

***Parking Enforcement  
Scrutiny Review***

***Report of Findings and  
Recommendations***



***Scrutiny Committee  
16 April 2002***

## **1. Background to the Review**

**1.1** The Scrutiny Committee of Tonbridge and Malling Borough has undertaken a review of parking enforcement procedures within the Borough. The review was initially scoped at a meeting of Committee in February 2002 and was discussed in detail at its meeting in March 2002. Final conclusions and recommendations were reported to the April meeting.

**1.2** Scoping of the review sought to concentrate investigations on the following areas of parking enforcement:

- whether the current levels of discretion applied to carrying out enforcement by attendants in issuing Penalty Charge Notices and administrative staff in waiving such Notices were appropriate;
- whether there were areas of the Borough where additional parking enforcement might be justified and whether enforcement should be undertaken at other times of the day and night.

**1.3** In order to avoid overlap and duplication, the Scrutiny Review has not been concerned with:

- car parking charges
- other financial information related to the parking service
- matters within the purview of the former Parking Strategy (Note: this has now been replaced by the Car Parking Action Plan which is currently under preparation).

**1.4** It is, however, appropriate for the Scrutiny Review to identify those concerns that may need to be addressed by the Car Parking Action Plan in due course. Such concerns are highlighted in the following conclusions and recommendations. It is not, however, part of the review to decide how such recommendations should be taken forward. This will be a matter for the Cabinet to consider.

**1.5** The review has involved the following work:

- presentation of detailed reports from the Director of Planning and Engineering
- a consultation with Members on particular problem areas for parking enforcement followed by a site visit of key areas
- Members work shadowing a parking attendant and a meeting with administrative staff

- submission of written evidence from Sevenoaks District Council
- presentation of evidence from the West Kent Police and the West Kent Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

**1.6** Full details of the review are contained in the relevant Scrutiny Committee agenda papers. The purpose of this report is not to repeat information in those reports but to identify the key issues, conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review process.

## **2. Review Conclusions**

**2.1** The Parking Enforcement review covered and touched upon a wide range of issues and concerns. For the purposes of presenting the key conclusions and recommendations, a total of 6 key issues are set out below.

### **Key Issue 1 – Levels of Discretion**

**2.2** The review was concerned with what levels of discretion were applied throughout the parking enforcement process. This included the following:

- discretions applied by the Parking Attendants on and off street faced with a variety of situations and enforcement issues including periods of grace before issuing a PCN
- the issuing of dispensations by the Director of Planning and Engineering for those needing to park in restricted areas
- decisions related to the waiving of Penalty Charge Notices following further correspondence from the offender etc or the abandonment of cases where the administrative costs of pursuing them would be prohibitive
- discretions applied to the time-scales at various stages of the PCN process.

**2.3** The review concluded that, in most circumstances referred to above, the current practices operated by staff were appropriate. The Work Shadowing exercise confirmed that Parking Attendants were exercising a commendable and sensible level of flexibility in carrying out their enforcement duties. The periods of grace used informally by Attendants were supported by the Chamber of Commerce. Similarly, administrative staff were found to be exercising appropriate levels of discretion throughout the process.

**2.4** Some concerns were expressed about dispensations for contractor vehicles parking with Residential Preferring Parking (RPP) areas.

Provided these vehicles had a genuine need to park within the area and were carrying out work to a local building etc (and that this could be easily confirmed by parking attendants) then it was felt that there was a case to allow greater leniency for such vehicles to park within the restricted period.

