

Comments / objection number : 1

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Knockholt

- commented on economic grounds
- commented on the poor bus facilities in the local villages

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 2

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented on the consultation process
- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The District Council carries out consultations in accordance with the appropriate legislation.
- This does not mean that everyone who has an interest would automatically be sent a letter, but that notices inviting comment are placed on-street and advertisements are placed in the local papers inviting comment.
- We also carry out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of any new restrictions before the formal consultation process is undertaken.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 3

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the displacement of commuters to neighbouring roads and the lack of facilities
- commented on the suitability of introducing restrictions in Watercroft Road
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park
- commented that the District Council should provide additional off-street parking facilities for commuters near the station

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- The District Council is not able to make parking areas for commuters – it has neither the funds or the land to do such a thing and could not consider the purchase of land and its development for such a purpose.

Comments / objection number : 4

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Badgers Mount

- commented on the extents of the proposals and the possible displacement of parking
- commented that additional off-street parking could be provided by the District Council near the station
- commented on the operation of the skip hire company in the station car park

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The District Council is not able to make parking areas for commuters – it has neither the funds or the land to do such a thing and could not consider the purchase of land and its development for such a purpose.

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 5

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Cudham

- commented on the lack of alternatives for commuters in the area

Responses

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.

Comments / objection number : 6

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Shoreham

- commented on the lack of facilities for commuters if the proposals are introduced
- commented on the parking issues for buses
- commented on the loss of cycle facilities
- commented on the restrictions to deter displacement parking in neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week.

The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.

- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 7

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the lack of footways along the roads from the nearby villages to the station
- commented on the inadequacy of the bus services in the area
- commented that the plans do nothing to deter commuters

Responses

- The proposals should reduce the numbers of commuters choosing to travel from Knockholt station as the economic benefits of free parking would be removed.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 8

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the lack of parking facilities at and around the station
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and

they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.

- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 9

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented on the loss of cycle facilities
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 10

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented on the loss of cycle facilities
- commented on the speed of vehicles travelling along London Road

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.

- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 11

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented on the loss of cycle facilities
- commented on the lack of alternative transport options for commuters to get to the station
- objected to the proposals on economic grounds

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.

Comments / objection number : 12

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities
- objected on economic grounds
- commented on the operation of waste transfer station from the station car park

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 13

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Pratts Bottom

- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities

- commented that the proposals could cause displacement parking into the Bromley Borough area

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Unfortunately parking issues within the London Borough of Bromley would need to be addressed by your local authority rather than By Sevenoaks District Council.
- Officers at Bromley Borough Council have been included as part of the consultation process.

Comments / objection number : 14

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sundridge

- Commented on the occurrence of parking in the bus stops
- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities
- objected on economic grounds
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station from the station car park

Responses

- The bus companies commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems. The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week.

The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.

- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 15

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Knockholt

- Commented on the occurrence of parking in the bus stops
- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities
- commented on the operation of waste transfer station from the station car park
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 16

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park
- objected on economic grounds
- commented that there have been incidents of vehicle damage through crime in the area

Responses

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The District Council is concerned about damage to vehicles and other elements of street crime, but cannot take on the role and responsibilities of the Police.
- However, the proposals would entail the District Council's officers patrolling the area on a regular basis and this may act as a deterrent and reduce street crime.

Comments / objection number : 17

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Knockholt

- commented on the short timescale for the consultation on the proposals
- commented that parking in the bus stops did not seem to be a problem
- commented on the loss of cycle facilities
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park

Responses

- The District Council carries out consultations in accordance with the appropriate legislation.
- This does not mean that everyone who has an interest would automatically be sent a letter, but that notices inviting comment are placed on-street and advertisements are placed in the local papers inviting comment.
- We also carry out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of any new restrictions before the formal consultation process is undertaken.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of its lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 18

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented on the use of the station car park as a waste transfer station
- raised concerns over the extents of the restrictions in and past Watercroft Road

- suggested the provision of additional off-street parking facilities in the area
- suggested that there should be better bus services from the local villages

Responses

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- There may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 19

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- Commented on the width of Watercroft Road, the speed of traffic and the unsuitable use by construction traffic
- commented that the restrictions were unsuitable for Watercroft Road
- suggested that land near the station be used for additional station parking

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- There may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 20

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented over the loss of cycle facilities
- commented that buses do not have problems using the bus stops

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.

