

**SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 16<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2008**

**TRAFFIC ORDER AMENDMENT 18**

**CHANGES TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN FAWKHAM, BRASTED, RIVERHEAD, FORDCOMBE, WEST KINGSDOWN, ASH-CUM-RIDLEY, LEIGH AND HARTLEY**

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 Leigh, Ash-Cum-Ridley, West Kingsdown, Fordcombe, Riverhead, Brasted, Fawkham and Hartley.

---

**This report supports the Key Aim** of safer communities and the effective and efficient use of resources.

**Portfolio Holder** Cllr. Williamson

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

---

**Recommendation:** It be RESOLVED that;

- (a) The comments and objections to the changes in the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order Amendment 18 be noted and the officer recommendations set out within this report be implemented.
- (b) The parking restrictions be introduced as proposed, subject to the officer recommendations set out within this report for Fawkham, Brasted, Riverhead, Fordcombe, West Kingsdown, Ash-cum-Ridley, Leigh and Hartley

---

**Background**

- 1 A review of parking restrictions in the parishes of Fawkham, Brasted, Riverhead, Fordcombe, West Kingsdown, Ash-cum-Ridley, Leigh and Hartley areas has been undertaken following requests from a number of local residents, businesses and in some cases the Parish Councils.
- 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 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2008.
- 3 The objection period generated a mixed result in terms of numbers of responses, ranging from nil for some schemes with others receiving numerous individual responses or petitions, an executive summary follows as item 4, with further details of each proposal in subsequent items.

#### 4 Executive Summary

##### *In the Parish of Fawkham*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>5. Fawkham</b>	Mr Johnson	Not required as sufficient legislation already exists and will cause extra visual clutter	Comments be set aside	Remove Fawkham Forge from the Order
	Mr Bryer	Requesting the restriction be redesigned	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

##### *In the Parish of Brasted*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>6. Brasted</b>	None	None	N/A	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

##### *In the Parish of Riverhead*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>7. Riverhead</b>	Mr Cave	Concerns it may adversely effect public transport usage	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr Pearson	Will loose current parking location	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr & Mrs Lennox	Will loose current parking location	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Cofatec Heatsave Ltd	Will adversely effect local burger bar	Comments be upheld	Reduce length of restriction in Service Road to accommodate burger van at the end
	Petition (154 signatures)	Will adversely effect local burger bar	Comments be upheld	Reduce length of restriction in Service Road to accommodate burger van at the end
	11 standard letters from local businesses	Will adversely effect local burger bar	Comments be upheld	Reduce length of restriction in Service Road to accommodate burger van at the end

**Item No. 4(a)**

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
	Marcin Chodynieski	Will adversely effect his burger bar	Comments be upheld	Reduce length of restriction in Service Road to accommodate burger van at the end

*In the Parish of Penshurst*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>8. Fordcombe</b>	Parish Council	Requesting only some of the restriction be introduced	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

*In the Parish of West Kingsdown*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>9. West Kingsdown</b>	None	None	None	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Dickinson	Request for traffic calming	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

*In the Parish of Ash-cum-Ridley*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>10. New Ash Green</b>	Dental Centre	Freedom of information request	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred
	Cllr Clark	Works no longer required	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred
	Dental centre	Limited public parking in area	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred
	Village Association	The restrictions will not be monitored or enforced	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred
	Cllr Pett	Restriction not required	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred
	Parish Council	Restriction not required	Comments be upheld	Scheme to be deferred

*In the Parish of Leigh*

**Item No. 4(a)**

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
<b>11. Leigh</b>	Mr Whiffin	Restricts parking for local amenities	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Parish Council	Request for redesign of restriction	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

*In the Parish of Hartley*

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Comments be set aside	Action
<b>12. Hartley</b>	Mary Farlane	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Terry Halpin	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Bill Buckley	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	William Ferrill	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Paul Libaert	Restrictions not necessary	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Gerard Carey	Restrictions not necessary	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	David Coffey	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Glen Shipston	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	John Quigley	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Gerry Budd	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Amanda Malas	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Yvonne Hegarty	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr Harbinson	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	A. MacEwan	Restrictions not required	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Alan Gray	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Smith	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Phipps	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kathryn Graham	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
Mrs Rennison	Restrictions not required	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed	
Sarah Gawor	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed	
Alison Cogle	Restriction not required	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed	