- 2.5** With regard to the waiving of Penalty Charge Notices, some concerns were expressed about the number of waivers related to the subsequent presentation of car parking tickets after a PCN had been imposed for non display of a valid ticket. Whilst some of these cases could well be due to tickets falling from view after purchase, offenders could be obtaining valid tickets from others to present as evidence to justify the waiving of the PCN. Similarly, the practice of some parkers passing on tickets to others to use up valid time was also contrary to the Parking Regulations. Whilst overall numbers of such occurrences might be relatively low, it was felt that consideration should be given to the installation of more sophisticated parking ticket machines in the future which require vehicle registration numbers to be keyed in. This would be dependent upon manufacturers overcoming current difficulties with new registration plate formats.
- 2.6** The Review was presented with a protocol to guide administrative staff in the issuing of waivers (**Annex A**), information related to the discretions applied to the time scales in processing PCNs (**Annex B**) and the periods of grace applied by Parking Attendants (**Annex C**). It was concluded that these should be recommended to Cabinet for formal adoption. In addition, it was agreed that parking dispensations continue to be issued by the Director of Planning and Engineering on merit, and that, subject to the additional comments at para 2.4 above, the current levels of discretion applied by parking attendants and administrative staff also be endorsed.

## **Key Issue 2 – Extending Enforcement to Additional Areas of the Borough and during Evening and Week-End Periods**

- 2.7** The Review highlighted a number of areas across the Borough where greater levels of parking enforcement could be justified. The West Kent Police representative also confirmed that many residents' concerns received related to parking problems in residential areas rather than town centre and commercial areas. Whilst the Member consultation and site visit identified problem parking areas across the whole Borough, concerns were found to be particularly acute in the following general locations:

- within rural village centres, particularly where there was a need to ensure short stay parking was kept available for use by casual shoppers;

- in residential areas in the suburbs of Tonbridge, within villages, and the Medway Gap urban area where illegal parking on double yellow lines and around corners etc caused problems of traffic danger and obstruction to other road users, including emergency vehicles and pedestrians.
- 2.8** In addition to the areas identified, the review also found that parking problems were occurring during the evenings and week-ends.
- 2.9** Attached as **Annex D** to this report is a full list of areas identified as parking enforcement problem areas. Areas where 'out of hours' enforcement was found to be needed have also been identified. It is not for this Review to determine how the need for extended parking enforcement could be implemented. This will be a matter for Cabinet to consider in relation to resource issues, potential added income from additional penalty charges which might be generated and wider service implications to be considered by the Car Parking Action Plan. In order to achieve additional enforcement action within available and potential resources, it was felt that particular problem areas could be targeted by Attendants at different times.
- 2.10** It is clear from this Review, however, that additional enforcement in the areas and at the times identified is a key public concern and one which should be addressed as a matter of urgency given the risks for traffic safety which are involved. It is therefore recommended that Cabinet consider how these needs could appropriately be met.

### **Key Issue 3 – Administrative Resources**

- 2.11** The Review found that adequate administrative resources to back up the parking enforcement process was critical to the efficient operation of the system. It was identified that 'back office' staff play a crucial role in processing Penalty Charge Notices, issuing dispensations, considering waivers and otherwise providing an interface with the public over parking enforcement problems.
- 2.12** In discussions with relevant staff, the review found that limitations on administrative staff resources was placing a 'break' on enforcement and the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices. Attendants had been asked, at certain times, to issue less PCNs due to the lack of office resources to process them. Clearly, without increased resources in place to provide the necessary support to Parking Attendants, the amount of proper enforcement undertaken will be reduced. This means that less Notices will be served on offenders and less income received to support further enforcement. This situation applies to the current levels of enforcement undertaken. If recommendations within this review are implemented concerning the extension of enforcement to additional areas and at other times, as noted above, then consideration must also be given to ensuring that a commensurate increase in administration resources is put in place to support such additional on-street enforcement. These

would be matters appropriately considered as part of work on developing the Car Parking Action Plan.

#### **Key Issue 4 – Traffic Regulation Orders**

**2.13** During the review, two issues regarding Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) were identified:

- the need to ensure that existing TROs are compatible with street markings and signage;
- the need to introduce new TROs in areas of particular concern where none currently exist.

**2.14** It was noted that whilst a comprehensive review of existing TROs had been undertaken and that regular checks were made, the site visits undertaken as part of the Review revealed a number of areas where potential conflicts between the terms of the TRO and the on-street signage existed. In certain cases, local knowledge of such conflicts by Parking Attendants resulted in some reluctance to enforce against parking offences due to concerns that PCNs would be waived at appeal. In order to give full confidence to Parking Attendants to issue PCNs where justified, it is recommended that the review of potential problem areas continues to be undertaken, taking into account the local views of Parking Attendants and the specific areas identified in **Annex E**.

