

**Agenda Item No:** 8  
**Report To:** Joint Transportation Board  
**Date:** Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2012  
**Report Title:** Prioritised List of Requested Parking Controls for Investigation and Possible Implementation  
**Report Author:** Ray Wilkinson, Engineering Services Manager  
Paul Jackson, Head of Environmental Services



**Summary:** This report has been written as a result of the number of parking control scheme requests received each year and the difficulty of assessing, prioritising and implementing them which is both fair and proportionate, as well as being understood by all those involved in requesting them. It therefore outlines all requests received for investigation in 2012/13 and explains the methodology behind the proposed prioritised list of schemes which the Board are asked to endorse.

**Key Decision:** NO

**Affected Wards:** All

**Recommendations:** **That the Board consider and approve the adoption of the proposed priority list for investigation, consultation and where agreed, implementation.**

**Financial Implications:** Various (see Appendix 1) – dependent on the extent of each scheme

**Contacts:** ray.wilkinson@ashford.gov.uk – Tel: (01233) 330299  
paul.jackson@ashford.gov.uk – Tel: (01233) 330297

## **Report Title: Prioritised List of Requested Parking Controls for Investigation and Possible Implementation**

### **Purpose of the Report**

1. This report outlines all parking control scheme requests received for investigation and explains the methodology behind the proposed prioritised list of schemes which the Board are asked to endorse.

### **Issue to be Decided**

2. The Board are asked to agree a prioritised list of parking control schemes for investigation and potential implementation.

### **Background**

3. A large number of requests for parking controls are received each year from a variety of sources including, residents, County and Borough Members, Parish Councils, bus operators, businesses and the emergency services. Given the finite availability of resources it is therefore important to develop a fair and logical method by which to prioritise these requests.
4. Following discussion with the Chair and Vice Chair of JTB, it has been suggested that a report be submitted to the Board at each year's March meeting to request approval of the prioritised list for the following year. Any scheme requests received after the finalisation of the list will therefore be recorded for inclusion on the following year's list unless they are of an emergency nature – i.e. are the subject of a formal notification from Kent Police or concern a crash site as recorded on the crash data base relating to dangerous parking practices. Not only will this process ensure that scheme requests are dealt with fairly and logically but it will also avoid the delays commonly experienced as a result of extended dialogues between Officers and requestees throughout the year on when newly proposed schemes might be implemented.
5. It should however be borne in mind that the proposed list represents simply an order of priority, not a project programme. The nature of these schemes is such that it is impossible to reliably determine the involvement required for a particular scheme prior to its instigation. Not only may the complexity and scope of the proposals vary considerably between schemes, but external factors such as the level of support / objection received from residents, statutory consultees and local bodies also has a major impact on the involvement required. In an average year (based on current staff resource) it can be anticipated that somewhere in the region of 10 schemes may be progressed to implementation but this is obviously subject to substantial variation.

## Types of Scheme

6. First, it should be borne in mind that parking restrictions are, in most locations, unnecessary. The Highway Code provides guidance to motorists on where they should and should not park regardless of the presence of parking restrictions. Parking restrictions only become necessary in those locations where either demand for parking is sufficiently high and the availability of parking sufficiently low that motorists become tempted to park in unsuitable locations or where the unsuitability of a particular location for parking may not be immediately obvious to the motorist, or where suitable parking is available but its use must be managed to ensure that those user groups with greatest need have opportunities to park. All such above described situations are most commonly encountered in urban areas where traffic flows and parking demand are generally higher. This results in a greater concentration in the number of parking requests around population centres.
7. The requests received relate to a variety of parking problems. These can broadly be divided into two categories:
  - (i) 'safety and movement';
  - (ii) 'parking management'.
8. (i) Safety and movement schemes are intended to address parking in locations which are dangerous or where the vehicle would impede the free flow of traffic (e.g. parking on bends, where the road is too narrow or there is high peak hour traffic flow).
9. (ii) Parking management schemes deal with parking in locations where there is competition from a number of user groups and where it is necessary to strike a balance between these groups (e.g. residential roads which experience heavy competition for parking from commuters or shoppers).
10. Although Kent County Council is the local Highway Authority for Kent (excluding Medway), a number of highway functions are undertaken by the District Councils who act as their agents. In March 2010 a revised Parking Protocol document was agreed which clarified this division of responsibilities.
11. In respect of new schemes the document identifies all parking management schemes (i.e. those involving controlled parking zones, limited waiting bays, and user specific bays such as disabled bays, taxi ranks etc) as the responsibility of District Councils.
12. All safety and movement schemes (i.e. schemes consisting of yellow lines, bus stop clearways, white access markings and yellow hatch markings) fall under the remit of Kent County Council. The introduction of all parking restriction schemes (both movement & safety and parking management) are however generally carried out by the District Councils however in order to ensure consistency, particularly in relation to the traffic orders themselves.