**Item No. 4(a)**

Town / Village	Respondent's details	Response summary	Comments be set aside	Action
	Mr Gawor	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Teresa Joseph	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Claire Smith	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kelly Harrison	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Steve Lewis	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr Kerton	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Miss Clarke	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Peter Stevens	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Johns	Concerns parking will be displaced	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	George Harvey	Concerns parking will be displaced	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr Wilton	Concerns parking will be displaced	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Holmes	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Margaret Jeffs	Concerns parking will be displaced	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Valerie Spikett	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Margaret Walsh	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Anne Inman	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Antony Owen	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	William Rons	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Penelope Vant	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Preston	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Dixon	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs Welsh	Restricts parking for church users	Comments be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

**5 Fawkham comments, objections & responses (in italics)**

- 5.1 An email has been received on the 23/10/08 from a Mr Dave Johnson. He has raised several reasons for his objections to the introduction of restrictions as detailed in Amendment 18. A summary of his objections is as follows (full details of all responses are available to view on [www.sevenoaks.gov.uk](http://www.sevenoaks.gov.uk), with paper copies available for inspection at the meeting):
- 5.2 His objections raise two main points, the first is his objection to the introduction of restrictions in Fawkham Forge as Sevenoaks District Council have not included this stretch of road within the statement of reasons as they are required to do so under statutory procedures for the introduction of new Traffic regulation orders.
- 5.3 The second and main objection is that not only are these restrictions in areas where cars often don't park during the daytime but they will also spoil the character of a rural village and are not in line with current government policy on reducing signing 'clutter' and visual intrusion
- 5.4 *The District Council accepts Mr Johnsons objection regarding the failure to give a statement of reasons for Fawkham Forge and will withdraw this section from the scheme, however the introduction of restrictions as detailed is an essential tool in keeping the road safe and clear for emergency service vehicles especially in the evenings when vehicles regularly completely block the road. Although parking in this manner is not allowed under obstruction law it is felt that a clearer visible deterrent will assist with this issue as well as giving further enforcement options.*
- 5.5 *The lines that will be placed in this location will be the smaller width 50mm lines in line with current conservation area protocols and as double yellow lines do not require signing the 'clutter' level and impact will be kept to a minimum.*
- 5.6 Mr Bryer has raised concerns regarding the side of the road in Small Grains that will have parking places. He is concerned that by allowing vehicles to park along the south eastern side this may encourage larger vehicles to drive along the footpath damaging it and endangering pedestrians.
- 5.7 *After consideration it has been decided to set aside Mr Bryer's objection as the parking has been deliberately placed along the south eastern side of Small Grains as this side abuts a green area which may in the future have fencing or bollards installed along the edges to prevent vehicles driving across the green. If this is done and parking was placed on the north western side of the road then emergency vehicle access could be extremely restricted. By placing vehicles as detailed the option for emergency vehicles only to use the extra width of the footway remains an option where as any other vehicles doing so will be committing a moving traffic offence and may be prosecuted.*

**6 Brasted comments, objections & responses**

- 6.1 There have been no objections to the formal consultation regarding the introduction of junction protection restrictions in 'West End' Brasted. The only response was from Kent Police who wrote in support of the measures
- 6.2 *Sevenoaks District Council intends to proceed with this scheme as proposed.*

**7 Riverhead comments, objections & responses**

- 7.1 A response was received from a Mr Cave on the 3/11/08, he objects to the introduction of the restrictions on the grounds that he feels that the District Council are only introducing extra restrictions to make money from parking charges or penalty charge notices.
- 7.2 He also feels that by introducing these restrictions in locations where people currently park and then catch the train we will potentially increase traffic and pollution by causing more car journeys to take place.
- 7.3 Within his letter he makes reference to the point that without vehicles parked in Bullfinch Lane acting as a natural traffic calming measure other costly methods will have to be introduced which will be a further waste of tax payers money.
- 7.4 *These restrictions are only being introduced in locations that will aid traffic flow and safety, this is especially true at the junction of Bullfinch Lane where vehicles currently park and cause traffic flows to stray onto the wrong side of the carriageway approaching a traffic island at a junction. A safety scheme like this is not designed to generate revenue as these are already areas identified in the highway code that vehicles should not park.*
- 7.5 *The natural 'traffic calming' that vehicles incorrectly parked in Bullfinch Lane create is as detailed above more of a hazard than a useful tool. Vehicles do slow down in this location when passing the cars because they naturally recognise that they have to place themselves in danger to do so, this further illustrates why vehicles should not be in that location.*
- 7.6 A Mr Pearson from 'Ubertek' responded on the 21/10/08 via email registering his objection to the placement of a bus stop clearway outside of the hire shop in Riverhead as this is a location where he regularly parks.
- 7.7 He states that if we do not resolve this matter to satisfaction then he will refer the matter to the Queens Bench division for administrative action under an Order 53.
- 7.8 *The location in question already has a bus stop in place and as by his own admission it is regularly parked on, this causes the buses to stop in the road creating a hazard to other road users and to the passengers who have to walk into the road to alight the vehicle. It also causes extra challenges to any disabled persons wishing to use the bus.*

