## SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

14 November 2011 at 7.00 pm<br>Conference Room - Council Office

## AGENDA

District Council Members: Membership:
Cllrs. Mrs. Davison, Edwards-Winser, (James) London, Searles, Towell, Underwood and
Williamson.
The County Councillors for the 7 County Electoral Divisions representing the Sevenoaks
District:
Cllrs. Brazier, Brookbank, Chard, Gough, Lake, (John) London and Parry.
The representative from the Kent Association of Local Councils:
Cllr. Robson

## Apologies for absence

1. Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 14 September 2011 (Pages 1-6)
2. Declarations of interest
3. Matters Arising/Update (Including Actions from Previous Meetings)
4. Proposed parking restrictions in Chevening and Riverhead.
(Pages 7-46)
Garry Connor
5. Petition - Valley Road, Fawkham. (Pages 47-54)
6. Sevenoaks Pedestrian Guardrailing Assessment.
(Pages 55-82)
Julian Cook
7. Highway Improvement Scheme Progress Report.
(Pages 83-92)
Julian Cook
8. Kent County Council Highways and Transportation (Pages 93-120) Restructure.

## EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing this agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public.)

Please note the following reports may be of interest for information and can be found on the Sevenoaks District Council website:

1. Highways Works Programme 2011/12.

Julian Cook
08458247800
2.

Sevenoaks Winter Service Plan - 2011/12.
Julian Cook
08458247800

To assist in the speedy and efficient despatch of business, Members wishing to obtain factual information on items included on the Agenda are asked to enquire of the appropriate Director or Contact Officer named on a report prior to the day of the meeting.

Should you require a copy of this agenda or any of the reports listed on it in another format please do not hesitate to contact the Democratic Services Team as set out below.

For any other queries concerning this agenda or the meeting please contact:
The Democratic Services Team (01732 227241)

## SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board held on 14 September 2011 commencing at 7.00 pm

Present: Cllr. J London (Chairman)<br>Mr D Brazier (Vice-Chairman)<br>Cllr Mrs J Davison, Sevenoaks District Council<br>CIIr. J Edwards-Winser, Sevenoaks District Council<br>Cllr. P Towell, Sevenoaks District Council<br>Mr R Brookbank, Kent County Council<br>Mr N Chard, Kent County Council<br>Mr R Gough, Kent County Council<br>Mr P Lake, Kent County Council<br>Mr J London, Kent County Council<br>Mr R Parry, Kent County Council<br>Apologies for absence: Cllr. T Searles, Cllr. J Underwood and Cllr A Robson

## 8. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 15 JUNE 2011

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board held on 15 June 2011 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendments:
(i) Minute 2 - Declarations of Interest, being amended to reflect that it is Cllr. Gough's wife who is the governor of the school;
(ii) Minute 3 - Matters Arising/Updates, the deletion of the second sentence of the first paragraph; and
(iii) Minute 7 - Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 2009, the insertion of a comma after the word 'suggestions' and the addition of the words 'which would be funded by County Member Parry's County Highways Fund.'

## 9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. Brazier declared a personal interest in minute item 4 as it was in his division and that he was called on occasion to advise the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste in his capacity as his Deputy.

Cllr Edwards-Winser declared a personal interest in minute item 5 as a member of the affected Ward.

## 10. MATTERS ARISING/UPDATE (INCLUDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS)

Cllr. Chard advised that he had not yet had the opportunity to speak with Ms. Squires regarding the petition for a pedestrian footway in Windmill Road, but that he thought it had been agreed that he would make a contribution from his Highway Allocations Budget. However he had also understood that initially there needed to be an agreement with the landowner, followed by a draft scheme and assessment of costs, before funding was looked at. Officers advised that talks with landowners could often take a couple of years to reach a conclusion and would speak to the County Member about funding.

Action: Kent Highway Services (KHS) to investigate whether the proposal could be funded by the County Member's Highway Allocations Budget.

## 11. PRESENTATION OF PETITION REGARDING ROAD SAFETY AROUND FAWKHAM CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL

Cllr. Mrs. Parkin thanked the Chairman for placing the presentation of the petition on the agenda and expressed her support for it.