## **Staff Resource**

13. Staff resource, aside from funding (discussed below), is the most crucial – and limiting - factor in respect of the number of schemes which can be investigated within any given year. ABC's Engineering Services is a small team, currently consisting of the Manager, Administrative Assistant and a temporary Assistant Engineer. Furthermore the investigation and introduction of new schemes is only one of a number of functions carried out by the department, so prioritisation of work, staff and funding resources are all vital for the effective functioning of this service.

## **Funding Sources**

14. Unfortunately sources of funding are limited. ABC's Engineering Services is not allocated a budget specifically for new schemes and those scheme requests received from KCC are generally funded through one of three sources:
  - The crash remedial budget (this budget is limited, relates strictly to safety restrictions in locations with a personal injury crash history and is awarded on a priority points basis);
  - The Member Highway Fund scheme (all County Members are provided with a £25,000 discretionary fund for local highway schemes which might not otherwise be prioritised sufficiently highly to attract funding from the main budget)
  - The Integrated Transport Packages scheme (this is administered by KCC's Public Transport team and relates to the introduction of bus stop clearways and similar schemes only).
15. Although the majority of schemes are funded from one of the three above sources other outside bodies may also provide funding, these include;
  - Parish Councils may choose to provide funding for a scheme
  - Businesses may provide funding to address a parking problem affecting them directly
  - Planning Obligations may also provide a source of funding for certain schemes
16. In addition to the above, at the meeting of the Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2012, a budget for an ABC Ward Members' Community Grant scheme was approved. This scheme provides ABC Members with £2,500 discretionary spend for local schemes. Subject to demonstrating clear community benefit this scheme may have the potential to contribute to parking schemes. This scheme will be introduced at the commencement of the 2012/13 financial year.

## **Prioritisation Methodology**

17. Allocation of resources is always difficult; more so when those resources are extremely limited. This report, as stated in the front page 'summary' is being brought to Members as a result of the number of parking control scheme requests received each year and the difficulty of finding a way to assess,

prioritise and implement them which is both fair and proportionate, as well as being understood by all those involved in requesting them.

18. We have, therefore, used a number of factors in assessing the schemes. These are;

- **Safety Implications**

Is there a significant safety risk associated with the problem (e.g. crash risk, pedestrian safety risk, obstruction of emergency service vehicles etc) and to what extent will it be alleviated by the introduction of the scheme?

- **Compliance with Legislation and National Guidance**

Does the scheme design meet with all relevant legislation and national guidance and is the scheme feasible from an enforcement perspective?

- **Improvement to the Highway Amenity**

Is there a significant issue relating to the effectiveness of the highway network (i.e. traffic flow – particularly public service vehicles, pedestrian access etc) and to what extent will the scheme alleviate the issue?

- **Supporting Sustainable Transport**

Does the scheme support sustainable transport options (e.g. improve bus, cycle or pedestrian access)?

- **Delivering Corporate Objectives**

To what extent does the scheme contribute to the economic resilience and well-being of the borough (i.e. job creation/retention. Economic development/regeneration) and does it facilitate corporate business planning for the future?

- **Risk of Unintended Consequences**

Is the introduction of the scheme likely to have unintended implications (e.g. migration of parking to unsuitable locations)?

- **Value for money**

How does the time / cost of the scheme relate to the anticipated benefit it will achieve?

- **Likely Success of the Scheme**

Is the scheme likely to encounter significant opposition at the formal consultation stage requiring the scheme to be abandoned?

- **Availability of Funding**

Has a funding source been identified and what are the limitations relating to the funding source (e.g. sum available, time period available etc)?

- **Can the Scheme be Combined?**

In the case of a small scheme can it be combined with another similar / nearby scheme to provide a cost saving?

