

**The Kent Council County (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks)**

**Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting, Loading & Unloading and On Street Parking Places (Amendment No. 8) Order 2009**

**Summary of responses and details of objections**

**Summary**

Ref	In the parish of	Road frontage	Support	Objection	Not clear	Recommendation
1	Ash-Cum-Ridley	Church Road (New Ash Green)	0	0	1	Note comments below and agree
2	Chevening	Chevening Road	0	1	0	Note comments below and agree
3	Chiddingstone	High Street (Chiddingstone)	No responses received			Agree
4	Crockenhill	Stones Cross Road	1	0	0	Agree
5	Dunton Green	London Road	0	1	0	Note comments below and agree
6	Edenbridge	High Street	0	0	1	Note comments below and agree
7	Edenbridge	Forge Croft	2	0	0	Agree
8	Edenbridge	Bough Beech Road	No responses received			Agree
9	Eynsford	High Street	2	0	1	Note comments below and agree
10	Fawkham	High Street	1	0	0	Agree
11	Halstead	Offord Lane	4	0	0	Agree
12	Hartley	Round Ash Way	1	0	0	Agree
13	Hartley	Fairby Lane	1	0	0	Agree
14	Hartley	Stack Lane	0	1	0	Note comments below and agree
15	Hever	School Lane (Hever)	1	0	0	Agree
16	Horton Kirby & South Darent	Horton Road	2	0	0	Agree
17	Horton Kirby & South Darent	Forge Lane	2	0	0	Agree
18	Kemsing	West End	2	0	0	Agree
19	Knockholt	Main Road	No responses received			Agree
20	Leigh	The Green	1	0	0	Agree
21	Otford	High Street	No responses received			Agree
22	Otford	Station Road	No responses received			Agree
23	Penshurst	Spring Hill (Fordcombe)	1	2	1	Note comments below and agree
24	Penshurst	High Street	2	0	1	Note comments below and agree
25	Riverhead	Witches Lane	No responses received			Agree
26	Riverhead	Worships Hill	1	0	0	Agree
27	Seal	Zambra Way	No responses received			Agree
28	Seal	Church Road (Seal Chart)	No responses received			Agree

Sevenoaks Joint Transport Board 16<sup>th</sup> March 2010 – Item 8 Appendix A

Ref	In the parish of	Road frontage	Support	Objection	Not clear	Recommendation
29	Seal	Park Lane (Godden Green)	1	0	0	Agree
30	Sevenoaks	Kennedy Gardens	No responses received			Agree
31	Sevenoaks	Plymouth Drive	No responses received			Agree
32	Sevenoaks	Seal Hollow Road	No responses received			Agree
33	Sevenoaks	Bradbourne Park Road	4	1	0	Note comments below and agree
34	Sevenoaks	Bradbourne Road	No responses received			Agree
35	Sevenoaks	Bradbourne Vale Road	1	0	0	Agree
36	Sevenoaks	Brittains Lane	No responses received			Agree
37	Sevenoaks	Bayham Road	2	0	0	Agree
38	Sevenoaks	Solefields Road	1	0	0	Agree
39	Sevenoaks	South Park	1	0	0	Agree
40	Sevenoaks	High Street	0	0	0	Agree
41	Sevenoaks	Holly Bush Lane	1	0	0	Agree
42	Shoreham	Church Street	No responses received			Agree
43	Sundridge with Ide Hill	Sundridge Road	2	3	0	Note comments below and agree
44	Sundridge with Ide Hill	Church Road	2	1	0	Note comments below and agree
45	Swanley	School Lane (Swanley Village)	1	0	0	Agree
46	Swanley	Sycamore Drive	3	0	0	Agree
47	Swanley	St Mary's Road	3	0	0	Agree
48	Swanley	Hilda May Avenue	1	0	0	Agree
49	Swanley	Court Crescent	3	0	0	Agree
50	Swanley	Beech Avenue	No responses received			Agree
51	Swanley (Hextable)	Egerton Avenue	4	2	0	Note comments below and agree
52	Swanley (Hextable)	St David's Road	3	2	0	Note comments below and agree
53	Swanley (Hextable)	Rowhill Road	3	0	0	Agree
54	Swanley (Hextable)	Puddledock Lane	No responses received			Agree
55	Weald	Long Barn Road	No responses received			Agree
56	Westerham	Rysted Lane	0	0	1	Note comments below and agree
57	Westerham	B2026 Main Road (Crockham Hill)	No responses received			Agree
58	West Kingsdown	Fawkham Road	No responses received			Agree