Comments / objection number : 21

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- Commented over the loss of the cycle facilities

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

Comments / objection number : 22

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Knockholt

- commented that discounts should be available to residents of the TN14 postcode area as this is their local station
- commented on the removal of the cycle facilities
- commented that there have been incidents of vehicle crime in the area

Responses

- We proposed introducing restrictions that would allow frontagers parking permits to park in the parking bays at reduced rates, but following the responses from the informal consultation the bays in that area were withdrawn.
- The District Council is not able to offer discounts to residents of a particular postcode, whether this be their local station or not, as the road forms part of the public highway, and only immediate frontagers could be considered in this way.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- The District Council is concerned about damage to vehicles and other elements of street crime, but cannot take on the role and responsibilities of the Police.
- However, the proposals would entail the District Council's officers patrolling the area on a regular basis and this may act as a deterrent and reduce street crime.

Comments / objection number : 23

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented that parking in bus stops is not an issue
- commented that the police are already able to deal with parking around the junctions
- commented that the off-street parking facilities near the station should be increased
- commented on the operation of the skip company from the station car park

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- Police enforcement of dangerous parking around junctions is resource-intensive and has to be prioritised against the other calls that they receive. Because of this the police cannot provide the deterrent to prevent dangerous parking.
- The District Council can carry out parking enforcement and remove the burden from the police (freeing up their resources for crime issues), but this requires the introduction restrictions such as those in the proposals.
- Their may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 24

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented that parking in bus stops is not an issue
- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities
- commented on the lack of parking at other stations

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent

that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

- The station car parks are outside the control of the District Council – they fall within the remit of the train operating companies.
- The decision to introduce charges at rural stations and the level of the charges that they set for parking are also outside our control.

Comments / objection number : 25

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented that parking in the bus stops did not seem to be a problem
- commented on the loss of cycle facilities

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

Comments / objection number : 26

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented that parking should be allowed on the property between the railway and London Road

Responses

- Their may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.

Comments / objection number : 27

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented that parking should be allowed on the property between the railway and London Road

Responses

- Their may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.

Comments / objection number : 28

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented that the existing parking problems are covered by current parking regulations
- commented that on-street parking increased when charges were introduced in the station car park
- commented that there have been incidents of vehicle crime in the area
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park

Responses

- Police enforcement of dangerous parking around junctions is resource-intensive and has to be prioritised against the other calls that they receive. Because of this the police cannot provide the deterrent to prevent dangerous parking.
- The District Council can carry out parking enforcement and remove the burden from the police (freeing up their resources for crime issues), but this requires the introduction restrictions such as those in the proposals.
- The station car parks are outside the control of the District Council – they fall within the remit of the train operating companies.
- The decision to introduce charges at rural stations and the level of the charges that they set for parking are also outside our control.
- The District Council is concerned about damage to vehicles and other elements of street crime, but cannot take on the role and responsibilities of the Police.
- However, the proposals would entail the District Council's officers patrolling the area on a regular basis and this may act as a deterrent and reduce street crime.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 29

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented that the existing station car park is dangerous due to the number of large lorries.
- commented that only the safety related restrictions at junctions are necessary
- objected that the consultation was not publicised widely enough

Responses

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The District Council carries out consultations in accordance with the appropriate legislation.
- This does not mean that everyone who has an interest would automatically be sent a letter, but that notices inviting comment are placed on-street and advertisements are placed in the local papers inviting comment.
- We also carry out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of any new restrictions before the formal consultation process is undertaken.

Comments / objection number : 30

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented that the parking in bus stops is no longer an issue
- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.

- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 31

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- Commented that the proposals were too drastic
- commented that the proposals for Watercroft Road would cause problems due to parking after 12pm would make the road impassable.

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The station car parks are outside the control of the District Council – they fall within the remit of the train operating companies.

- The decision to introduce charges at rural stations and the level of the charges that they set for parking are also outside our control.

Comments / objection number : 32

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented that there have been incidents of vehicle crime in the area

Responses

- The District Council is concerned about damage to vehicles and other elements of street crime, but cannot take on the role and responsibilities of the Police.
- However, the proposals would entail the District Council's officers patrolling the area on a regular basis and this may act as a deterrent and reduce street crime.

Comments / objection number : 33

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns about displacement parking

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Unfortunately parking issues within the London Borough of Bromley would need to be addressed by your local authority rather than By Sevenoaks District Council.
- Officers at Bromley Borough Council have been included as part of the consultation process.

Comments / objection number : 34

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads
- objected on economic grounds
- commented that the District Council should provide additional off-street parking facilities near the station

- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The District Council is not able to make parking areas for commuters – it has neither the funds or the land to do such a thing and could not consider the purchase of land and its development for such a purpose.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 35

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 36

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 37

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 38

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 39

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 40

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 41

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 42

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 43

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds
- objected that the road to the west of the station was outside Sevenoaks District
- commented that a nearby landowner tried operating a private off-street car park
- commented that the fare stage change would still mean that Knockholt station would be used despite the charges.