## **The Schemes: What, Why & How?**

19. Based on the above assessment criteria, the following proposed prioritised list consists of a total of 29 schemes, some of which are formed by the combination of two or more, smaller discrete scheme requests.

### **Station Road, Pluckley (Priority No. 1)**

20. The first scheme identified on the list is Station Road, Pluckley. This is in recognition of the safety issues involved. The primary concern at this site relates to the regular on-street parking taking place immediately adjacent to a humpback bridge where the line of sight for approaching vehicles is obscured by the road topography, effectively hiding the parked vehicles from sight until the moving vehicle is within close proximity.
21. A Form 1214 (also known as a pink peril) has been received from the Police, formally advising of the need for action at this site. In addition to this however there are also obstructive / unsafe parking practices taking place on residential roads in the vicinity of the station. It is necessary that any action taken at this location considers not only the immediate safety issue around the bridge but also the impact on both commuters and residents. As a priority safety scheme this work is to be funded from KCC's crash remedial budget.

### **Victoria Road & Leacon Road (Priority No. 2)**

22. Following the opening of the new 'Victoria Way' scheme (providing a through route between Beaver Road and Brookfield Road), the bus operator has applied a revised bus route to provide shorter journey times between Singleton and the town centre. The operator has therefore requested the introduction of a total of 6 bus stops with bus stop clearways and bus borders to serve the new section of the route and a date of 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012 has been set for the introduction of the service (once the route is registered the bus operator is required to commence the operation of services on the route from a date identified within the registration).

### **Henwood Industrial Estate (Priority No. 3)**

23. This scheme was requested to address unsafe and unsuitable parking practices on the estate, particularly obstruction of commercial vehicles accessing units on the estate, obstruction of the footway and parking on junctions and bends. This scheme is funded from the Member Highway Fund scheme. The scheme was taken to consultation in September 2011 and subsequently received approval, subject to resolution of concerns over the displacement of commuter parking, at a special meeting of the JTB held in October 2011. An update report was taken to the December 2011 JTB meeting and it was agreed that, subject to a review of charges in the Henwood P&D Car Park (to be agreed by Cabinet), the proposals be implemented.
24. A set of revised parking charges (a reduction from £1.00ph to £0.80ph and equivalent reduction in all day and season ticket prices) has subsequently

been agreed by Cabinet. The revised charges will therefore be implemented shortly in tandem with the safety scheme.

#### **Cobbs Wood Industrial Estate (Priority No. 4)**

25. Similar to the Henwood scheme, this scheme is proposed in order to address unsafe and unsuitable parking practices on the Cobbs Wood estate. At present the estate is subject to a number of sections of single yellow line which have been in-situ since sometime before 2000. The location and extent of the current restrictions require review however, due to inconsistencies in their positioning. In addition the use of single yellow lines effectively indicates to motorists that parking in these locations is acceptable outside of the working day. This is not the case in many of the locations where single yellow lines are currently employed - around junctions, bends and where the road is too narrow to safely accommodate parking. The Highway Code specifically stipulates that parking should not take place in these locations at any time. The single yellow line restrictions have also proved difficult to enforce because motorists regularly remove the sign plates making the lines unenforceable. The scheme will therefore require these lines to be replaced with double yellow lines. Due to the crash record at this site the scheme is to be funded by KCC's crash remedial budget.

#### **Willesborough Lees (Priority No. 5)**

26. This safety scheme has been proposed as part of a larger multi-agency approach to tackling transport and commuter parking problems affecting the William Harvey Hospital and surrounding residential roads. A controlled parking zone was implemented across a 500m radius of the hospital in 2007 in order to tackle dangerous and unsuitable parking and also to provide residents with greater opportunities to find parking in the vicinity of their homes. Since that time however there is evidence that commuter parking has extended beyond this zone and has now become a problem in residential roads on the periphery of the existing controlled parking zone. Funding for this scheme is to be sourced from the Member Highway Fund scheme.

#### **Goat Lees (Priority No. 6)**

27. This scheme is intended to address current unsuitable parking practices in residential roads resulting from commuter parking generated by the nearby Eureka Business Park. Although a parking survey carried out early in 2011 found little evidence of unsafe / obstructive parking practices, reports from residents, the Parish Council and Ward Member have all stated that the parking situation has deteriorated and requires intervention to discourage dangerous parking practices. The Parish Council has offered to fund this scheme from its precept.