### **Details of comment and objections**

The following are paraphrased comments and objections from members of the public received during the formal consultation periods. Replies in support of the proposals have not been included.

#### **1. Ash-Cum-Ridley, Church Road (New Ash Green)**

##### **The comment**

This related to the main access being through a public car park and that the access on to Church Road did not require School Keep Clear markings.

##### **Response**

The proposal does not include plans for the introduction of School Keep Clear markings, but would make enforcement available should the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) wish to introduce such markings.

#### **2. Chevening, Chevening Road**

##### **The objection** (4 copies received from the same objector)

The objection relates to the two School Keep Clear markings currently in place in Chevening Road and the parking habits of parents. It suggests that a parking area could be used within the school grounds to pick up and drop off children.

The objection also comments on a recent planning permission to increase the local playing field facilities without increasing the parking.

The objection comments that the safety of school children is foremost the parents responsibility, not the residents of the village and that restrictions penalize local residents.

##### **Response**

The proposal is to make the existing facilities enforceable by the District Council's Civil Enforcement Officers (by way of penalty charge notice) rather than by uniformed police officers (by way of fixed penalty notice and a three point endorsement on driving license), and to restrict the times of operation to those times when the area is busiest with parents dropping off children, rather than the current situation where enforcement could happen at any time.

As such the proposal reduces the times of operation and offers a lower penalty, though it may increase the possibility of enforcement being available. This should improve the situation for residents and provide a safer environment for children near the school.

#### **5. Dunton Green, London Road**

##### **The objection**

The school entrance already has a bus stop and buses automatically obstruct the entrance to the school and any further road markings will be irrelevant.

##### **Response**

The proposal does not include plans for the introduction of School Keep Clear markings, but would make enforcement available should the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) wish to introduce such markings.

#### **6. Edenbridge, High Street**

##### **The comment**

The nearby church commented that as long as it did not infringe on parishioners rights to enter church grounds for public service there was no objection.

##### **Response**

The proposals merely re-make the existing TRO that covers this area, with no on-street changes.

#### **9. Eynsford, High Street**

##### **The comment**

The head teacher would like the restriction to apply to the 'in' gate only, but have an additional time of 11.30am-13.30pm

**Response**

The proposal is to make all the existing School Keep Clear markings enforceable, rather than make adjustment to them or to remove them. The responsibility for the introduction, placement or removal of School Keep Clear markings rests with the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services).

**14. Hartley, Stack Lane**

The objection

This related firstly to difficulties getting in to and out of a resident's driveway at school times due to parent parking, and secondly to the fact that Stack Lane is not adopted Highway.

**Response**

Only the first metre or so is adopted Highway, at the junction with Church Road, and any proposal would only cover that area. Additionally, the proposal is to make all the existing School Keep Clear markings enforceable, rather than make adjustment to them or to remove them. The responsibility for the introduction, placement or removal of School Keep Clear markings rests with the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services).

**23. Penshurst, Spring Hill (Fordcombe)**

**Objection 1**

This related to a loss of parking for residents of Stone Row if School Keep Clear markings are introduced, as it would penalize residents in favour of parents, with no advantage for schoolchildren.

**Objection 2**

This objection was on the grounds that the more signs and lines would turn a rural village into suburbia and that they are an eyesore.

**The comment**

This related to the speed of traffic and the driving habits of parents, and the parking of the school coach in the mornings and afternoons, and that unless some form of enforcement was available at school times there would be little point in introducing School Keep Clear markings.

**Response**

The proposal does not include plans for the introduction of School Keep Clear markings, but would make enforcement available should the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) wish to introduce such markings.