**2.15** The review has also identified a number of areas where additional TROs may be required to ensure parking problems are addressed. These are also documented in **Annex E**. As noted above, it is not for this review to indicate when and how such problems should be dealt with. The Borough Council's forthcoming Car Parking Action Plan will provide the mechanism for ensuring that the need for more controls is considered. It is therefore recommended that these identified areas be commended to Cabinet for consideration as part of this work.

#### **Key Issue 5 – Residents Preferential Parking Zones**

**2.16** The review assessed a number of issues related to Residents Preferential Parking zones. In general terms, the review found that RPP zones were generally well controlled and inappropriate parking properly enforced with appropriate levels of discretion allowed for. During the work shadowing exercise and site visits, a number of issues related to the adequacy of parking controls in these areas were identified. In addition, a number of locations were visited which could well benefit from the introduction of similar RPP arrangements to control inappropriate parking.

**2.17** With regard to enforcement practices, the following issues were identified:

- a need to introduce a further restricted period of parking during the afternoon to prevent cars parking in such areas after 10.30 am but staying into the evening thus causing difficulties for residents to park at the end of the normal working day. A further hour restriction between 5pm and 6pm was suggested to ensure that casual visitors to local homes would not be deterred;
- a need to ensure that visitors tickets within RPP zones were not misused and were limited for use only within the specific RPP zone for which they were purchased;
- a need to ensure that redundant double yellow lines within designated parking areas were removed to ensure there was no confusion about parking restrictions.

**2.18** A specific areas identified as having a potential need for an RPP type arrangement was the Slade area in Tonbridge. However, it is likely that there are other areas of parking pressures within the Borough that could benefit from the introduction of similar schemes.

**2.19** It is therefore recommended that Cabinet consider the need for additional RPP schemes in the Borough in order to prioritise bids. In addition, they are also invited to consider the specific enforcement issues highlighted above and introduce any changes that may be necessary to the RPP schemes to ensure that they are best suited to needs of local residents.

### **Key Issue 6 – Other Review Issues Arising**

**2.20** The Review has identified a number of other issues related to parking enforcement that are worthy of further consideration.

**2.21** Although not strictly covered by the terms of the review, the issue of parking problems associated with boot fairs, and the enforcement against dangerous parking causing an obstruction was also raised during the Member consultation. The representative of the West Kent Police explained that such offences were a police responsibility but the scope to address such problems was limited by available police resources. It was felt that, rather than being able to respond to ad hoc concerns from the public on these issues, the Police could undertake one-off initiatives to deter such offences or otherwise deal specifically with persistent offenders. Given the level of concerns expressed about boot fairs and other forms of dangerous parking, it was recommended that the matter should be taken up directly with responsible authorities including the Kent Police, Local MPs, and relevant Government departments.

- 2.22** The need for on-going and effective liaison between parking officers at the Borough Council and the Kent Police over parking problems was acknowledged. The review found that current arrangements between the two agencies appeared to be working effectively but that continued efforts should be made to liaise over problem areas given the different, but related, responsibilities of the two agencies.
- 2.23** The general public can play a key role in assisting with parking enforcement by drawing attention to specific problems and requesting attendance at specific locations. Whilst the review found that Attendants were keen to provide such a service, the ability of the public to make contact with them was limited by the fact that they were often on patrol. The provision of a well publicised parking hotline number linked to an answer machine at the parking attendants hut was identified as one means to achieve better direct contact with the public.
- 2.24** The review received information about a new initiative being trialed within London Boroughs on the use of CCTV to enforce parking restrictions in particular problem areas. It was agreed that initiatives of this type should be kept under review by the Council to establish whether future opportunities existed for this type of enforcement to be introduced in the future, particularly if supported by Government funding. Such matters could be included in a future review of the role and function of CCTV generally within the Borough.