#### **Willesborough Infants & Juniors Schools (Priority No. 7)**

28. This scheme is intended to address unsafe / unsuitable parking at the beginning and end of the school day. At present significant parking issues are experienced both in Highfield Road and Church Road extending out from the school accesses. Problems experienced in these locations include unsafe

parking around junctions and bends, obstruction of crossing points, and traffic congestion. A funding source for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **Downs View Infant & Kennington Junior Schools (Priority No. 8)**

29. This scheme has been requested by both the Borough and County Member and is intended to address unsafe / unsuitable parking at the beginning and end of the school day. Current parking practices around both schools result in obstruction of traffic flow, dangerous parking around junctions and parking on the footway. The scheme will rationalise existing parking and crossing controls to improve the availability of suitable parking as well as address parking in unsuitable locations. This work is to be funded through the Member Highway Fund scheme

### **Aldington Primary School (Priority No. 9)**

30. This scheme was requested in order to address unsafe parking practices around the school at the beginning and end of the school day. At present an advisory only 'school keep clear' marking is located outside the school; however this does not meet DfT specifications. It is therefore proposed to improve crossing facilities outside the school and also to address problems relating to the obstruction of adjacent accesses. This scheme is to be funded through the Member Highway Fund scheme.

### **North School, Willesborough (Priority No. 10)**

31. This scheme is intended to address unsafe / unsuitable parking at the beginning and end of the school day and is to be funded through the Member Highway Fund scheme.

### **Bridge Street & Bramble Lane, Wye (Priority No. 11)**

32. This scheme addresses two discrete issues. In Bridge Street there are currently obstructive parking problems which are impacting on the bus service. The bus operator has expressed concern and stated that without resolution they will have to re-evaluate the viability of the route. In Bramble Lane there is a safety issue concerning regular parking around the junction with Havillands Place, the access of the Station car park, and the nearby bend. A source of funding for this scheme has yet to be identified although the Parish Council have intimated that they may be willing to provide funding.

### **Various Locations (Priority No. 12)**

33. This scheme consists of safety restrictions in a variety of locations in order to address congestion issues impacting on bus services and the introduction of bus stop clearways (in tandem with bus boarders) at those stops within the Borough where they have yet to be introduced. The introduction of these restrictions were outlined in the 'Bus Strategy for Ashford (2006)' as actions for KCC. However due to funding issues much of the work identified remains outstanding. Assurances have now been made that Ashford will receive priority for the allocation of funds in 2012/13 from the Integrated Transport Plan fund.



### **Bybrook Road (Priority No. 13)**

34. This scheme consists of the relocation of a bus stop. The bus stop is currently located on a bend which prevents the bus from pulling in fully flush with the kerb. Due to the relatively narrow carriageway width, the rear of the bus thereby creates an obstruction when waiting at the stop. It is therefore proposed to investigate its relocation to a more suitable site nearby. A source of funding for this scheme has yet to be agreed.

### **Sir John Fogge Avenue (Priority No. 14)**

35. This scheme is intended to address current unsuitable parking practices (specifically around a junction and build outs) which regularly obstruct the passage of the bus service. Due to concerns over this issue the bus operator has stated that, unless remedied, they will be unable to continue to run a service on this route and would instead have to reroute the E Line Service - therefore bypassing the estate. Funding for this work has been identified in KCC's Transport Integration budget.

### **O/S The Vine PH, High Street, Tenterden (Priority No. 15)**

36. This scheme involves the redesign of the bus stop located outside The Vine PH to accommodate overlaying buses. At present there is no such facility, making it difficult for various bus operators utilising this stop to successfully timetable their services. This has resulted in buses regularly stopping in contravention of parking restrictions. One operator has stated that if this matter remains unresolved they will be unable to continue to service the route. As with the above scheme this work is to be funded from KCC's Transport Integration budget.