**24. Penshurst, High Street**

**The comment**

This related to a number of issues including speeding and parking near the school, but did not indicate a preference for the proposals or against.

**Response**

None of the issues that fall within the remit of the District Council and the points raised will be passed to the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) for consideration.

**33. Sevenoaks, Bradbourne Park Road**

**The Objection**

Whatever you do, parents will continue to drop their children off at the school gates. Zig-zags and double yellow lines have never deterred them. Congestion is a problem but this is only for a short period twice a day. Any money you spend will be wasted.

**Response**

The proposals merely re-make the existing TRO that covers this area, with no on-street changes. No additional expense would be incurred.

**43. Sundridge with Ide Hill, Sundridge Road (Ide Hill)**

**Objections 1, 2 & 3**

These all related to the introduction of new School Keep Clear markings, commenting that displacement parking would cause other problems.

**Response**

The proposal does not include plans for the introduction of School Keep Clear markings, but would make enforcement available should the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) wish to introduce such markings. As such the objections are not relevant.

**44. Sundridge with Ide Hill, Church Road (Sundridge)**

**The objection**

This related to fact that there are no changes for Sundridge & Brasted Church of England school, but are in fact a proposal to take on more general sweeping powers, and that the District Council already has too many powers and that people should be left alone.

**Response**

The proposal is to make the existing facilities enforceable by the District Council's Civil Enforcement Officers (by way of penalty charge notice) rather than by uniformed police officers (by way of fixed penalty notice and a three point endorsement on driving license), and to restrict the times of operation to those times when the area is busiest with parents dropping off children, rather than the current situation where enforcement could happen at any time.

Where existing School Keep Clear markings are in place the proposal reduces the times of operation and offers a lower penalty, though it may increase the possibility of enforcement being available. This should improve the situation for residents and provide a safer environment for children near schools.

**51. Swanley (Hextable), Egerton Avenue**

**Objection 1**

This objection is on the grounds that there is no justification for the proposals because there has never been an accident or vehicle parked in the area of the proposal, that the costs of introducing the proposals would be better spent elsewhere, and suggesting that the restrictions would not be monitored.

**Objection 2**

There were no comments or explanatory notes attached to the objection (and as such it is set aside as irrelevant)

**Response**

The proposal is to make the existing facilities enforceable by the District Council's Civil Enforcement Officers (by way of penalty charge notice) rather than by uniformed police officers (by way of fixed penalty notice and a three point endorsement on driving license), and to restrict the times of operation to those times when the area is busiest with parents dropping off children, rather than the current situation where enforcement could happen at any time.

This removes the enforcement burden from the Police and allows the District Council to be more reactive to the needs of the community.

**52. Swanley (Hextable), St David's Road**

**Objection 1**

The objection was on the grounds that; residents would have to move their vehicles to other roads during the times of the restrictions, that parents would still park to drop-off regardless of restrictions, that cars already park all-day and that parents already cause congestion with no regard to residents.

**Objection 2**

The objection suggested that the school gates do not currently get blocked in, and that large vehicles have had no problems in accessing the area.

**Response**

Sevenoaks Joint Transport Board 16<sup>th</sup> March 2010 – Item 8  
Appendix A

The proposals only affect the areas already covered by School Keep Clear markings and only affect the side of the road where parking tends not to occur. Residents who park on the opposite side to the school would not be affected.

Making the restrictions enforceable should address the problems associated with parents stopping to pick-up or drop-off as they can currently do so with relative surety that there would not be any penalty due the scarcity of police enforcement.

The proposals are not to ease access for large vehicles into the school, though this is a benefit, but to keep the area clear outside the school gates to protect children and other vulnerable road users.

**56. Westerham, Rysted Lane**

**The comment**

The head teacher of the nearby school commented that she was not sure of any proposed changes, or where they are likely to be.

**Response**

The proposal does not include plans for the introduction of School Keep Clear markings, but would make enforcement available should the Highway Authority (Kent Highway Services) wish to introduce such markings.