

**SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 16 JUNE 2009**

**TRAFFIC ORDER AMENDMENT 24 - CHANGES TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN SEVENOAKS AND RIVERHEAD**

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 the Sevenoaks and Riverhead areas.

---

**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 24 be noted and the recommendations set out within this report be implemented.
- (b) The parking restrictions be introduced as proposed, subject to the recommendations set out within this report for Sevenoaks and Riverhead.

---

**Background**

- 1 Following requests from the Sevenoaks Town Forum and the Sevenoaks Parking Review Group, a review of parking restrictions in the town of Sevenoaks and the Montreal Park and Amherst Hill areas of Riverhead was undertaken in 2007 and restrictions were introduced in June 2008.
- 2 After the introduction of a large parking scheme it is normal practice to assess the effectiveness of the measures introduced, any change in driver behaviour and any feedback from residents and members of the public. Such a review is normally undertaken approximately 6 months after the introduction of the scheme.
- 3 The Sevenoaks Parking Review Group met in December 2008 to assess the changes introduced and to consider any alterations that may have been required.
- 4 The Parking Review Group developed a number of proposals to alter parking restrictions.

**Item No. 5**

- 5 Two rounds of consultation were carried out on the proposals in Sevenoaks, with the second round being the formal opportunity to object to the proposals. The formal objection period closed on 15 May 2009.
- 6 At the same time, the Montreal Park Residents' Association consulted all of the residential properties in the Montreal Park area of Riverhead, and subsequently formally asked that the District Council promote a change to extend the parking restrictions along Marlborough Crescent (north) and Marlborough Crescent (South).
- 7 The consultation carried out by the Montreal Park Residents Association was carried out thoroughly and fairly and met the criteria for informal consultation. Subsequently it was not necessary for the District Council to repeat the informal consultation, and proceeded directly to the formal consultation stage. The formal objection period closed on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2009.
- 8 The objection period generated a mixed result in terms of numbers of responses, ranging from nil for some proposals with others receiving numerous individual responses or petitions. An Executive Summary follows as item 9, with further details of each proposal in subsequent items.

**Executive Summary**

In the Parish of Sevenoaks

9. Proposals for changes to parking restrictions were made in the following areas and for the following reasons;

**Bosville Drive**

10. To alter the parking bays to reflect changes to the Highway following the installation of new driveways.

**Bradbourne Park Road**

11. To amend parking bays to ease traffic flow and to alter parking bays to reflect changes to the Highway following the installation of new driveways.

**Eardley Road**

12. To increase the availability of short-stay parking and long-stay parking for permit holders in the area.

**Fiennes Way**

13. To remove restrictions to allow all-day parking by local residents.

**Mount Harry Road**

14. To adjust a parking bay outside 108 Mount Harry Road to improve visibility for a nearby resident.

**South Park and Argyle Road**

15. To prevent parking between two close together driveways which was causing an obstruction and to provide additional parking facilities following a change to the South Park / Argyle Road junction layout.

**St John's Hill**

16. To prevent daytime parking close to the entrance to a local business's car park so visibility is improved.

**The Drive (disabled bay)**

17. To increase the length of the existing disabled parking bay to it provides a better facility for a nearby disabled resident.

**Vine Court Road**

18. To introduce restrictions across and between close driveways where parking has been causing obstruction.

**Bayham Road**

19. To prevent parking close to the junction of Holly Bush Lane and to prevent parking on the bend.

**Braeside Avenue & Braeside Close**

20. To prevent parking on one side of the road and to prevent all-day parking by introducing a 1 hour restriction during the afternoon.

**Greatness Road & Northview Road**

21. To introduce a residents' parking scheme and to prevent parking near the junctions with A25 Seal Road.

**Southern High Street**

22. To change a redundant 'Doctor' permit holder parking bay to a disabled bay, as no valid 'Doctor' permits have been issued and there have been requests for additional disabled parking facilities around the southern end of the town.

**Hillingdon Avenue**

23. To extend double yellow lines from the junction of The Crescent to prevent parking opposite the driveway of local residents who have expressed difficulties with access.