### **Bluebell Road & Violet Way, Park Farm West (Priority No. 16)**

37. The restrictions in Violet Way have been requested by the developer, while those in Bluebell Road have been requested by the bus operator. Both requests are in order to address obstructive parking issues. These roads have not yet been adopted; however there are plans to extend the existing Park Farm bus service to serve the new Park Farm West development as well as the earlier Park Farm East. This revised route will eventually extend along Bluebell Road (currently under construction), linking the two developments to Bad Mustereifel Road. Prior to full completion, however, the bus operator intends to operate an interim route which will also include use of the bus bridge over the A2070 where unsuitable parking currently takes place.
38. The developer has already implemented private restrictions (double yellow lines enforced privately) to address the parking problems; however it is important that a formal scheme is implemented prior to adoption of the roads in order to negate the need for the existing lining to be removed prior to adoption only to be reinstalled with the backing of a traffic order at a later date.

### **Fairview (Priority No. 17)**

39. Requests for a scheme at this location have come from a number of sources. The problem concerns residents parking in dangerous / unsuitable locations such as on bends, around junctions and roundabouts and across designated fire paths. The issue not only impacts of private vehicle users and emergency services but also on the bus service serving the estate. It is therefore proposed to address these issues with the introduction of safety restrictions. Funding for this work has yet to be identified.

### **High Street, Charing (Priority No. 18)**

40. This scheme has been requested by the Parish Council and is intended to better manage parking on Charing's High Street by addressing unsafe parking around junctions and introducing a number of limited waiting bays to serve short stay shoppers. A funding source for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **Repton Avenue & Sir Bernard Paget Avenue (Priority No. 19)**

41. Safety restrictions have been requested by Waitrose Ltd to address current unsafe / obstructive parking practices taking place around the Waitrose Store on Repton Avenue and Sir Bernard Paget Avenue. It is believed this parking is generated by a combination of residents (there are 24 dwellings located above the Waitrose Store) and store customers. Funding for this work has yet to be identified

### **The Street, Great Chart (Priority No. 20)**

42. A request has been received from both the Ward Member and Parish Council for the introduction of passing bays in order to address current traffic congestion issues at this location resulting from continuous uninterrupted parking along its length. This currently results in regular mounting of the footway by passing vehicles. Funding for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **Pittlesden, Tenterden (Priority No. 21)**

43. This scheme is intended to address inconsiderate and unsafe parking by residents and commuters – primarily obstructive parking and parking on the greens. Pittlesden lies adjacent to Tenterden High Street attracting significant numbers of commuters looking for free all day parking. In addition the properties have relatively few off-street parking facilities and the configuration of the road does not lend itself to extensive parking. As a result on-street parking demand significantly outstrips the availability of suitable parking.
44. In the Tenterden & St Michaels Parking Review scheme which was taken to consultation in spring 2007, Pittlesden fell within the proposed controlled parking zone designed to discourage commuter parking and provide greater opportunity for residents to find on-street spaces. This scheme was shelved, however, until such time as a new public town centre car park became available due to concerns over the impact on town centre businesses and their employees. The scheme has been requested by the Borough Member and funding has been sourced from the Kent Member Highway Fund scheme.

### **A20, Charing, Hothfield & Westwell (Priority No. 22)**

45. This scheme has been requested in order to tackle nuisance parking currently taking place in a number of lay-bys along the A20. This nuisance parking is the result of long distance lorry drivers 'overnighting' in these lay-bys and depositing refuse - including human waste. In addition there have also been complaints from nearby residents regarding noise issues, specifically generator noise from refrigerated vehicles. A funding source for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **St Teresas Close & Heathfield Road (Priority No. 23)**

46. Safety restrictions have been requested in these roads in order to address the current unsafe / nuisance parking taking place as a result of high parking demand generated by town centre commuters. Funding for this work has yet to be allocated.

### **Star Road and Mill Court estates (Zones 6 & 7) (Priority No. 24)**

47. Either a safety or parking management scheme has been requested to address commuter parking issues generated by Ashford International Rail Station and the town centre. A source of funding for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **High Street, Tenterden (Priority No. 25)**

48. A request has been received from ABC's Licensing Dept for a review of the restrictions currently governing those parking bays on which Tenterden's Friday street market takes place. At present the 1 hour limited waiting bays (in the High Street) are suspended on Friday mornings between 6am – 10am. This prevents vehicles parking in the bays before the market vendors have had the opportunity to set up their stalls. After 10am those bays not utilised by stalls then become available for parking once again. This work is to be funded by ABC's Licensing Dept budget.