**Item No. 4(a)**

- 7.9 *Whilst Mr Pearson is within his rights to take further action it should be noted that any action under an Order 53 refers to potential errors in the procedural process of making a new traffic order and not the order itself. This would be particularly strange in this case as bus stop clearways can be introduced without the requirement of an Order under general statute.*
- 7.10 A response letter from Mr & Mrs Lennox was received on the 20/10/08 registering their objection to the introduction of restrictions in Bullfinch Lane as it will remove their current parking location. They have requested that the section of Bullfinch Lane from Baden Powell Road to London Road be parking for residents only.
- 7.11 They are also concerned that the displaced vehicles will then park further away in side roads and cause new problems.
- 7.12 *These restrictions are only being introduced in locations that will aid traffic flow and safety, this is especially true at the junction of Bullfinch Lane where vehicles currently park and cause traffic flows to stray onto the wrong side of the carriageway approaching a traffic island at a junction. A safety scheme like this is not designed to generate revenue as these are already areas identified in the highway code that vehicles should not park. For these reasons it is not possible to maintain these areas of parking as residents only. Any displaced vehicles will then park in alternative locations in line with guidance set out in the Highway Code.*
- 7.13 A letter of objection was received on the 17/10/08 from all staff members at 'Cofatec Heatsave Ltd'. The letter was in support of the burger van that is located near their premises in the lay by just off of the London Road where restrictions are to be introduced as this is an access road to parking areas and other commercial units.
- 7.14 They feel that these restrictions will not only force the burger bar itself to move but as the customers will no longer be able to park on one side of the lay by his livelihood will be removed.
- 7.15 *The area in question is a small section of the Old London Road now used only as an entrance road to various commercial properties and to rear parking areas*
- 7.16 *The restriction in this area is designed to maintain a good access for emergency service vehicles to all of the properties and parking areas in that location. It is true however that the very end of the lay by beyond the final vehicular entrance may be a suitable location for the burger van without restricting access so if following further investigation a big enough gap can be safely accommodated at the end then the Council will shorten the restrictions to allow for this possibility.*
- 7.17 *It should be noted however that the trailer serving the food should be in compliance with all statutory highway and food safety operating requirements*



**Item No. 4(a)**

*as this report and its recommendations are not responsible for ensuring these are currently in place.*

- 7.18 A petition with 154 signatures was received from the burger van operator on the 14/10/08 stating that vehicles only park in this area when attending their workplace or short term parking to purchase food from his van.
- 7.19 *The area in question is a small section of the Old London Road now used only as a entrance road to various commercial properties and to rear parking areas*
- 7.20 *The restriction in this area is designed to maintain a good access for emergency service vehicles to all of the properties and parking areas in that location. It is true however that the very end of the lay by beyond the final vehicular entrance may be a suitable location for the burger van without restricting access so if following further investigation a big enough gap can be safely accommodated at the end then the Council will shorten the restrictions to allow for this possibility.*
- 7.21 *It should be noted however that the trailer serving the food should be in compliance with all statutory highway and food safety operating requirements as this report and its recommendations are not responsible for ensuring these are currently in place.*
- 7.22 11 letters have also been received, they have been drafted by the vendor of the burger van and distributed to local businesses to sign and return, these again state their wish to object to the introduction of restrictions in this area as it will effect the livelihood of the burger van.
- 7.23 *The area in question is a small section of the Old London Road now used only as a entrance road to various commercial properties and to rear parking areas*
- 7.24 *The restriction in this area is designed to maintain a good access for emergency service vehicles to all of the properties and parking areas in that location. It is true however that the very end of the lay by beyond the final vehicular entrance may be a suitable location for the burger van without restricting access so if following further investigation a big enough gap can be safely accommodated at the end then the Council will shorten the restrictions to allow for this possibility.*
- 7.25 *It should be noted however that the trailer serving the food should be in compliance with all statutory highway and food safety operating requirements as this report and its recommendations are not responsible for ensuring these are currently in place.*
- 7.26 An individual letter from Marcin Chodyniecki the vendor of the burger van was received this again states his wish to object to the introduction of restrictions in this area as it will effect the livelihood of the burger van.

