

**SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 18<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2007**

**CHANGES TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN EYNSFORD, FARNINGHAM AND SHOREHAM**

Report of the: Community and Planning Services Director

Status: For Decision

---

**Executive Summary:** This report requests that Members approve the changes to the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order for Eynsford, Farningham and Shoreham.

---

**This report supports the Key Aim of** effective and efficient use of resources in providing income to meet and support the Council's three year Financial Plan.

**Portfolio Holder** Cllr. Williamson

**Head of Service** Head of Environmental and Operational Services – Mr. Richard Wilson

---

**Recommendation:** It be RESOLVED that;

- (a) The objections to the change to the on-street parking traffic regulation order be noted and set aside.
- (b) The parking restrictions be introduced as proposed for Farningham and Eynsford and as amended for Shoreham.

---

**Background**

- 1 A review of parking restrictions in the Eynsford, Farningham and Shoreham areas has been undertaken following requests from a number of residents.
- 2 Two rounds of consultation have been carried out, with the second round being the formal opportunity to object to the proposals. The formal objection period closed on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2007.
- 3 The objection period generated 15 responses relating to Eynsford, 7 relating to Farningham and 2 relating to Shoreham.

**Introduction**

The responses to the proposed restrictions are listed below and the objections are detailed in the following sections;

**Teardrop Centre, Farningham**

1 comment in favour of proposals;

Kent Police

**Manor Farm, High Street, Farningham**

1 comment in favour of proposals;

Kent Police

**Oliver Crescent, Farningham**

3 comments in favour;

Kent Police  
Mrs Marsh, 51 Oliver Crescent  
Mr Salathiel, 56a Oliver Crescent

1 comment on general parking pressures in the area;

Mr Sarris, 54 Oliver Crescent

1 unresolved objections;

Mr Marsh, 56b Oliver Crescent

**Darenth Way, Shoreham**

1 objection – subsequently withdrawn;

Shoreham Parish Council

1 comment in favour of proposals;

Kent Police

**Old Mill Close, Eynsford**

9 comments in favour of proposals;

Mrs Grant, 54 Old Mill Close  
Mr Nelson, 20 Old Mill Close  
Mrs Evans, 7 Old Mill Close  
Kent Police  
Mr Lee, 2 Old Mill Close  
Mrs Tillson, 1 Old Mill Close  
Eynsford Parish Council  
Mr Hill, 60 Old Mill Close  
Mr Rand, 32 Old Mill Close

3 comments on general parking pressures in the area;

Mrs Russell, 22 Old Mill Close  
Mrs Mikik, 59 Old Mill Close  
Mrs Bates, 24 Old Mill Close

3 unresolved objections;

Mrs Fowler, 2 Mill Lane  
Mr Skinner, 44 Old Mill Close  
Mrs Walker, 53 Old Mill Close

## **Objections**

### **Oliver Crescent, Farningham – Mr Marsh, 56b Oliver Crescent (appendix 1)**

Mr Marsh objected that the proposals did not include restrictions opposite his access and any vehicles that might park there could cause access problems, particularly when using his caravan.

This is no change from the existing situation and the proposals have been designed to be the minimum lengths so that on-street parking facilities can be retained for residents.

Mr Marsh has been informed of the District Council's Portfolio holder's decision to set aside the objection and recommend the introduction of the restrictions as proposed and has not responded further.

### **Darenth Way, Shoreham – Parish Council (appendix 1)**

The Parish Council objected to the proposal to introduce 'no waiting at any time' markings across the bridge in Church Street on the basis that it would seem unsightly and unnecessary.

The District Council has amended the proposals by deleting the 'no waiting at any time' on Church Street and the Parish Council have subsequently withdrawn their objection.

### **Old Mill Close, Eynsford – Mrs Fowler, 2 Mill Lane (appendix 1)**

Mrs Fowler commented that the proposals were excellent for safety, but would cause the residents of Old Mill Close to complain about displacement parking.

The proposals have been designed to allay concerns about visibility at junctions and to allow large vehicle access and are in line with the guidance within the Highway Code about parking near junctions.

Mrs Fowler has been informed of the District Council's Portfolio holder's decision to set aside the objection and recommend the introduction of the restrictions as proposed and has not responded further.

**Old Mill Close, Eynsford – Mr Skinner, 44 Old Mill Lane (appendix 1)**

Mr Skinner commented that the proposals will mean that disabled residents will have to walk further to their vehicles and that the proposals are excessive.

The proposals were designed to the minimum lengths necessary to be effective in controlling the parking problems.

Mr Skinner has been informed of the District Council's Portfolio holder's decision to set aside the objection and recommend the introduction of the restrictions as proposed and has not responded further.

**Old Mill Close, Eynsford – Mrs Walker, 53 Old Mill Close (appendix 1)**

Mrs Walker commented that the proposals seemed excessive, and was concerned that there were no alternative parking facilities proposed.

The proposals were designed to the minimum lengths necessary to be effective in controlling the parking problems.

Mrs Walker has been informed of the District Council's Portfolio holder's decision to set aside the objection and recommend the introduction of the restrictions as proposed and has not responded further.

**Summary**

The parking restrictions be introduced as proposed for Farningham and Eynsford and as amended for Shoreham as listed in the attached Traffic Regulation Order amendment (appendix 2).

**Sources of Information:** Existing on and off-street parking traffic regulation orders held by the Parking and Amenity team

**Contact Officer(s):** Andy Bracey Ext.7323

**KRISTEN PATERSON  
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR**

**RISK ASSESSMENT STATEMENT**

By not introducing the measures proposed in Eynsford, Farningham and Shoreham the current parking problems associated with unregulated and inappropriate parking will continue.

By not amending errors and omissions in the existing orders, the existing orders could be challenged, and appeals against penalty charge notices could be upheld. Parking enforcement in areas of known errors would be unavailable.