### **High Street, Biddenden (Priority No. 26)**

49. This scheme was requested by the Ward Member with a view to reviewing the current safety restrictions to establish whether there are grounds for the removal or reduction in the extent of the double yellow lines thereby improving on-street parking opportunities for customers of the mini market. Funding for this scheme has yet to be identified.

### **St Stephens Walk (Priority No. 27)**

50. At present significant numbers of motorists attending the St Stephens Health Centre park on-street in St Stephens Walk. This has resulted in complaints over parking on the verges and potential obstruction issues around the St Stephens Health Centre access. A source of funding for this work is yet to be identified.

### **Chilham Square (Priority No. 28)**

51. The Square is currently subject to informal parking arrangements only. Due to the high demand for parking in this location – from residents, businesses and visitors - and concerns over the visual intrusion on the historic square by uncontrolled parking, the Parish Council have requested the introduction of a parking management scheme. It is understood that this work is to be funded by the Chilham Future Delivery Board.

### **Hunter Avenue development (Priority No. 29)**

52. As part of the planning obligations for the Hunter Avenue development, a £20,000 developer contribution was identified for investigation into parking restriction requirements and implementation as required to address any parking issues arising on the estate.

### **Conclusion**

53. As can be seen from the above a wide variety of scheme requests are received each year from various bodies dealing with a range of parking issues. Thirteen of the 28 schemes have been requested either wholly or partly on safety grounds, and 15 because of traffic congestion. It is understandable that people who live or work in these areas are concerned to ensure that parking schemes are developed and that they have the 'comfort' of knowing if, and when, they will be implemented.
54. As we have stated earlier, due to the limited resources available it is simply not possible to address all these schemes in any given year. It would, therefore, appear to be vital that a logical, fair and transparent method of handling these requests is applied. This not only ensures that best value is achieved but also that those requesting the schemes can see that their schemes have been properly and objectively assessed and that everyone has been dealt with even-handedly.
55. The Prioritised Scheme List (Appendix 1) has been formulated using the above criteria and the Board is therefore asked to endorse this list for application.

### **Portfolio Holder's Views**

56. This report sets out to prioritise the parking management schemes which have come to the Borough Council from various sources. It aims to give priority to those schemes which tackle dangerous situations and, at the same time, to assure members that their schemes are in the pipeline.
57. Inevitably there will be discussion over the order in which schemes should be prioritised. The list attached to the report has been reviewed by the chair and vice-chair of the JTB, the Portfolio Holder and relevant officers and is believed

to take a fair approach bearing in mind hazardous situations, identified funding and staff time. I recommend it to the Joint Transportation Board.

**Contact:** Ray Wilkinson (01233) 330299  
Paul Jackson (01233 330297)

**Email:** [ray.wilkinson@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:ray.wilkinson@ashford.gov.uk)  
[paul.jackson@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:paul.jackson@ashford.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1

Priority No.	Location	Description	Requested by	Funding Source	Scheme Type	Responsibility
1	Station Road, Pluckley	Safety restrictions to address dangerous parking either side of the humpback bridge highlighted by the police (who have issued a formal notification)	Police	KCC Crash Remedial budget	Safety	KCC
2	Victoria Road & Leacon Road	Introduction of 6 bus stops and bus stop clearways to serve revised route.	Bus operator	KCC Public Transport	Traffic congestion	KCC
3	Henwood Industrial Estate	Safety scheme to address unsafe / suitable parking by workers / visitors on the estate	Local businesses	KCC Member Highway Fund	Safety & nuisance parking	KCC
4	Cobbs Wood Industrial Estate	Safety scheme to address unsafe / suitable parking by workers / visitors on the estate	KCC	KCC Crash Remedial budget	Safety & nuisance parking	KCC
5	Willesborough Lees	Safety scheme around periphery of existing Zone F limited waiting scheme to control parking generated by William Harvey Hospital	County Member	KCC Member Highway Fund	Safety & nuisance parking	KCC
6	Goat Lees	Safety restrictions to address commuter parking issues	Borough Member & Parish Council	Parish Council	Safety & nuisance parking	KCC
7	Willesborough Junior School	Safety restrictions to control unsafe parking at the beginning and end of the school day	Ward Member	?	Safety & traffic congestion	KCC

