDSTONE; Bower Lane, Dover Street, Foley Street, King Edward Road, Milton Street, and Whitmore Street;

Establish new parking places for disabled persons vehicles (Blue Badge Holders)

5.20 Orders receiving objection to Waiting restrictions variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11 together with a summary of the objections and the relevant Joint Transportation Board recommendations. (DYL means waiting to be prohibited at all times by double yellow lines; SYL and loading restrictions means no waiting at the times prescribed).

5.21 MAIDSTONE; John Street;

To amend the current Mon-Fri 9am-5pm restrictions to DYL at the junctions to preserve sightlines and free flow of traffic.

Four objections were received on the grounds that the imposition of a 24 hour restriction would have a significant detrimental impact upon the residents in the area, by removing the ability to park outside of the current restriction times. They would also have a negative impact upon the running of the business in the area, in both in terms of the delivery of supplies and also impact upon customers and patrons of the business.

Although it is appreciated that the proposal will reduce parking availability, it should also be noted that you should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction, however the original decision to amend the initial Order was made to increase the parking availability and if there are difficulties which relate to safety then these should be referred to Kent County Council. One letter in support.

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee not to proceed with the proposal.**

5.22 MAIDSTONE; Sandling Road;

To amend the current Mon-Fri 9am-5pm restrictions to Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm and DYL to preserve sightlines and free flow of traffic and reduce traffic congestion.

One comment was received on the grounds that the proposal to change the current restriction to the proposed Monday to Saturday 8.00am – 6.30pm restriction would have a detrimental impact on the residents parking availability, it was also suggested by a local resident that the current Residents' Parking restriction times should be reduced to a 5 minute waiting limited.

The original request raised concerns in relation to the vehicles parking on the current restrictions which impeded vehicle movement: we have no plans to change the current waiting limit in the residents parking bays as a proposal to change the waiting times in North 1 was put forward in 2013 but was not approved due to objections received. The Council did, however, change the upper section of Sandling Road to 30 mins as this was supported.

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the proposal.**

5.23 MAIDSTONE; St Laurence Avenue;

To introduce DYL opposite the access/egress to a commercial property.

One objection was received on the grounds the restrictions are no longer warranted as the company who occupied the premises and who requested the restrictions no longer occupy the land, negating the need for the restrictions.

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee not to proceed with the proposal.**

5.24 MAIDSTONE; The Mallows;

To introduce restrictions from Mon-Sun 8am -6pm to manage parking demand and allow free flow of traffic and safe passage.

Seven objections were received on the grounds that the imposition of the current proposed Monday to Sunday 8.00am – 6.00pm restriction would have a significant detrimental impact on the residents parking availability, and the dispersion of vehicles into other streets would also have a further effect on the other residential streets. Three comments were also received and three letters of support, however some residents do not consider that there was a problem with parking.

The proposal is designed to manage the current parking demand in the area and migration of vehicles may occur. However, this will be monitored and, if necessary, further restrictions may need to be considered although this will need to be managed carefully to reduce the impact on residents.

We have written to the residents with an amended proposal of Mon-Fri 09.00am – 5.00pm and have received one correspondence withdrawing their objection to the original proposal and in favour of the new proposal.

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee not to proceed with the proposal as there remains substantial objections to the scheme.**

5.25 MARDEN; High Street;

To amend the current Mon-Fri 1.30-2pm restriction to Mon –Fri 10.30-11am and amend the Monday to Saturday 08:00 to 18:30 restriction opposite Maidstone Road to DYLS to improve safety, at the request of local councillors and the Parish Council to review the parking restrictions in the village. One objection was received on the grounds that the imposition of a 24 hour restriction would have a significant detrimental impact upon the running of the business in the area, in both in terms of the delivery of supplies and also impact upon customers and patrons of the business and their generally safety. It will therefore have a direct influence on customer levels; the dispersion of vehicles into other street would also have a detrimental effect on the mainly residential streets.

The proposal is only to change a small section of SYL from Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm restriction, opposite the Maidstone Road junction to a 24 hr restriction. Therefore, currently, vehicles cannot park in this location during these hours. We are also proposing to amend the existing SYL from Mon – Fri 1.30 -2pm to Mon-Fri 10.30am -11.am and will still leave sufficient parking for customers. There is also alternative parking within the Village Car Park.

We have been working in liaison with the Parish Council and have had responses back from Councillors. They did not make comment on the consultation as they agreed with the DYL proposal. However, their comments are: \_DYL are supported outside the Post Office mainly on road safety grounds as it is opposite Maidstone Road junction which is particularly difficult junction for larger vehicles. The effects on businesses would be no different during the day as the restriction period is the same and reduced outside of the operational hours (with parking available nearby for any early morning deliveries / collections).

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee to proceed with the proposal.**

5.26 Designated free parking places

5.27 MARDEN; High Street;

To introduce a 4-hour waiting limited bays to increase vehicle turnover due to the review of the parking restrictions in the Village.

Two objections and two letters containing comments on the proposal were received on the grounds that, the imposition of a 4-hour waiting restriction would have a significant detrimental impact upon the residents and businesses in the area, in both in terms of the delivery of supplies etc and also impact upon customers and patrons of the business.

It could therefore have a direct influence on customer levels; the dispersion of vehicles into other street would also have a detrimental effect on the mainly residential streets.

**Joint Transportation Board Recommendation: To recommend to the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transportation Committee not to proceed with the proposal.**

## **6. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION**

- 6.1 Where agreed, the Traffic Regulation Order Waiting Restrictions Variation No 30 and Designated Parking Places Variation No 11 will be amended accordingly and presented to Kent County Council as the Highway Authority for sealing.
- 6.2 The 'as made' Order will be advertised.
- 6.3 The objectors will be informed of the outcome.

## **7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Implications</b>	<b>Sign-off</b>
<b>Impact on Corporate Priorities</b>	The proposals are intended to resolve parking problems and improve traffic flow by reducing localised congestion; this is in accordance with the Council's priority to improve access across the Borough through better roads, thereby keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all.	Parking Services Manager
<b>Risk Management</b>	Consideration has been given to objections and formal letters of support with regard 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
<b>Financial</b>	The costs of the order variation and implementation will be met from within the existing Parking Services budget.	Finance Team

<b>Staffing</b>	None	
<b>Legal</b>	Formal orders will need to be made and signed by Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.	Kate Jardine, Team Leader (Planning) Mid Kent Legal Services
<b>Equality Impact Needs Assessment</b>	None identified	Clare Wood, Policy & Performance Officer
<b>Environmental/Sustainable Development</b>	None	
<b>Community Safety</b>	None	
<b>Human Rights Act</b>	None	
<b>Procurement</b>	None	
<b>Asset Management</b>	None	

## **8. REPORT APPENDICES**

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

- Appendix A: Maps of the Proposals

---

## **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.