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- There is some discussion about the exact location of the boundary of the Sevenoaks District Council area and that of its neighbour, the London Borough of Bromley.
- The boundary runs from the Wheatsheaf Hill, westwards along the railway to the station access road, where it moves away from the railway to the top of the embankment line on the north side of London Road, to the junction with the dual carriageway.
- This means that the whole of London Road (and the section known as Sevenoaks Road) are within the district of Sevenoaks.
- There may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.
- The change of ticket zone of Knockholt Station is outside of the control of the District Council, as are the fares charged.

Comments / objection number : 44

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds
- commented that only the safety related restrictions at junctions are necessary

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 45

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- objected on economic grounds
- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads
- commented that parking in the bus stops did not seem to be a problem

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.

Comments / objection number : 46

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- objected on economic grounds
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station from the station car park

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 47

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- objected on economic grounds
- commented on the loss of the cycle facilities

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

Comments / objection number : 48

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- objected on economic grounds
- concerns about displacement parking to neighbouring roads
- commented on the removal of the cycle facilities
- commented that the road west of the station is within the Bromley Council area

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.
- There is some discussion about the exact location of the boundary of the Sevenoaks District Council area and that of its neighbour, the London Borough of Bromley.
- The boundary runs from the Wheatsheaf Hill, westwards along the railway to the station access road, where it moves away from the railway to the top of the embankment line on the north side of London Road, to the junction with the dual carriageway.
- This means that the whole of London Road (and the section known as Sevenoaks Road) are within the district of Sevenoaks.

Comments / objection number : 49

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Sundridge

- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 50

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Knockholt

- objected on the grounds that the proposals would be of little or no benefit to the parishioners who use the station
- commented on the operation of a waste transfer station in the station car park

Responses

- We proposed introducing restrictions that would allow frontagers parking permits to park in the parking bays at reduced rates, but following the responses from the informal consultation the bays in that area were withdrawn.
- The District Council is not able to offer discounts to residents of a particular postcode, whether this be their local station or not, as the road forms part of the public highway, and only immediate frontagers could be considered in this way.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 51

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : New Eltham

- objected over the loss of cycle facilities

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week.

The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.

- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

Comments / objection number : 52

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- objected that the District Council had not consulted all of the local residents within 1 mile of the station
- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads
- objected on economic grounds
- commented that parking in the bus stops did not seem to be a problem

Responses

- The District Council carries out consultations in accordance with the appropriate legislation.
- This does not mean that everyone who has an interest would automatically be sent a letter, but that notices inviting comment are placed on-street and advertisements are placed in the local papers inviting comment.
- We also carry out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of any new restrictions before the formal consultation process is undertaken.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of its lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.

Comments / objection number : 53

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Shoreham

- objected that the proposals would reduce the number of spaces for parking near the station
- objected that the proposals seem to be too extensive and extend too far
- commented that parking in the bus stops did not seem to be a problem
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The proposals should reduce the numbers of commuters choosing to travel from Knockholt station as the economic benefits of free parking would be removed.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of its lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 54

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- raised concerns over displacement parking to nearby roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.

- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Unfortunately parking issues within the London Borough of Bromley would need to be addressed by your local authority rather than By Sevenoaks District Council.
- Officers at Bromley Borough Council have been included as part of the consultation process.

Comments / objection number : 55

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- raised concerns over displacement parking to nearby roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Unfortunately parking issues within the London Borough of Bromley would need to be addressed by your local authority rather than By Sevenoaks District Council.
- Officers at Bromley Borough Council have been included as part of the consultation process.

Comments / objection number : 57

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the economic impact on commuters
- commented on the District Council's consultation process

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The District Council carries out consultations in accordance with the appropriate legislation.

- This does not mean that everyone who has an interest would automatically be sent a letter, but that notices inviting comment are placed on-street and advertisements are placed in the local papers inviting comment.
- We also carry out informal consultation with the immediate frontagers of any new restrictions before the formal consultation process is undertaken.

Comments / objection number : 58

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Wrotham

- commented on the lack of alternative transport options for commuters to get to the station
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 59

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented on the lack of facilities in the area for commuters
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park

Responses

- The proposals formalise the on-street parking, and whilst it restricts parking around the junctions, does not prevent on-street parking.
- There will be some deterrent effect for commuters that choose to use Knockholt station on economic grounds, and the on-street parking places in the proposals should be sufficient to cater for the expected demand for on-street parking.

- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.