A representative of the parents and children of the school spoke on behalf of the petitioners. He informed the Board that there was a great deal of concern regarding road safety around the school which was located on a busy country road which pedestrians had to cross to gain access to the school. The school itself was in a 40 mph zone only 350 yards from the 30 mph zone within Fawkham Green itself. There had been several accidents in the area and outside the school itself. Campaigning for more road safety improvement features had been ongoing. The petitioners were aware that road traffic surveys had been carried out following an agreement in spring 2011 to look at reducing the speed to 30 mph but no conclusions had been shared and nothing further had been heard.

He advised that another school in the area had stopped parking within the school playground, had a new crossing, road markings and a school crossing patroller. In comparison their children were crossing an unmarked road with sweeping bends and a small straight where traffic often increased their speed. The road also narrowed leaving drivers concentrating more on their passing space rather than their environment. Just beyond the school entrance/exit there was an overgrown hedgerow obstructing sightlines, causing exiting traffic to pull out onto the wrong side of the junction to gain a better view, causing further problems. The school's lighting was frequently out of order or on the wrong timings and was often covered by tree growth. Existing road markings and signage had faded. Parking inside the school was limited which meant many parents parked on the road, adding to the congestion problems. Many parents lived in Fawkham and walked their children to school with younger children and buggies which made it harder to cross the road.

In conclusion he requested that the speed limit be reduced to 20 mph , at least during school-run hours, a pedestrian crossing be built, traffic calming be installed, that the existing signage be maintained and lighting left in good
working order, that there be more significant road signage with no-stopping signs and zigzag road markings, and that the car parking issue be addressed. The petition was presented to the Chairman.

Members advised that issues such as parking within the school premises and the funding for a school crossing patroller fell outside the scope of the Board and were issues for the school to address itself.

Action: KHS to inspect the area and carry out any remedial works necessary to existing signage, road markings, lighting and hedgerows, and also fully investigate and report back to the next meeting on the issues raised.

## 12. PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN OTFORD PART 2

The Senior Parking and Traffic Engineer (SDC) presented the report which requested Members to approve a traffic regulation order to introduce new parking restrictions in the Bubblestone Road, The Old Walk and The Butts areas of Otford. He advised Members that requests for such measures had been received from local residents during the consultation exercise on the new parking restrictions implemented to control commuter parking in the Tudor Drive and Well Road areas. He brought Members' attention to the objections received and officers' responses as detailed within the report. Some Members of the Board agreed that traffic had already been displaced to these sites since the introduction of the earlier measures.
A Member expressed his support for the scheme as a whole but queried whether a 10 m all day no waiting restriction was enough on junction corners as he understood it should be 15 m . In response he was advised that the minimum requirement was 10 m and that best practice was 15 m and Members' attention was drawn to the comments received from Kent Police (Appendix C to the report). Members discussed the possible need to extend the length of the corner protection in certain areas, but concurred that as the emergency services were happy with the 10 m restriction it would be better to review the situation once implemented.
Following a query as to where displacement parking would now occur, the Officer advised that it would lessen and spread over a wider area, hopefully encouraging more use of the station car park. Displacement parking may occur around The Pond, station and possibly Leonard Road, and current restrictions in these areas may need to be reviewed as a result. He confirmed that a review of the new restrictions, if agreed, would be carried out within a 612 month time period.

Resolved: That the comments and objections to the changes in the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 22 be noted, and the officer recommendations set out within the report be approved for implementation.

The size of Appendix $C$ to the report was commented on and a suggestion made that further appendices of this length would be better kept electronically accessible rather than printed on paper. County Members expressed concern on ease of access to the documents, but it was agreed in principle that for
future reports large appendices should be made available on the website rather than printed in full.

## 13. SEVENOAKS CYCLE STRATEGY

The Kent Highway Schemes Manager introduced the report which sought Members approval to carry out a public consultation exercise on the draft Cycling Strategy. He reminded Members that it was an objective of Kent's Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for all districts to have a cycling strategy place by 2012. He advised that Sevenoaks had little existing cycling infrastructure and that most was for leisure rather than commuting purposes.
County Cllr. Brazier applauded the enthusiasm, knowledge and ingenuity of the Sevenoaks Cycling Forum which had helped get the Strategy to this stage. The Working Group, made up of County Cllrs., District Cllrs. and the Forum had resulted in a spirited and thoughtful attempt to devise a strategy in a challenging environment. He felt that on offer were the safest alternative routes available and he was excited to see what the public made of it. Cllr. Chard thought it was exciting, pragmatic and practical, with a forewarning of the amount of work to be done after the consultation exercise.