### **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1** As a result on the review, the following recommendations to Cabinet are made:
- (1) that the protocol to guide administrative staff in the issuing of waivers (**Annex A**), the discretions applied to the time scales in processing PCNs (**Annex B**) and the periods of grace applied by Parking Attendants (**Annex C**) be adopted.
  - (2) that parking dispensations continue to be issued by the Director of Planning and Engineering on merit, and that, subject to the additional comments at para 2.4 above, the current levels of discretion applied by parking attendants and administrative staff be endorsed.
  - (3) that consideration be given to the introduction of new parking ticket machines within car parks which require car registration numbers to be identified to improve enforcement against non-payment and to deter the illegal transfer of tickets between car park users.
  - (4) that the list of areas as set out at **Annex D** be considered for additional parking enforcement and that proposals for additional parking enforcement resources to target areas of identified concern be considered in relation to potential added income from additional penalty

charges which might be generated and any wider service implications related to the Car Parking Action Plan;

- (5) that the issue regarding the need for adequate parking enforcement administrative resources be considered as part of work on the Car Parking Action Plan with a view to ensuring that adequate support is made available to facilitate, and not hinder the provision of, required levels of parking enforcement as identified by the review;
- (6) that, to ensure compatibility with on-street signage, existing Traffic Regulation Orders be subject to on-going review, taking into account the local views of Parking Attendants, and the list of the specific areas requiring further checks as set out at **Annex E**;
- (7) that, as part of the Car Parking Action Plan, consideration be given to the introduction of new Traffic Regulation Orders in the areas of need as identified in **Annex E**;
- (8) that within existing Residents Preferential Parking zones, consideration be given to the following matters:
  - (a) the introduction of a further restricted period of parking during the afternoon;
  - (b) the current format of visitors tickets issued within RPP areas be reconsidered to deter misuse and are limited for use only within the specific RPP area for which they were purchased;
  - (c) the removal of all redundant double yellow lines within designated parking areas.
- (9) that consideration be given to the introduction of further RPP schemes in areas of need within the Borough, including those identified by this review, to be brought forward in the context of the Car Parking Action Plan.
- (10) that concerns expressed about parking problems related to boot fairs and other forms of dangerous parking be taken up directly with responsible authorities including the Kent Police, Local MPs, and relevant Government departments.
- (11) that continued efforts be made to ensure there is appropriate liaison between the Council, the Kent Police and other relevant agencies regarding problems of parking enforcement.
- (12) that consideration be given to the provision of a well publicised parking hotline number linked to an answer machine at the parking attendants hut to ensure there are appropriate opportunities for the public to report parking enforcement problems quickly and effectively.

- (13) that the use of CCTV for parking enforcement be kept under review and be included in any future review of the role and function of CCTV generally within the Borough.

**Protocol for Responding to Requests for Cancellations/waivers of Penalty Charge Notices**

**1. Requests that can be dealt with by Administrative Assistants, Administrative Officer and their managers:**

Any request from member of public or staff:

- Address not in England or Wales
- Community midwife/nurse
- Disabled badge holder presented
- Dispensation certificate presented
- Foreign vehicle
- Handheld computer fault
- Loading/unloading evidence produced
- Owner not traced
- Pay & display machine faulty
- Processing error
- Representations allowed
- Staff permit holder (on first offence)
- Stolen vehicle
- Test ticket
- Waived this time only
- Valid permit/pay & display ticket
- Vehicle broken down
- Vehicle driven away (unable to affix PCN)

**2. Requests that can/must be dealt with by Senior Administrative Officer and his/her managers:**

Any request from member of public or staff:

- Any of the above
- Did not contest appeal
- DVLA mismatch
- General reason
- Inadequate signing
- NPAS accepted appeal
- Parking attendant error
- Staff permit holder
- Statutory declaration received

**3. Requests that can/must be dealt with by Administration Manager and his/her managers:**

Any request from member of public or staff:

- Any of the above
- Police/emergency vehicle
- Special circumstances

**4. Requests that can/must be referred to Chief Engineer or Director:**

Any request from chief Officers or Member of the Council:

- Any of the above and any that are not included above.

