

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr D G Cook 17 Azalea Drive	Pay and display will be taken by station commuters.	This is the District Councils intention, to provide a managed solution to the station commuter parking problem.
	The local office workers will be the first to use the 2 hour limited waiting bays.	If the limited waiting bays are available, then they could be used by all members of the public for up to 2 hours, but residents have the opportunity to use them at all times and so may already be parked there before the local office workers arrive.
	After 10am the local office workers will move their vehicles to park on the 9am-10am restrictions.	The District Council is proposing single yellow lines in areas where there are already single yellow lines, the only difference is the time of restriction has been reduced. At present this is not seen to be a problem.
	Extensive parking on the 9am-10am areas, particularly on the bend in Azalea Drive will cause buses to use the pavement to pass oncoming cars and deny residents safe access to the road between parked cars.	The District Council does not feel that parking in the areas proposed for 9am-10am restrictions is a significant problem. There have been no reports from the bus companies about problems caused by parked vehicles preventing access on Azalea Drive.
	Facilitating overnight parking on what is clearly a major route for buses and cars between peak times of approx. 7.30-8.30am defies all logic.	Azalea Drive is not a major distributor road and is of sufficient width to allow managed parking.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr C Metcher 17 Charnock	The parking bays proposed outside 29 Charnock should be changed to double yellow lines	
	The parking bay between 16 and 18 Charnock that was suggested at the second round of consultation be re-instated	The District Council has no preference as to which side of the road the parking bays are installed.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to note your comments and install the parking bay between 16 and 18 Charnock rather than the parking bay outside 29 Charnock.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr & Mrs Woolf 19 Charnock	The parking bay between 16 and 18 Charnock that was suggested at the second round of consultation be re-instated.	The District Council has no preference as to which side of the road the parking bays are installed.
	Pay and display parking between 69 and 77 Goldsel Road will give no clear view to the right for traffic leaving High Firs.	The proposed parking bays are set some distance back from the junction and the sightlines are in excess of those recommended for these classes of roads and road speeds.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to note your comments and install the parking bay between 16 and 18 Charnock rather than the parking bay outside 29 Charnock. The parking bays on Goldsel Road would be as proposed.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Ms Ockenden 26 Charnock	The parking bays proposed in outside 26 Charnock conflict with a new permission to provide off-street parking and to drop the kerb.	The District Council was not aware of the proposal to drop the kerb at your property.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to note your comments and delete the proposal for a parking bay at this point, recommending the continuation of the single yellow line restriction through the area.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr B Lowe 4 Court Crescent	The proposals are discriminatory.	All parking restrictions are based on the principle that no one has a right to park on the Public Highway. Without such a right there can be no discrimination.
	The proposals would have an adverse ecological effect as householders pave areas of front gardens.	This would ultimately be a choice for the residents, though the District Council does not force residents to have more vehicles than their current off-street parking facilities.
	The area is covered under the Planning Acts by a tree planting scheme and householders are removing the trees.	This may be an issue for subsequent planning enforcement.
	There are 24 different restrictions proposed for Court Crescent. It will be necessary to erect a small forest of posts to display the individual restrictions.	This is not so. There are 5 types of restriction in Court Crescent and only 3 require signing. The District Council tries (where possible) to use existing street furniture to prevent sign clutter.
	Residents needs are not being considered across the board.	The District Council has undertaken an unprecedented 3 rounds of consultation, above and beyond the statutory requirements, and is listening to the views of the majority of residents.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr R Buchan 85 Cranleigh Drive	The parking bays along side 85 Cranleigh Drive have been removed.	This was as a response to comments from residents at the previous round of consultation
	There should be parking restrictions in the alongside 85 Cranleigh Drive	The comments from the majority of residents suggested that no restrictions were wanted in the area so the District Council deleted them from the proposals. It may be that at a later date, restrictions could be introduced to this area.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Ms L Westpfel 22 Cranleigh Drive	The introduction of double yellow lines opposite 22 Cranleigh Drive will encourage parking on the other side of the road, causing visibility problems whilst leaving the driveway.	The proposed double yellow lines are to improve visibility at the junction of Cranleigh Drive and Court Crescent and are also to deter commuter parking.
		The restrictions outside 22 Cranleigh Drive are intended to deter commuter parking and with other proposals in other roads to make better provision for commuters, it is not envisaged that this will be a significant problem.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr & Mrs Windget 99 Cranleigh Drive	The previously proposed parking restrictions have been deleted.	The comments from the majority of residents suggested that no restrictions were wanted in the area so the District Council deleted them from the proposals. It may be that at a later date, restrictions could be introduced to this area.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.



Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Miss S Crawley 113 Cranleigh Drive	Could the yellow line restrictions be extended to cover the front of 113 Cranleigh Drive?	This request conflicts with comments from other residents. It may be, that at a later date the District Council may extend the restrictions to cover your property, but this would require a change of will by neighbouring residents.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr S Robertson 77 Cranleigh Drive	The proposals deter school parking in Court Crescent, but not in Cranleigh Drive.	The District Council is trying to tackle the problems in Court Crescent outside the school gates. By allowing parent parking on Cranleigh Drive (a wider road than Court Crescent) we are able to 'dilute' the problem.
	Parents park across driveways and cause problems	Obstruction of driveways is an issue for the police, but if it occurs when a parking restriction is in force then the Parking Attendants will be able to take action.
	Parking enforcement is always in Sevenoaks, never in Swanley	This is not true, and the changes to the parking restriction times will mean that more enforcement will be available in Swanley than there has been before.

**Portfolio Holder's recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr C Stone 61 Cranleigh Drive	The proposals are an improvement but are over-complicated.	The proposals are designed to deal with the problems but to provide the minimum inconvenience to residents.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr P Bucknall 17 Cyclamen Road	The existing proposals already prevent commuter parking	There have been requests from residents to reduce the times of operation of the restriction. The proposals do this without reducing their efficiency.
	The proposals remove the main 'guest' parking for the road	The proposals allow on-street parking where previously it was not possible, and guests to residents could park all day under the existing 'visitors voucher' scheme (currently not applicable to the area).
	It is preferable to reduce the time of the restriction but not at the expense of free shared / guest parking.	This is not the case. The proposals allow more flexibility for residents and visitors than current restrictions allow.
	New signs and posts would downgrade the appearance of the area	There area existing signs that would be replaced. The District Council tries to use existing street furniture where possible to reduce sign 'clutter'.
	The proposals will force residents to concrete over their grassed front areas.	The proposals are less restrictive than the current parking controls and so should not encourage widespread conversion of gardens to driveways.

**Portfolio Holder's recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr C Knight 29 Cyclamen Road	Parking permits should be given to all residents of the affected roads so residents are not 'ticketed', though non-residents should be 'ticketed'.	The proposals include elements of resident permit parking but these cannot be provided for free. Priority is given to residents with no off-street parking facilities first. The proposals are designed to encourage the commuter parking in to non-residential areas.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr S Crowe 13 High Firs	There are no parking problems on High Firs	This is contrary to the views of a number of residents of the area.
	Why should the residents of High Firs be penalised by having to pay to park?	To allow flexibility and to be able to provide parking facilities for residents rather than for commuters the District Council must use parking permits. There is a charge for parking permits that applies across the District.
		The Council has three options - 1, To allow uncontrolled parking outside 13 High Firs. 2. To exclude all parking outside 13 High Firs. 3. To allow residents parking outside 13 High Firs. Option 1 is likely to be heavily abused by commuters, Option 2 will not meet your needs, so we are reduced to Option 3, permit parking.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr P DePasculi 24 Greenacre Close	The proposals to introduce pay and display parking outside Warwick House, Azalea Drive will displace parking to the private garage block areas in Greenacre Close	The existing bays are not available for long-stay parking (though this is abused at the moment). The proposals will allow more long-stay parking than currently happens which should reduce any displacement that may occur.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr T Clarke 28 Hazel End	The previously proposed parking restrictions have been deleted.	The comments from the majority of residents suggested that no restrictions were wanted in the area so the District Council deleted them from the proposals. It may be that at a later date, restrictions could be introduced to this area.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.



Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr B Downer 34 Ladds Way	Why are double yellow lines proposed only outside 11 & 13 Ladds Way?	The properties in question have recently installed new dropped kerbs and off-street parking facilities and requested restrictions to prevent obstruction.
	Which residents of 11-21 Ladds Way require permits?	The District Council will not say which specific resident has or has not applied for a parking permit. However, the bays are not sited outside specific properties and would be available for anyone with a permit for that are to use, not just the owner of the property it may happen to be outside.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Miss J Angus 11 Ladds Way	Why are double yellow lines proposed only outside 11 & 13 Ladds Way? We wish to retain a single yellow line	The proposals are designed to prevent obstruction of the newly constructed driveways. However, a single yellow line that operates Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am could be installed instead though this will require a traffic sign and post to installed in front of the property.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

It is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to note the objection and to amend the proposed double yellow line to a single yellow line, operating Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mrs S Laybourn 13 Ladds Way	Why are double yellow lines proposed only outside 11 & 13 Ladds Way? We wish to retain a single yellow line	The proposals are designed to prevent obstruction of the newly constructed driveways. However, a single yellow line that operates Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am could be installed instead though this will require a traffic sign and post to installed in front of the property.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