Members welcomed the strategy making some general comments which included:

- to note that Shoreham is a Parish not Town Council
- keen not to create conflict with pedestrians
- Halfords to be added to the list of cycle shops to be consulted.
- the Parish Clerk at Shoreham was disappointed their comments were not included and were concerned with regards to footpath SL32 being turned into a cycle path
- further clarification was needed, such as a map reference, to the areas identified within the questionnaire

Mr. J. Morrison from Sevenoaks Cycling Forum addressed the Board speaking in support of the strategy. He was happy with the progress that had been made since the formation of the Working Group. He advised that on the inspection visits, routes had been carefully and thoughtfully assessed and any that were too narrow did not go into the plan. He was excited that the district would be benefitting from having been chosen as the Paralympic Road Cycling venue and hoped to capitalise on that with regards to the promotion of cycling. He thanked all Councillors and Officers involved with special thanks to Ms. R. Thomas (KHS). Looking to the future there were areas still not covered, but he believed that most of the proposed schemes would be achievable with minimal cost. There was no uniform definition of a cyclist as they ranged in skill, age and purpose so it was difficult to find a solution that suited everyone. He was eager to engage the District Council further, particularly on matters of provision by development control within large planning developments, and the Community Development Team in wider scale issues such as health and obesity.

Resolved: That the plan to carry out a full public consultation exercise on the Draft Sevenoaks Cycle Strategy and intended method of distribution, be approved.

## 14. INFORMATION ITEMS

Information items listed on the agenda and made available on the Committee Management Information System were noted (CMIS). A further information item on 'Winter Damage Repairs - Find \& Fix and Surfacing Schemes' was also received and noted.

In answer to a question from a member of the public, the KHS District Manager (Sevenoaks) replied that he hoped to bring a further report on pedestrian guard railings to the next meeting of the Board.

The KHS District Manager (Sevenoaks) advised that the new KHS staffing structure had just been made available. It was agreed that this should be circulated and considered at the next meeting.

Action: The new KHS staffing structure be circulated to all Members and considered at the next meeting of the Board.

THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 7.58 pm
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# SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - 14 DECEMBER 2011 <br> PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS IN CHEVENING AND RIVERHEAD 

Report of the: Community and Planning Services Director
Status: For decision

Executive Summary: This report requests that Members approve the introduction of a traffic regulation order to introduce new and amend existing parking restrictions in the Witches Lane, Westerham Road, Cranmer Road and St Marys Drive areas of Chevening and Riverhead parishes.

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

Portfolio Holder Cllr. Hunter

Head of Service $\begin{aligned} & \text { Head of Environmental and Operational Services - Mr. Richard } \\ & \text { Wilson }\end{aligned}$

Recommendation: It be RESOLVED that the comments and objections to the changes in the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 16 be noted and the officer recommendations set out within this report be approved for implementation.

## History

1. In respect to Cranmer Road and St Marys Drive, the District Council had received comments that parking near the entrance to these roads was causing congestion and hindering vehicles turning in and out. Hence, the proposal to introduce a double yellow line restriction at the junction of Cranmer Road and to extend the existing double yellow line restriction in St Marys Drive at the junction with the A25 Worships Hill.
2. In respect to Witches Lane, the District Council had been requested by Kent Highways to include proposals for double yellow line restrictions opposite the Amherst County Primary School and adjacent the traffic calming feature in order to prevent congestion and to maintain traffic flow.
3. In respect to the existing double yellow line restriction on all the approaches to the traffic light junction on the A25 outside the Riverhead Primary School, the Traffic Regulation Order needs to be amended to agree with current road markings and signing. The change is to simply remove the reference to "no loading or unloading" in the Order as this is neither necessary nor required.

This proposal affects Worships Hill, Westerham Road, Witches Lane and Cold Arbour Road in the vicinity of the traffic light junction.
4. The District Council undertook formal public consultation for all the proposals in March 2011. It is acknowledged that the results of the consultation should have been brought to this Board at an earlier date, but issues relating to workloads and restructuring of Kent Highways delayed the matter.
5. Plans detailing the proposals and the draft Traffic Regulation Order are shown in Appendices $A$ and $B$ respectively.