**Plymouth Drive and Plymouth Park**

24. To reduce a parking bay on Plymouth Drive to improve visibility for traffic emerging from Plymouth Park and to extend double yellow line restrictions

**Item No. 5**

along Plymouth Park to prevent parking opposite the driveway of local residents who have expressed difficulties with access.

**Valley Drive**

25. To extend yellow lines in to the cul-de-sac and to change the times of operation of the single yellow lines in line with residents requests.

**The Drive**

26. To allow parking permits to be issued to non-residents, where currently they are only available to residents and vehicles belonging to businesses based in the road.

In the Parish of Riverhead

27. Proposals for changes to parking restrictions were made in the following areas and for the following reasons;

**Marlborough Crescent (North and South)**

28. To extend the existing parking restrictions to deter commuter parking, requested by the Montreal Park Residents' Association.

**For Information: Decisions made by the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment**

**Bosville Drive**

29. To alter the parking bays to reflect changes to the Highway following the installation of new driveways.
30. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**Bradbourne Park Road**

31. To amend parking bays to ease traffic flow and to alter parking bays to reflect changes to the Highway following the installation of new driveways.
32. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**Eardley Road**

33. To increase the availability of short-stay parking and long-stay parking for permit holders in the area.

**Item No. 5**

Properties directly consulted	15	
Responses received	2	13.33%
In favour	1	50%
Against	1	50%

A resident commented that the physical layout of the highway differed from the proposals as their vehicle access was not considered. The proposed parking bays have been reduced in response to the objection, now resolved.

As the only objection has been resolved, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**Fiennes Way**

34. To remove restrictions to allow all-day parking by local residents.
35. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**Mount Harry Road**

36. To adjust a parking bay outside 108 Mount Harry Road to improve visibility for a nearby resident.

Properties directly consulted	11	
Responses received	1	7.14%
In favour	0	0.0%
Against	1	100%

The objection referred to an unrelated issue and had no bearing on the proposal.

37. As the only objection was not relevant to the proposal, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**South Park and Argyle Road**

38. To prevent parking between 2 close together driveways which was causing an obstruction and to provide additional parking facilities following a change to the South Park / Argyle Road junction layout.
39. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**St John’s Hill**

- 40. To prevent daytime parking close to the entrance to a local business’s car park so visibility is improved.
- 41. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**The Drive (disabled bay)**

- 42. To increase the length of the existing disabled parking bay to it provides a better facility for a nearby disabled resident.
- 43. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**Vine Court Road**

- 44. To introduce restrictions across and between close driveways where parking has been causing obstruction.

Properties directly consulted	21	
Responses received	7	33.33%
In favour	5	71.43%
Against	0	0%
Don’t know (or unclear response)	2	28.57%

- 45. As no objections were received during the formal consultation process, the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has approved the introduction of the restrictions.

**For Decision: Comments, Objections and Responses**

**Bayham Road**

- 46. To prevent parking close to the junction of Holly Bush Lane and to prevent parking on the bend.
- 47. The formal consultation produced the following response;

Properties directly consulted	122	
Responses received	21	17.21%
In favour	18	85.71%
Against	3	14.29%

The objections suggested that the restrictions should be much shorter, but this would encourage parking close to the junction or in front of the driveways of the properties.

- 48. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Braeside Avenue & Braeside Close**

- 49. To prevent parking on one side of the road and to prevent all-day parking by introducing a 1 hour restriction during the afternoon.

Properties directly consulted	40	
Responses received	4	10%
In favour	1	25%
Against	2	50%
Don't know (or unclear response)	1	25%

- 50. Given the low level of response, and that being ambiguous, it is appropriate to consider the informal responses, where 69.23% were in favour of the proposals, which were originally suggested by the Residents' Association.
- 51. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Greatness Road & Northview Road**

- 52. To introduce a residents' parking scheme and to prevent parking near the junctions with A25 Seal Road.