## Penalty Charge Notice Recovery System (PCNs Processing)

### 1. PCN Processing:

The process for carrying out the PCN recovery system is set down in The Department of Transport's Circular 1/95 "Guidance on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London". It is not possible for a local authority to either disregard, or modify, any part of the recovery system, although the wording of the legislation does permit some degree of discretion. The Circular contains a PCN Recovery System Flow Chart that illustrates the process for recovering PCN Charges and a copy of the flow chart will be made available for inspection at the meeting. The Council uses a computer programme known as "Parking Office", a software system developed and sold by a well established company known as Langdale Systems, which is now part of the National Car Parks Group. As might be expected, Parking Office closely follows the course of the flow chart published in the Circular.

*[Note: In the following text, two sets of figures are expressed for the duration of certain events. The figure shown in normal text is that set down in the Circular. The figure in italics is that that is used in practice according Directive from the Traffic Enforcement Centre, or as a result of Officer discretion.]*

### 2. Alternative Options in Processing of PCNs:

In essence, there are a number of scenarios that can occur, for example:

(a) Driver responsibility:

- The PCN is paid within the discounted time.
- The issuing of the PCN is informally challenged.
- The PCN is not paid within the discounted time.

(b) Registered keeper responsibility:

- The PCN is paid following the Notice to Owner (NtO).
- The PCN is not paid following the Notice to Owner (NtO).
- The issuing of the PCN is formally challenged.
- The Bailiffs are called in to recover a debt.

Each of these scenarios will be addressed in the following brief notes.

### 3. The PCN is Issued and Paid:

- The issuing of the PCN is recorded in the handheld computer used by the Parking Attendant. The contents of the handheld computer are downloaded, on a daily basis, into the Parking Office System. The duplicate PCNs and photographs are retained on file.
- The PCN charge is £60, but if payment is made within 14 days this charge is discounted by 50%, however, in reality, this period is extended (*Officer discretion*) to 19 days to allow for postal delays, etc. In most instances, payment is made within this period and this is notified to administration staff by means of a batch computer file from Financial Services.
- The issue of a PCN can be informally challenged, in writing, and a waiver sought. In this case the request for a waiver will be considered (*Officer discretion*) and, if the waiver can be justified, the PCN will be cancelled and the file closed. However, if a waiver cannot be justified, the person seeking the waiver will be informed of the decision and the reasons for it, in writing.

The letter will inform the offender that he/she will still be able to obtain the discounted charge for the period of 14 days from the date of the letter (*Officer discretion*). The case file will be closed, if payment is made within 14 days (*19 days Officer discretion*).

**4. The PCN is issued and the Charge is Not Paid:**

- If the PCN charge is not paid within the 14 days period (*19 days – Officer discretion*), the Charge reverts to the full amount of £60.
- 28 days after the date of the contravention, an enquiry is sent to the Driver and Vehicle Licencing Agency (DVLA) requesting the name and address of the registered keeper.
- On receipt of the name and address of the registered keeper a formal notice (NtO) is sent informing the registered keeper that the charge is unpaid and that payment of the full amount (£60) should be made within 28 days (*35 days allowed – Directive from the Traffic Enforcement Centre*).
- If payment is made within the stipulated period the case file is closed.

**5. Notice to Owner is Issued and Formal Representations Received**

- The representations can be accepted and the case file is closed, or the representations can be declined.

**6. Notice of Rejection (NtR) Issued to Owner and Formal Appeal is Made to the National Parking Adjudication Service (NPAS);**

- The registered keeper can appeal to the NPAS to waive the PCN charge within 28 days (*35 days – Directive from Traffic Enforcement Centre*) from the date of the NtR. The registered keeper can base his/her appeal on six criteria, but in reality, the NPAS will accept an appeal on any issues. The NPAS will invite the Council and the Appellant to state their cases and will adjudicate.
- The NPAS can allow the appeal, in which case the PCN is cancelled and the case file closed.
- The NPAS can decline to allow the appeal, in which case the registered keeper is obliged to pay the full PCN charge.
- The decision of the NPAS is final.
- If the registered keeper does not appeal to the NPAS, or has not paid the PCN charge, a Charge Certificate is issued that informs the registered keeper that the PCN charge has increased by 50% to £90.