<b>Priority No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requested by</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Scheme Type</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
8	Downs View School & Kennington Juniors	Safety restrictions to control unsafe parking at the beginning and end of the school day	County & Borough Members	KCC Member Highway Fund	Safety & traffic congestion	KCC
9	Aldington Primary School	Safety restrictions around Aldington Primary School to address dangerous parking practices at the beginning and end of the school day	County Member	KCC Member Highway Fund	Safety	KCC
10	North School	Safety restrictions to control unsafe parking at the beginning and end of the school day	County Member	KCC Member Highway Fund	Safety & traffic congestion	KCC
11	Bridge Street & Bramble Lane, Wye	Safety restrictions - specifically to address unsafe parking in Bramble Lane (on a bend) and obstructive parking on Bridge Street which is currently affecting the bus route	Ward Member	?	Safety & traffic congestion	KCC
12	Various locations	Safety restrictions to address bottlenecks on town centre bus routes as identified in the Bus Quality Partnership 'Quick wins'	QBP	KCC Public Transport	Traffic congestion	KCC
13	Bybrook Road	Relocation of bus stop	County Member	KCC Member Highway Fund	Traffic congestion	KCC
14	Sir John Fogge Ave	Introduction of restrictions to help maintain bus access	Bus operator	KCC Public Transport	Traffic congestion	KCC
15	O/S The Vine PH, High Street, Tenterden	Alterations to the bus stop configuration o/s The Vine PH to accommodate bus layovers	QBP	KCC Public Transport	Traffic congestion	KCC

<b>Priority No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requested by</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Scheme Type</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
16	Bluebell Road & Violet Way, Park Farm West	Introduction of restrictions to help maintain bus access in Bluebell Road and avoid general traffic congestion in Violet Way	Developer / Bus operator	Developer & KCC Public Transport	Traffic congestion	KCC
17	Fairview	Safety restrictions to control unsuitable parking by residents obstructing bus route and access to fire paths	Borough Member / Bus operator / Management Company	?	Traffic congestion	KCC
18	High Street, Charing	Safety restrictions at junctions with School Road and Old Ashford Road. Also limited waiting parking bays in part of High Street to encourage turnover	Parish Council	?	Traffic congestion & parking management	KCC / ABC
19	Repton Avenue & Sir Bernard Paget Avenue	Safety scheme to address unsafe / unsuitable parking around the Waitrose Store generated by shoppers / residents	Waitrose Store	?	Traffic congestion	KCC
20	Pittlesden, Tenterden	Safety restrictions to address unsafe / unsuitable parking by residents & commuters	County & Borough Members	KCC Member Highway Fund	Traffic congestion	KCC
21	The Street, Great Chart	Safety restrictions to create passing places at intervals along one side of the carriageway	Ward Member & Parish Council	?	Traffic congestion & safety	KCC
22	A20 Charing, Hothfield & Westwell	Overnight weight restriction in various laybys to control overnight lorry parking	County Member / Residents / Parish Council	KCC Member Highway Fund / ?	Nuisance parking	ABC
23	St Teresas Close & Heathfield Road	Safety scheme around periphery of existing Zone E limited waiting scheme to control parking generated by the town centre	Ward Member	?	Safety & nuisance parking	KCC
24	Star Road and Mill Court estates (Zones 6 & 7)	Safety restrictions or controlled parking zone to address commuter parking issues	Borough Member	?	Safety & nuisance parking / parking management	KCC / ABC



<b>Priority No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Requested by</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Scheme Type</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
25	High Street, Tenterden	Alterations to the restrictions relating to the Friday street market	ABC Licensing Dept	ABC Licensing Dept	Parking management	ABC
26	High Street, Biddenden	Review of existing restrictions with a view to reducing their extent to better accommodate shoppers seeking on-street parking	Borough Member	?	Rationalisation of existing restrictions	KCC
27	St Stephens Walk	Safety restrictions to address unsuitable parking around the Surgery	Ward Member	?	Nuisance parking	KCC
28	Chilham Square	Restrictions to manage parking on the Square to balance the needs of residents, visitors and businesses	Parish Council	Chilham Future Delivery Board	Parking management	ABC
29	Hunter Avenue development	Investigate potential parking issues and implement restrictions as necessary	Planning Obligation	S106	Safety & traffic congestion / traffic management	KCC / ABC