It is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to note the objection and to amend the proposed double yellow line to a single yellow line, operating Monday to Friday, 9am to 10am.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr M Panell 18 Lowercroft	Why were some of the residents suggestions for Lowercroft ignored?	Some of the suggestions proposed by residents of Lower Croft were not possible, given the legislation that the District Council has to work to. For example, it is not possible to give permit for residents to park on single yellow line.
		The District Council then decided to remove all of the proposals apart from the absolute minimum of restrictions to maintain access for large vehicles and emergency services.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr G Curties 8 Lowercroft	Why were the proposals for Lowercroft reduced?	There were a number of objections to the proposals from residents. Also, some of the suggestions proposed by residents of Lowercroft were not possible, given the legislation that the District Council has to work to. For example, it is not possible to give permit for residents to park on single yellow line.
		The District Council then decided to remove all of the proposals apart from the absolute minimum of restrictions to maintain access for large vehicles and emergency services.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr & Mrs Webber 19 Lila Place	Why are the existing restrictions in Lila Place being changed?	The times of the parking restrictions are being reduced in response to requests from residents, asking that the restrictions start later in the day. This change also ties-in with other changes in the area and would allow for more effective use of enforcement resources.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr D Baynton 62 Pinks Hill	The proposed restrictions would be inconvenient and restrictive where there is no current parking problem.	The proposals are designed to deal with the areas where there are problems, and to cover the surrounding areas to prevent the problems from displacing to neighbourhood roads.
	The proposals allow for limited waiting for up to 2 hours, but this would be inconvenient for residents who need to park a car on street during the day.	The proposed limited waiting parking bays could also be used by residents with a residents parking permit. This would allow residents to park in those bays for unrestricted time periods.
	Why would residents have to pay for parking permits?	The District Council applies a charge for resident parking permits across the District and a special case cannot be made for residents of the High Firs area.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr T Grant 88 Pinks Hill	The proposed restrictions would be inconvenient and restrictive where there is no current parking problem.	The proposals are designed to deal with the areas where there are problems, and to cover the surrounding areas to prevent the problems from displacing to neighbourhood roads. Residents from other nearby properties in Pinks Hill have requested restrictions to counter any parking displacement.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.



Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr & Mrs Barnes 2 Pinks Hill	The proposals for parking on Goldsel Road will not improve road safety and are of no benefit to local residents.	The proposals are designed to provide a place for existing commuter cars that are currently causing parking problems in the residential roads. It is also expected that the associated reduction in road width will provide a reduction in vehicle speed on Goldsel Road. This will be monitored by Kent Highway Services.
	The exit from Azalea Drive is a main crossing point for parents with small children. To allow parking on a regular basis and the associated reduction in road width would be reckless and irresponsible. The Council should shoulder the responsibility for any accidents occurring as a result.	The choice of where to cross a road should be made by pedestrians based on the conditions at the time. There is a pelican crossing nearby and pedestrians would be able to make the choice to use that facility.
	Several cars are now choosing to park on the motorway bridge on a daily basis, presenting a danger to road users.	Parking on the bridge (and further westwards along Goldsel Road) falls within Crockenhill Parish and The District Council is promoting separate parking restrictions to address this issue.
	Parking on Goldsel Road is adequate.	This is not the case, as evidenced by the parking problems on the High Firs Estate, caused by lack of suitable commuter parking facilities.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr R Hill 51 Pinks Hill	The proposed restrictions would be inconvenient and restrictive where there is no current parking problem.	The proposals are designed to deal with the areas where there are problems, and to cover the surrounding areas to prevent the problems from displacing to neighbourhood roads.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr A Cain 12 Pinks Hill	The proposals will force parking to the other side of the road.	This is not the case. The proposals will allow residents to be able to park all day in an areas where at present they cannot park from 7.30am until 10am. The proposals will also prevent parking on the nearby bend.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr B Page 55 Pinks Hill	The proposals will not allow residents with 2 or more off-street parking spaces to apply for a parking permit.	This District Council's qualifying criteria for residents parking permits has been revised.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr M East 10 Pinks Hill	The proposals outside 10 Pinks Hill do not allow sufficient room for emergency services to pass if vehicle park on both sides.	The proposals are circulated to the emergency services for their comments and no concerns have been raised. It is not unusual to have parking bays opposite single yellow lines, or even two single yellow lines opposite each other. Any vehicle that causes an obstruction would be causing an offence and could be dealt with by the police.
	The proposals will cause a hazard to residents who live opposite the parking bays as it will be difficult to exit driveways.	Vehicles already park in the area in question and residents are able to gain access and egress without problem.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr J McMurrie 32 Philip Avenue	The proposals outside 32 Philip Avenue seem to be contrary to the advice set out in the Highway Code.	Advice in the Highway Code covers all of the Highway and it is not a requirement in a low traffic volume area to place restrictions around every junction. If parking becomes a problem on the junction then the District Council may look to introduce restrictions at a later date.
	As the proposed restrictions only run for 1 hour it will lead to commuters 'taking a chance'.	Changing the times of the restrictions enables us to focus our resources more effectively and there should be regular enforcement.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mrs J Jones 9 Pine Close	The proposals for Pine close will create parking chaos and will prevent emergency vehicle access.	The proposals are circulated to the emergency services for their comments and no concerns have been raised. The proposals will deter long-stay commuter parking but should not affect short term parking. The restrictions should also ease (rather than restrict) access for emergency services or for larger vehicles.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr D Eckles 16 Springfield Avenue	The proposals are an improvement, but there should be an additional length of double yellow lines outside 16 Springfield Avenue.	The proposals are designed to be the minimum of restrictions. However, the District Council may introduce this extra section of double yellow lines at a later date.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.



Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr J Wood Address not given	The proposals for the St George's Road area are not necessary and the majority of residents do not want them.	The proposals have been reduced to a minimum to maintain emergency access to the area. This was done in light of the comments from residents of the western end of St George's Road.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Ms Y Sydney Address not given	The proposals do nothing to ease the parking problems for residents of the St George's Road area that have no off-street parking facilities.	The proposals were reduced and the residents parking proposals were withdrawn due to comments from residents. The proposed restrictions are the minimum necessary to maintain emergency and large vehicle access to the area.
		Whilst the District Council appreciates that some residential properties have no off-street parking facilities and no opportunity to create any, it is not the District Council's responsibility to provide parking for residents, particularly not at the expense of other residents or emergency access.

**Portfolio Holder's recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Ms L Jones 37 St George's Road	The proposed double yellow lines should be single yellow lines for one hour during the day.	The proposed double yellow lines are at the request of the immediate frontagers who have problems with commuter parking and have commented during the previous rounds of consultation. The proposals also ease access for large and emergency vehicles to the area.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr R Wilson 48 St George's Road	The proposed single yellow lines will require residents to move their vehicles for just one hour of the day. This is not environmentally friendly. Can residents permits be introduced?	The District Council proposed an element of residents permit parking at a previous round of consultation and the responses from residents were overwhelmingly against the proposals. To introduce a very short length of resident parking bays and permits would not provide an effective and enforceable scheme.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr R Tauszky 50 St George's Road	The proposed single yellow lines will require residents to move their vehicles for just one hour of the day. This is not fair to residents with more cars than parking spaces who have to park on-street. Can residents permits be introduced?	The District Council proposed an element of residents permit parking at a previous round of consultation and the responses from residents were overwhelmingly against the proposals. To introduce a very short length of resident parking bays and permits would not provide an effective and enforceable scheme.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr & Mrs Gee 8 Kingswood Avenue	The proposals are un-necessary as there are no parking problems on Kingswood Avenue (apart from around the junction of London Road and Kingswood Avenue)	The proposals are designed to remove the congestion around the London Road and Kingswood Avenue junction and also to prevent the displacement of the commuter cars to other locations in Kingswood Avenue.
	There needs to be traffic calming measures on Kingswood Avenue at the junction with Willow Avenue	The introduction of traffic calming falls within the remit of Kent Highway Services who are currently looking at the issues.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr C Packham 116 Pinks Hill	The original proposals went further and would have prevented commuter parking displacement outside 116 Pinks Hill, but the now reduced proposals would allow commuters to park there.	The District Council proposed parking restrictions in the previous rounds of consultation but the responses from residents were strongly against the proposals. As the lower section of Pinks Hill is the furthest point of the proposals it is not certain that commuters will displace this far. If commuter parking does spread to this point then the an extension to the restrictions may be required.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr & Mrs Long 47 Goldsel Road	The existing restrictions on Goldsel Road should be continued and the proposed residents parking scheme be removed, in response to the petition from residents of Goldsel Road.	In light of the comments from residents, the proposals for the southern side of Goldsel Road (between numbers 43 and 67 Goldsel Road) have been deleted, retaining the existing single yellow line parking restriction.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the response from residents and the petition, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to recommend that the proposals for the southern side of Goldsel Road (between 43 and 67 Goldsel Road) be abandoned and the existing restrictions be maintained.



Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr M Price Haworth 19 Court Crescent	The proposals for Court Crescent are unnecessary as residents never suffer any inconvenience from commuters or the 'school run'.	The District Council is proposing the restrictions following a number of complaints from residents of Court Crescent about the school parking and from a number of residents concerned about commuter parking. The proposals are designed to alleviate the concerns rather than displace them from one part of Court Crescent to another.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Mr H Wadsworth Address not given	The proposals on the southern side of Goldsel Road will reduce visibility for traffic turning right out of Azalea Drive.	This is no the case. The parking over which concern has been raised would not affect visibility as it is on the other side of the road.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Ms S Barnaby Address not given	The proposals for Lowercroft do not help residents that live on the pathways at either end.	The proposals were reduced and the residents parking proposals were withdrawn due to comments from residents. The proposed restrictions are the minimum necessary to maintain emergency and large vehicle access to the area.
		Whilst the District Council appreciates that some residential properties have no off-street parking facilities and no opportunity to create any, it is not the District Council's responsibility to provide parking for residents, particularly not at the expense of other residents or emergency access.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr I Ashford United House, Goldsel Road	The proposed pay and display bays opposite the access road to United House should be 'residents only' as parking of large vehicles in this area could cause problems for deliveries to United House. At present some large vehicles (including single decker bu	The proposals parking facilities prevent the parking of large vehicles in the area. Changing the proposal from 'Pay & Display and resident parking' to 'residents parking only' would not change the categories of vehicles that are allowed to park.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr C Drake Swanley Town Council, St Marys Drive	The existing restrictions on Goldsel Road should be continued and the proposed residents parking scheme be removed, in response to the petition from residents of Goldsel Road.	In light of the comments from residents, the proposals for the southern side of Goldsel Road (between numbers 43 and 67 Goldsel Road) have been deleted, retaining the existing single yellow line parking restriction.
	The changes to proposals in Kingswood Avenue and The Beeches are welcomed.	
	The lay-by on London Road, opposite Oliver Road should have parking restrictions to prevent vehicles from being parked there indefinitely as is the situation at present.	This is not one of the proposals currently being promoted by the District Council, though it may form part of future proposals for Swanley.
	Any parking proposals that are put in place must ensure that highway safety issues have been addressed.	The effects of parking proposals are difficult to predict, but the proposals have all been designed with the aim of improving road safety and have been circulated to the emergency services and the Highway Authority for comment.
	Items 70 (a)(ii) and 70 (c ) should be removed as discussed.	The District Council is not intending to introduce these measures and the items were included in the schedules in error.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the response from residents and the petition, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to recommend that the proposals for the southern side of Goldsel Road (between 43 and 67 Goldsel Road) be abandoned and the existing restrictions be maintained and the other proposals be introduced as proposed.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mr A Gray 95 Cranleigh Drive	The previously proposed parking restrictions have been deleted, though they dealt with the issues in the cul-de-sac.	The comments from the majority of residents suggested that no restrictions were wanted in the area so the District Council deleted them from the proposals.
		The parking problems are caused by residents parking and a desire to maximise capacity in the cul-de-sac. Any proposals the District Council may promote would significantly reduce the on-street parking capacity of the area. It may be that at a later date, if requested by a number of residents, restrictions could be introduced.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.

Swanley Parking Review – Portfolio Holder recommendations

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board – 18<sup>th</sup> September Agenda Item 10 (Appendix 1)

Name	Comment	Response
Mrs W Caulfield 29 Telston Court, Edwards Gardens	The proposals for parking bays at the end of Edwards Gardens would be in front of the new driveway to 17 Edwards Gardens.	This is not the case. The proposal is for a combination of double and single yellow lines around the end of the cul-de-sac, as requested by the immediate residents. No parking bays are proposed for the end of the cul-de-sac.
	The proposed parking bay bordering the private land in Edwards Gardens is on a bend and is against the advice set out in the Highway Code about parking.	The bays are existing, the only change proposed is to the time of operation and not the extents. The advice in the Highway Code reflects difficulties associated with visibility obstruction caused by parked vehicles. In Edwards Gardens, where vehicle speeds are low and visibility is good this is not seen to be a problem.
	When residents get out of their cars they step on to private land and to get to their houses, causing damage to the private land.	The District Council cannot legislate to make motorists get out of their cars through one door or another, and any member of the public who chooses to step on to private land does so at their own responsibility. It would be an issue between the land owner and the individual in question.

**Portfolio Holder’s recommendation**

Given the responses received and the points raised, it is the decision of the District Council's Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment to set aside the comments and recommend that the proposals be introduced.