**7. Notice to Owner is Issued and No Representations Are Made and the PCN is not Paid:**

- The PCN charge is increased by 50% (to £90) and a Charge Certificate is issued.
- If no payment is made within 14 days (*21 days – Direction from Traffic Enforcement Centre*) an application is made to the County Court for the debt to be registered.
- If the full PCN charge and the Court Registration Fee (£5) is not paid within 21 days (*36 days – Directive from Traffic Enforcement Centre*) the Court's authority to issue a Warrant is sought and the Council's Bailiff instructed to recover the debt.
- The Bailiff will undertake a DVLA search to ensure that the name and address of the vehicle owner have not changed and will then notify the registered keeper that he intends to recover the debt and allows the registered keeper to pay off the debt.
- If payment of the debt is not made, the Bailiff will write again to registered keeper issuing a Notice of Seizure and Inventory. The Notice is usually served on the

registered keeper by the Bailiff's representative. The registered keeper is then given time to pay off his/her debt.

- If payment of the debt is made, the case file is closed.
- If payment of the debt is not made, the Bailiff will seize goods previously identified in the Inventory and these will be auctioned.

**8. Payment of the PCN Charge at Any Stage:**

- The Council has the discretion as to whether it should accept payment of the discounted PCN charge, or proceed through the process of recovery of the full PCN charge.
- The registered keeper can offer to pay the appropriate charge at any stage through the process, up to the time when a Warrant of Execution has been issued to the Bailiff.

The Council's staff has accepted late payments of the PCN charge (*Officer discretion*). However, once the Bailiff has been involved and incurred costs, these costs need to be paid directly to the Bailiff by the registered keeper.

## Periods of Grace

- 1.1.1 The procedures for issuing PCNs do not specify any periods of 'grace' that Parking Attendants should apply before issuing a PCN. In practice, the Parking Attendants do apply some discretion before issuing PCNs for certain types of offence.
- 1.1.2 In off-street car parks the Parking Attendants allow ten minutes for car park users to purchase a parking ticket from a machine. The Attendants will enter the registration number of the car that is not displaying a parking ticket into their hand-held computer. The computer will not, however, issue a PCN until another entry is made at least ten minutes later. This ensures that enough time is allowed for users to purchase a ticket, or to visit a local shop to obtain change for the ticket machines.
- 1.1.3 The Parking Attendants allow a period of fifteen minutes to elapse beyond the time shown on an expired parking ticket before issuing a PCN. In this case the hand-held computers are not programmed to introduce a delay and the Attendant will note the time that he/she first sees the vehicle in his/her notebook.
- 1.1.4 The only other 'grace' period is applied to motorists who have parked their vehicles on a street subject to waiting restrictions. In this case the Attendants allow three minutes before issuing a PCN. The Attendant will enter the details of the vehicle in their hand-held computers and it is often the case that the three minutes period has expired by the time that the information has been fed in.

