

SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 16 DECEMBER 2008

TRAFFIC ORDER AMENDMENT 20

CHANGES TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN SWANLEY

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 Swanley.

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 20 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 Swanley.

Background

- 1 The Swanley Parking Review was implemented in April 2008. It is normal practice when introducing large parking reviews to monitor the restrictions and where appropriate to introduce minor changes and amendments approximately six months after the scheme start to accommodate any changes to that were not foreseeable before the introduction of the main scheme.
- 2 A number of other requests for parking restrictions in the Swanley area had also been received from residents and businesses and the proposals were included within the 6 month review of the Swanley Parking Review.
- 3 Two rounds of consultation have been carried out. The informal consultation produced a number of comments from frontagers and some of the proposals were adjusted to reflect those comments. The second round (formal) consultation was the opportunity for the public to object to the proposals.

Item No. 4(b)

- 4 The formal objection period closed on 24th November 2008.
- 5 Letters were sent to frontagers of the proposed restrictions, with a reply slip for the resident to indicate support (or not) for the proposals. The objection period generated a mixed result in terms of numbers of responses, ranging from nil for some of the proposals with others receiving several responses. An Executive Summary follows as item 5, with further details of each proposal in subsequent items.

6 Executive Summary of comments and objections

In the Town of Swanley

Location	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
7. Bramley Close	Mr K Baker	In favour of proposal	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs B Skinner	In favour of proposals – the quicker, the better.	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
8. Court Crescent	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
9. Cyclamen Road / Phillip Avenue	Mr A Thrussell	In favour - a sensible amendment	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr G Martin	In favour, though the proposal seems pointless	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
10. Cyclamen Road	Mr P Bucknall	Not in favour, double yellow lines not wanted	Objection be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr & Mrs Gardner	In favour of proposals – but raising other parking issues	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr L Vincent	In favour of proposals as cars and vans constantly park on the bend	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr & Mrs Mather	In favour of the proposals	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
11. Goldsel Road	Mrs P Newnham	In favour of proposal but would like disabled parking facilities	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs M Marchant	Not in favour – parked cars block view at junction	Objection be set aside	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs B Skinner	In favour of proposals, but would like a single yellow line instead	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed

Item No. 4(b)

Location	Respondent's details	Response summary	Recommendation	Action
	Mr C Metcher	In favour of proposals, but suggesting other changes	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr Crawley	In favour of proposals, but suggesting the removal of the parking completely.	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
12. Mark Way	Mr R Seagrave	In favour of the proposal	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
13. St George's Road	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
14. St Georges Road / Salisbury Avenue	Mr J Moore	In favour - the proposal will make the road very much safer	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mrs S Huntley	In favour – provided the restrictions are enforced	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr D Hayday	In favour of the proposal	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Mr A Turner	In favour of proposal, but would like additional restrictions	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
15. Salisbury Avenue / London Road	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	Traffic Order to be made as proposed
16. St Mary's Road / Apple Orchard	Mr W Yeowell	In favour of the proposal	Comments be noted	The restrictions in front of 66 St Mary's Road be reduced in length by 4m.
	Mr & Mrs Lamboi	Not in favour – would like to park in front of their access	Objection be upheld	The restrictions in front of 66 St Mary's Road be reduced in length by 4m.
	Kent Police	No objection	Comments be noted	The restrictions in front of 66 St Mary's Road be reduced in length by 4m.

7 Bramley Close comments, objections & responses (in italics)

- 7.1 Two reply slips were received from residents, both indicating their support for the proposals.
- 7.2 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response (full details of all responses are available to view on www.sevenoaks.gov.uk, with paper copies available for inspection at the meeting).
- 7.3 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

8 Court Crescent comments, objections & responses

- 8.1 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.
- 8.2 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

9 Cyclamen Road / Phillip Avenue comments, objections & responses

- 9.1 Two reply slips were received from residents, both indicating their support for the proposals, though one resident commented that he thought the proposals were pointless.
- 9.2 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.
- 9.3 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

10 Cyclamen Road comments, objections & responses

- 10.1 Three response slips were received from frontagers of the proposed restrictions in support of the proposals. Mrs Gardner went on to raise other issues not pertaining to the current proposals that are being considered within this report.
- 10.2 *The comments made by Mrs Gardner will be investigated and addressed separately.*
- 10.3 A response slip and subsequent emails were received from Mr Bucknall, objecting to the proposed restrictions for two reasons; firstly that he did not want any additional signs to be placed in the footway outside his property as this could obstruct access to his property, and secondly, that there was limited guest and evening / night-time parking available in Cyclamen Road and the proposals would reduce this further.
- 10.4 *The District Council has explained the situation to Mr Bucknall that changes to parking restrictions on the opposite side of the road from his property would not entail any changes to the signing arrangements outside his property and so would not affect access to his driveway.*
- 10.5 *The proposed parking restrictions on the bend follow requests from a number of residents who have complained about parking there and the obstruction of*

Item No. 4(b)

accesses and parking in front of the garages. All of the properties in Cyclamen Road have off-street parking available to them, the majority having facilities for more than one vehicle.