**Item No. 4(a)**

- 7.27 *The area in question is a small section of the Old London Road now used only as an entrance road to various commercial properties and to rear parking areas*
- 7.28 *The restriction in this area is designed to maintain a good access for emergency service vehicles to all of the properties and parking areas in that location. It is true however that the very end of the lay by beyond the final vehicular entrance may be a suitable location for the burger van without restricting access so if following further investigation a big enough gap can be safely accommodated at the end then the Council will shorten the restrictions to allow for this possibility.*
- 7.29 *It should be noted however that the trailer serving the food should be in compliance with all statutory highway and food safety operating requirements as this report and its recommendations are not responsible for ensuring these are currently in place.*

**8 Fordcombe comments, objections & responses**

- 8.1 A response was received on the 7/10/08 from the Parish Council. They have requested that only the restriction on the north eastern side be implemented and the others be dropped from the scheme as they feel that they do not want lines within the village but this would be a compromise that still maintains safety.
- 8.2 *As indicated by their response there is a need in this location to remove vehicles from this staggered crossroads to enable good sight lines and safe traffic flows, earlier informal consultation confirmed several near misses in this area and so to only protect one half of the junction is not acceptable and may even increase the perception that parking near to the other is fine*
- 8.3 *It is the case that no vehicle should currently be parked in this location as it is against Highway Code guidance however these restrictions will formalise and further advise this position.*

**9 West Kingsdown comments, objections & responses**

- 9.1 There have been no objections to the formal consultation regarding the introduction of junction protection restrictions in 'The Briars' West Kingsdown. The only response was from Kent police who wrote in support of the measures
- 9.2 *Sevenoaks District Council intends to proceed with this scheme as proposed.*
- 9.3 A formal response to the introduction and modification of restrictions in 'Hever Road' West Kingsdown was received on the 7/10/08 via email from Mrs Dickinson. It raises no objections to the proposals but does request other traffic calming measures in the area
- 9.4 *Sevenoaks District Council intends to proceed with this scheme as detailed. The extra traffic calming is the responsibility of the Highway authority. And*

**Item No. 4(a)**

*does not form part of this report but it is noted and will be passed to Kent Highways.*

**10 Ash-Cum-Ridley comments, objections & responses**

- 10.1 A response was received from the New Ash Green dental centre via email on the 14/10/08. It stated no formal objection but did have a Freedom of information request attached. This request related to earlier consultation details and responses
- 10.2 *This request has been logged into the Sevenoaks District Council system for dealing with Freedom of information requests and will be dealt with under the protocols set out in the Council's Charter.*
- 10.3 Cllr Clark has responded via email on the 7/10/08. She has objected to the scheme on the grounds that the restriction modification is no longer required. It is believed that the original scheme advocate is no longer around to promote these actions and all other locals are opposed to the restrictions.
- 10.4 *Whilst some limited support was registered at an earlier informal consultation stage none has been registered formally, with this in mind along with strong opposition from ward and parish members it has been decided to defer this scheme and to pass it to Kent Highways Services for consideration as one of their own stand alone safety schemes.*
- 10.5 A second response from the Dental Surgery in New Ash Green was received via email on the 30/10/08. It strongly objects to the modification of the existing restrictions on the following grounds: - There is no local support for the scheme by residents or Councillors, the parking in the area is limited already and will be made worse during planned redevelopment works, vehicles parked in these locations have not and do not cause any issues.
- 10.6 *This scheme was being promoted as a safety scheme and as such parking capacity is not a primary consideration, however due to the lack of support for the scheme and no records of safety related incidents in that location it has been decided to defer this scheme and to pass it to Kent Highways Services for consideration as one of their own stand alone safety schemes.*
- 10.7 New Ash Green Village Association responded by letter on the 30/10/08 registering their objection to the modification of the existing restrictions. They object on the grounds that the scheme is not required or supported locally.
- 10.8 *Whilst some limited support was registered at an earlier informal consultation stage none has been registered formally, with this in mind along with strong opposition from ward and parish members it has been decided to defer this scheme and to pass it to Kent Highways Services for consideration as one of their own stand alone safety schemes.*