## Annex D

### Areas Requiring Greater Enforcement

| Area of Concern   | Nature of Problem  |
|---|--|
| Borough Green High Street and Western Road  | Illegal parking on double yellow lines including evening periods. Particular problems in vicinity of Borough Green Stores and misuse of disabled bays. |
| Hildenborough – junction of Ridings Lane and B245 and Noble Road near Railway Station       | Dangerous parking near junction, non use of railway car park leading to on-street parking and problems for residents.                                  |
| Hadlow Square and High Street, Hadlow   | Short term spaces intended for shoppers taken up by long stay users.   |
| Rochester Road, and St Mary's Walk Burham (including Chinese Takeaway and Doctors' Surgery) | Illegal parking causing obstruction and danger to road users. Evening periods also a concern.  |
| Doctors Surgery, A20 Larkfield  | Parking on pavement causing congestion on A20.   |
| London Road/Bell Lane and London Road/Orchard Grove junctions, Ditton.                      | Problems of corner parking during evening peaks related to take away and other services.   |
| Eccles Old Village  | Illegal parking by residents within narrow streets on double yellow lines.   |
| Aylesford High Street   | Illegal parking at ragstone bridge and other locations outside of designated parking bays including in the vicinity of Vicarage Close.                 |
| Rochester Road, Bush Row, Aylesford   | Parking on double yellow lines around corners particularly during evening periods.   |
| West Malling High Street from Church to Five Pointed Star                                   | Parking on yellow lines during evening period.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Swan Street, West Malling                        | Casual parking outside of fish and chip shop causes major problems of congestion including in evening periods.   |
| Wouldham Village                                 | Problems of illegal parking within High Street, Castle Street, New Road and Nelson Street.   |
| Slade Area, Tonbridge                            | Parking on double yellow lines around corners creating problems for emergency access.  |
| Wrotham Village Centre                           | Need to enforce short stay spaces intended to serve local shops. Often used by long stay users.  |
| Tonbridge Car Parks                              | Need to ensure Car Parking Orders are enforced during non-charged periods eg misuse of disabled bays and parking outside of allocated spaces on Sundays. |
| Vale Rise, Vale Road and Woodgate Way, Tonbridge | Need to maintain enforcement in these areas given likely pressure from future traffic generating uses.   |
| Mill Crescent/Mill Lane, Tonbridge               | Need for enforcement including evening periods.  |
| Bus Stops, Hildenborough                         | Need to enforce No Stopping Order.   |
| Snodland Town Centre                             | Need to enforce against misuse of loading bays and disabled spaces and illegal parking within the High Street.   |

## Annex E

### Areas for Review of TROs/Signage

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Laybys on High Street, North of Big Bridge, Tonbridge | Need to re-assess scope of TRO for each lay by potentially to provide for some short stay use to provide access to local shops and services but also ensuring a reasonable opportunity for delivery vehicles to park off street to avoid congestion and obstruction to free flow of traffic. |
| Leybourne Way, outside Tesco                          | Need to prevent overnight lorry parking  |
| Woodlands School, Hunt Road, Tonbridge                | Possible need for more restrictions to control school related parking at morning and afternoon peaks.  |
| Opposite St Peters School, Aylesford                  | Need to check nature of restrictions applying outside school and ensure restrictions are in place to deter obstruction by school related traffic.  |
| Junction of Woodland Rd/New Rd, Ditton                | Parking on corners creates obstruction and dangers. Need for TRO to protect movement and sight lines.  |
| Shipbourne Rd, Tonbridge, north of Welland Rd         | Residents parking during evening causes problems of obstruction to other road users including pedestrians  |
| Angel Lane, Tonbridge                                 | Need to improve signage related to disabled spaces.  |
| Tonbridge High Street                                 | Need to check general TRO and compatibility with signage. Need to properly define bus stop opposite Watergate area.<br><br>Consider need for unloading/loading ban on lower High Street (east side) to promote rear servicing.   |
| Danvers Road, Tonbridge                               | Need to check TRO and compatibility with signage.  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| West Malling High Street                    | Improve yellow lines outside Tesco and dry cleaners. Review TRO controls applying within bus stop near The Green.  |
| West Malling Car Parks                      | Need to assess need for ticket system to allow for better enforcement to deter long stay use within short stay car park and to deter use by commuters of long stay car park. |
| Swan Street, West Malling                   | Consider TRO for parking bay outside Abbey.  |
| Broadwater Road to Lucks Hill, West Malling | Consider need for TRO to protect vehicular movement and sight lines and to prevent obstruction and dangers caused by on-street parking.                                      |
| Disabled Bay Signs                          | Need to ensure these refer to Blue/Orange Badge Holders to ensure proper enforcement can be undertaken.  |
| Borough Green Car Park                      | Possible need to introduce charging regime to strengthen prohibition of long stay use.   |