**Item No. 5**

Properties directly consulted	55	
Responses received	25	45.45%
In favour	5	20%
Against	19	76%
Don't know (or unclear response)	1	4%

53. Given that a high level of response against the proposals was received during the consultation process, **the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment has recommended that the proposal to introduce restrictions in Greatness Road and Northview Road be abandoned.**

54. As the introduction of restrictions at the junctions with A25 Seal Road would have safety implications, the Highway Authority could consider these junctions for future prioritisation and attention if appropriate.

**Southern High Street**

55. To change a redundant 'Doctor' permit holder parking bay to a disabled bay, as no valid 'Doctor' permits have been issued and there have been requests for additional disabled parking facilities around the southern end of the town.

Properties directly consulted	14	
Responses received	2	14.29%
In favour	0	0%
Against	0	0%
Don't know (or unclear response)	2	100%

56. Both comments received requested facilities to be able to load and unload, but this is already available on the double yellow lines already at the location.

57. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Hillingdon Avenue**

58. To extend double yellow lines from the junction of The Crescent to prevent parking opposite the driveway of local residents who have expressed difficulties with access.

Properties directly consulted	7	
Responses received	1	14.29%
In favour	0	0%
Against	1	100%



**Item No. 5**

59. The response related to lack of convenient parking and the desire of residents to park at the location. However, the resident opposite requested the change due to parking at the location impeding access to his property.

60. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Plymouth Drive and Plymouth Park**

61. To reduce a parking bay on Plymouth Drive to improve visibility for traffic emerging from Plymouth Park and to extend double yellow line restrictions along Plymouth Park to prevent parking opposite the driveway of local residents who have expressed difficulties with access.

Properties directly consulted	5	
Responses received	1	20%
In favour	0	0%
Against	1	100%

62. The single objection related to the loss of 1 parking space and the difficulty that this would present to staff working in the town. However, parking is still available in other roads a similar distance from the town centre.

63. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Valley Drive**

64. To extend yellow lines in to the cul-de-sac and to change the times of operation of the single yellow lines in line with residents requests.

Properties directly consulted	25	
Responses received	5	20%
In favour	4	80%
Against	1	20%

65. The objecting response indicated a preference for a different time of restriction, but the majority of residents chose the proposed time when given the choice during the informal consultation.

66. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**Marlborough Crescent (North and South)**

67. To extend the existing parking restrictions to deter commuter parking, requested by the Montreal Park Residents' Association.

**Item No. 5**

Properties directly consulted	223	
Responses received	102*	45.74%
In favour	79	91.86%
Against	6	6.98%
Don't know (or unclear response)	1	1.16%

*\* The total number of responses differs from the total of properties in favour, against and unclear as several residents chose to comment twice.*

- 68. The Montreal Park Residents Association carried out the informal consultation and demonstrated high levels of support for the proposals. The vast majority of the respondents support the proposal.
- 69. **The Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and the proposal be introduced as advertised.**

**The Drive**

- 70. To allow parking permits to be issued to non-residents, where currently they are only available to residents and vehicles belonging to businesses based in the road.
- 71. The formal consultation produced the following response;

Properties directly consulted	74	
Responses received	14	18.92%
In favour	1	7.14%
Against	13	92.86%

- 72. The Sevenoaks Town Parking Review Group met on 1 April 2009 to consider the outcome of the informal consultation. Of the 15 informal responses received, 14 were against the proposal. Given that the view of the Group was to note the objections but to proceed with the proposal in order to bring The Drive in line with most other roads in the area, **the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment recommends that the objections be set aside and that the proposal be introduced as advertised.**
- 73. It should be noted that as in other permit areas, permits will only be issued to non-residents subject to parking availability, and the District Council intends to maintain 20% of total capacity for short-term parking.

**Supporting Documents**

74. Electronic versions of the following are available via CMIS;
- The Traffic Regulation Order (with appropriate entries highlighted)
  - Plans of the proposals
  - Scanned copies of the original consultation responses (excluding personal data)
  - Minutes of the Sevenoaks Parking Review Group

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

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

**KRISTEN PATERSON  
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR**

**RISK ASSESSMENT STATEMENT**

75. By not introducing the measures proposed in Sevenoaks and Riverhead, the current parking problems in these areas associated with unregulated and inappropriate parking will continue.