10.6 *No vehicle should currently be parked on the bend as it is against the guidance set out in the Highway Code, however as this is currently occurring, the proposals will formalise this advice, allow enforcement by the District Council and allay concerns of residents about parking there and about obstruction of the garages and vehicle accesses.*

10.7 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.

10.8 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

11 Goldsel Road comments, objections & responses

11.1 There were 5 response slips received, 4 in favour and one against the proposals.

11.2 Mrs Newnham commented that she was in favour of the proposals but would like a disabled parking bay to be marked outside her property.

11.3 *The provision of a disabled parking bay would be subject to the disabled resident meeting the criteria for such a bay and previous correspondence has suggested that Mrs Newnham would not meet the established criteria. However, as a Blue Badge holder, Mrs Newnham is already entitled to a free residents' parking permit to park within any of the parking bays on Goldsel Road, Azalea Drive or Lila Place near her property.*

11.4 Mrs Skinner commented that she was in favour of the proposal, but wanted the parking bays changed to a single yellow line from 9am-10am to make it easier for residents parking, and the Pay & Display meter to be moved to the section of Goldsel Road by Leyhill Close.

11.5 *The current parking facilities allow residents to park (using a residents' permit) for unlimited periods, whilst providing a flexible parking facility for non-residents. Changing the parking to a single yellow line would remove the priority facility for residents. There is already a Pay & Display machine site on Goldsel Road by Leyhill Close (though the machine is currently not in-situ pending repairs).*

11.6 Mrs Marchant was not in favour of the proposal, suggesting that the parking bays on the south side of Goldsel Road between High Firs and the pedestrian crossing be removed as it presents a hazard for traffic turning right on to Goldsel Road as the parked cars block a clear view of the road.

11.7 *The District Council feels that the existing parking arrangements already meet the appropriate visibility standards for the Goldsel Road / High Firs junction and the existing parking has been looked at by officers from the District Council, Kent Highway Services and the Roads Policing Team of Kent Police.*

Item No. 4(b)

- 11.8 *The current proposal is to remove 5 metres of parking by the extension of the double yellow lines, to improve visibility and further allay the concerns of motorists using the junction, without removing the parking facilities that residents and motorists are wanting to use.*
- 11.9 Mr Metcher commented in favour of the proposals, but suggested that the parking bays should be removed completely. Mr Metcher comments that he has sought opinions from Kent Police traffic officers who have commented that the layout of the parking bays are not 'safe' (with regard to the pedestrian crossing and the junction), and from an officer within Kent Highway Services who apparently echoed the comments.
- 11.10 *Whilst the District Council appreciates the comments provided by Mr Metcher, the District Council's view is that the current parking restrictions meet the appropriate design standards for this sort of facility.*
- 11.11 *The comments from individual traffic officers from Kent Police should not be considered to have the same authority as those from the appointed officer from the Police (regardless of rank) who comments with the authority of the Chief Constable.*
- 11.12 *The District Council feels that the existing parking arrangements already meet the appropriate visibility standards for the Goldsel Road / High Firs junction. However, to allay concerns, the current proposal is to remove 5 metres of parking by the extension of the double yellow lines, to improve visibility of motorists using the junction, without removing the parking facilities that residents and motorists are wanting to use.*
- 11.13 Mr Crawley commented in favour of the proposals to reduce the parking bay, but suggested its complete removal.
- 11.14 *The District Council feels that the existing parking arrangements already meet the appropriate visibility standards for the Goldsel Road / High Firs junction. However, to allay concerns, the current proposal is to remove 5 metres of parking by the extension of the double yellow lines, to improve visibility of motorists using the junction, without removing the parking facilities that residents and motorists are wanting to use.*
- 11.15 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.
- 11.16 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

12 Mark Way comments, objections & responses

- 12.1 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.
- 12.2 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

13 St George's Road comments, objections & responses

Item No. 4(b)

13.1 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.

13.2 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

14 St George's Road / Salisbury Avenue comments, objections & responses

14.1 Three reply slips were received from residents, all indicating their support for the proposals, though one suggested that the restrictions would need enforcement.

14.2 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.

14.3 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

15 Salisbury Avenue / London Road comments, objections & responses

15.1 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.

15.2 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed.*

16 St Mary's Road / Apple Orchard comments, objections & responses

16.1 One response slip (supported by an email) was received supporting the proposal.

16.2 One letter and accompanying plans against the proposals was received from the residents of No 66 St Mary's Drive, indicating that they currently park in front of their own driveway, that they would wish to continue to do so and the proposals would prevent this.

16.3 *The District Council tries to understand the needs of residents and proposes that the restrictions be reduced by 4 metres so the residents of No. 66 St Mary's Drive can continue to park in front of their driveway.*

16.4 Kent Police provided a standard 'no objection' response to the proposals.

16.5 *The restrictions should be introduced as proposed, save for a reduction in length of 4 metres in front of No.66 St Mary's Drive.*

Risk Assessment Statement

By not introducing the measures proposed in Swanley 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

Item No. 4(b)

orders held by the Parking and Amenity team

Contact Officer(s): Andy Bracey Ext.7323

**KRISTEN PATERSON
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR**