**Item No. 4(a)**

- 10.9 Cllr Pett has responded with an objection on the 3/11/08 stating that the scheme has no local support and is not necessary. He also believes the original advocate is no longer available to promote the scheme.
- 10.10 *Whilst some limited support was registered at an earlier informal consultation stage none has been registered formally, with this in mind along with strong opposition from ward and parish members it has been decided to defer this scheme and to pass it to Kent Highways Services for consideration as one of their own stand alone safety schemes.*
- 10.11 The Parish Council has responded with an objection on the 9/10/08 stating that the scheme has no local support and is not necessary. They also believes the original advocate is no longer available to promote the scheme.
- 10.12 *Whilst some limited support was registered at an earlier informal consultation stage none has been registered formally, with this in mind along with strong opposition from ward and parish members it has been decided to defer this scheme and to pass it to Kent Highways Services for consideration as one of their own stand alone safety schemes.*

**11 Leigh comments, objections & responses**

- 11.1 A response was received via email from Mr Whiffin on the 27/10/08 objecting to the introduction of restrictions in 'Powder Mill Lane'. His response states two main concerns. The first is that there is a lack of parking capacity in or near the War memorial and church as well as no crashes or incidents in that location so the restrictions are not required. The second is that the introduction of restriction lines will be detrimental to the visual impact of the treasured village green which is adjacent to Powder Mill Lane.
- 11.2 *This restriction is a safety scheme of junction protection and bend protection in locations where the Highway Code clearly states that vehicles should not be parking. The introduction of the lines is to formalise this position and to highlight this to motorists.*
- 11.3 *Parking provision in suitable and safe areas has been kept to a maximum and the visual impact will be kept to a minimum by only applying 50mm wide lines (not requiring any signs) as is standard practice in conservation areas.*
- 11.4 The Parish Council responded on the 15/10/08 via email. They have raised concerns about parking capacity in the area for residents of Hildenborough Road as well as the visual impact of yellow lines within a conservation area.
- 11.5 *This restriction is a safety scheme of junction protection and bend protection in locations where the Highway Code clearly states that vehicles should not be parking. The introduction of the lines is to formalise this position and to highlight this to motorists.*

**Item No. 4(a)**

11.6 *Parking provision in suitable and safe areas has been kept to a maximum and the visual impact will be kept to a minimum by only applying 50mm wide lines (not requiring any signs) as is standard practice in conservation areas.*

**12 Hartley comments, objections & responses**

12.1 The introduction of restrictions around the Church Road, Stack Lane & Woodland Avenue junctions has generated 43 responses mostly from users of the church on the corner. The objections all cover the same points and as such will be responded to collectively.

12.2 The main objection covered is that the introduction of restrictions covering an operational period of 'At any time' will severely effect the parking of persons attending the St. Francis de Sales church.. Especially wedding and funeral cars. In this respect many of the respondents ask if only the restrictions on the north eastern side of Church Road could be introduced

12.3 Many of the objections state that vehicles will now have to park further away causing difficulties for elderly or disabled persons wishing to attend church as well as displaced vehicles potentially causing problems in near by roads.

12.4 *The area where the restrictions are to be introduced is designed to reflect the instructions within the highway code and covers junction protection and bend protection. Because these restrictions are being introduced as a safety scheme to prevent vehicles being in a dangerous position on the highway they must be in force 'At any time' The restrictions are being placed to the minimum standards to help reduce the impact on local parking capacities and amenities' as well as maintaining safe sight lines and vehicle movements*

12.5 *These restrictions will not effect official wedding or funeral vehicles as they are exempt within the traffic orders from this kind of restriction whilst performing the dedicated service and so will still be able to pull up and park as they currently do. Disabled drivers are also exempt for 3 hours whilst displaying their badge and time-clock. Double yellow lines indicate no parking or waiting but vehicles may still pull up to allow passengers to exit or alight thus allowing elderly or immobile persons to be dropped off and then the driver to go and find a suitable parking position slightly further away.*

12.6 *It would not be sensible to introduce only half of the restriction as many of the respondents have suggested, as this will lead to the impression that parking on the south western side is suitable which it is not. Many of the respondents indicated that on darker evenings exiting Stack Lane can be a little hazardous as Church Road bends slightly opposite Woodland Avenue which is why restrictions should continue along around the bend opposite the Woodland Avenue junction.*

**Risk Assessment Statement**

By not introducing the measures proposed in Fawkham, Brasted, Riverhead, Fordcombe, West Kingsdown, Ash-cum-Ridley, Leigh and Hartley 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.

**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**