Comments / objection number : 60

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- Commented on the occurrence of parking in the bus stops
- commented that parking should be allowed on the property between the railway and London Road

Responses

- The bus companies have commented that the existing bus stops have been difficult to access – this has led to one of the stops on the southern side of the road being moved out of it's lay-by due to parking problems.
- The proposal would allow the buses to revert to using the lay-by rather than stopping in the traffic stream.
- Their may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.

Comments / objection number : 61

From : Supplied
Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- Commented over the loss of the cycle facilities

Responses

- The removal or reduction in facilities for cyclists is not done lightly, but it reflects a change in tack away from on-street advisory cycle lanes towards cohesive cycle routes.
- The road is wide, visibility is good and no significant gradient, and the existing cycle lane is underused and is solidly parked during the week. The removal of sections of the advisory cycle lane should not be of significant detriment to cyclists.
- The original proposals tried to retain cycle lanes in both directions, albeit narrow, but the comments received from cyclists it was apparent that they preferred not to be in a narrow lane when cycling past parked cars for fear of doors opening etc.

Comments / objection number : 62

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Sevenoaks

- commented that parking should be allowed on the property between the railway and London Road

Responses

- Their may be significant planning issues over the use of the land between London Road and the railway (east of the station entrance) for parking, and because of the legal issues it is something that the District Council cannot condone.

Comments / objection number : 63

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Shoreham

- commented that the existing parking problems are covered by current parking regulations
- commented on the operation of the waste transfer station within the station car park
- objected on economic grounds
- commented that the proposed street furniture and road markings would contribute to visual suburbanisation of the green belt

Responses

- Police enforcement of dangerous parking around junctions is resource-intensive and has to be prioritised against the other calls that they receive. Because of this the police cannot provide the deterrent to prevent dangerous parking.
- The District Council can carry out parking enforcement and remove the burden from the police (freeing up their resources for crime issues), but this requires the introduction restrictions such as those in the proposals.
- The use of the western end of the station car park for a waste transfer station and the operation of skip lorries is outside the remit of the District Council – it rests with the owners of the car parks, the train operating company.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- Any restrictions need to be signed and marked to indicate to motorists their effect, but the District Council is looking to minimise their impact where possible.

- Whilst some see the introduction of any lines or signs as an intrusion in to the countryside, this has to be considered against the visual intrusion already caused by rows or parked vehicles.

Comments / objection number : 64

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented that the proposals would not reduce commuter numbers
- commented that the the proposals in Watercroft Road may be unnecessary
- commented that Watercroft Road should be re-surfaced as it is in poor condition

Responses

- The proposals should reduce the numbers of commuters choosing to travel from Knockholt station as the economic benefits of free parking would be removed.
- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- Unfortunately the other issues raised fall outside the control of the District Council, and are within the remit of the Highway Authority, Kent Highway Services.

Comments / objection number : 65

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented that the restrictions were unsuitable for Watercroft Road

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 66

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- commented that there was a problem of criminal damage to vehicles parked on-street in the area
- objected on economic grounds

Responses

- The District Council is concerned about damage to vehicles and other elements of street crime, but cannot take on the role and responsibilities of the Police.
- However, the proposals would entail the District Council's officers patrolling the area on a regular basis and this may act as a deterrent and reduce street crime.
- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.

Comments / objection number : 67

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 68

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over displacement parking to neighbouring roads
- commented that the District Council should provide additional off-street parking facilities near the station

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.
- The District Council is not able to make parking areas for commuters – it has neither the funds or the land to do such a thing and could not consider the purchase of land and its development for such a purpose.

Comments / objection number : 69

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) :

- commented with concerns over possible displacement parking to neighbouring roads

Responses

- The proposals have been designed to deter displacement parking, on the basis that the further away from the station, the longer the walk and the less desirable the parking.
- The restrictions should prevent displacement parking, but we would review the effect of the proposals after approximately 6 months and if necessary look at either extending or reducing the area covered.

Comments / objection number : 70

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds
- commented that the District Council should provide proper off-street parking by removing the grass verges

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.
- The District Council is not able to make parking areas for commuters – it has neither the funds or the land to do such a thing and could not consider the purchase of land and its development for such a purpose.

Comments / objection number : 71

From : Supplied

Location (if blank, via internet) : Halstead

- objected on economic grounds
- commented that only the safety related restrictions at junctions are necessary

Responses

- Parking enforcement by the District Council is not without cost – we need to employ an appropriate number of enforcement officers, and they need to visit the areas where problems occur on a regular basis to be effective.
- This is either funded by residents through their council tax bills or by the motorist through on-street charges or penalty charges.
- Asking residents to foot the bill for problems that are predominantly caused by commuters is seen as unfair to residents.