## Consultation Responses

6. The District Council carried out formal consultation on the proposals in accordance with the statutory requirements, with the consultation running from 10 February to 13 March 2011. The proposals for St Marys Drive had been amended as noted below following informal consultation undertaken in 2010. A plan detailing the earlier proposal is attached as Appendix D .
7. In respect to the proposals the responses are summarised as follows; copies of comments received are included in Appendix C:

| Cranmer Road (new double yellow line restriction <br> at junction) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responses | 2 |  |
| In favour of proposal | 1 | $50 \%$ |
| Against proposal | 0 |  |
| No opinion | 1 | $50 \%$ |

One comment received from a resident of Cranmer Road related to concern that the parking restrictions proposed for Witches Lane would compound problems in Cranmer Road. This was not recorded as being in favour or against any of the proposals and is included in the table for Cranmer Road.

| St Marys Drive (extension to existing double <br> yellow |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responses | 8 |  |
| In favour of proposal | 3 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Against proposal | 5 | $62.5 \%$ |
| No opinion | 0 |  |
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Objections were received from five residents of Riverhead House broadly concerned about the loss of parking spaces and giving the view that the existing restrictions were adequate. However, the prior, informal consultation responses asked that the restrictions be extended to cover the access road to Riverhead Mews and Riverhead House due to parking that occurs there.

| Witches Lane (double yellow lines opposite the <br> school) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responses | 5 |  |
| In favour of proposal | 3 | $60 \%$ |
| Against proposal | 2 | $40 \%$ |
| No opinion | 0 |  |

A response from the Headmaster of the Amherst County Primary School confirmed he was in favour of the proposals. Chevening Parish Council wished it to be recorded that they were against the proposals. A Sevenoaks District Councillor for Dunton Green and Riverhead disagreed with the proposal.

## Change to the existing restrictions at the traffic light junction

No responses were received in relation to this proposal.
8. In general, Kent Police confirmed it had no specific comment to make and the Riverhead Parish Council stated that it was pleased with the proposals but made no specific comments.

## Recommendations

9. In view of the highway implications within the proposals, the consultation responses have been discussed with officers at Kent Highways. It is the view of Kent Highways that in the interests of preventing obstruction of the highway and to assist the flow of traffic, all objections should be set aside in respect to all the proposals and that the proposals be approved for implementation.
10. It is, therefore, recommended that Members consider the objections, but also the expressions of support for the proposals received and accordingly set aside the objections and approve the introduction of the restrictions as proposed.

## Key Implications

## Financial

11. If approved, the work required to implement the proposals will be discussed with Kent Highways to determine how best to proceed. The cost to install additional yellow lining is estimated at $£ 800$ and will be met from the respective Councils highways lining budgets once the action has been agreed.

## Community impact and outcomes

12. The proposals should reduce obstruction to the highway and assist in the flow of traffic, although there will be a reduction in the number of parking spaces available at certain locations.

## Legal, Human Rights, etc

13. The procedures appropriate to the promotion, advertisement and introduction of a traffic regulation order (as set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996) have been followed and exceeded.

## Risk Assessment Statement

14. The proposals should have no increased level of risk beyond those relating to the management of on-street parking.

Sources of Information:

Contact Officer(s):
KRISTEN PATERSON
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR
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Agenda Item 4
THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE DISTRICT OF SEVENOAKS) (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING \& UNLOADING AND ON -STREET PARKING PLACES)
(AMENDMENT 16) (RIVERHEAD \& CHEVENING) ORDER 2009
THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL, (hereinafter referred to as "the Council") acting as the local traffic authority and in exercise of its powers under Sections 1, 2, 32, 35, 36, 45, 46, 47, 49, 53, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the "RTR Act of 1984"), the Traffic Management Act 2004 (hereinafter referred to as the "TMA 2004"), the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007 (hereinafter referred to as "CEoPC Regulations 2007") and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act of 1984, hereby makes the following Order.

The attached Appendices 5 (Chevening) and 23 (Riverhead) are to be substituted in to "The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2009" and in to all subsequent amendment Orders:

## Citation

The Interpretation Act 1978 shall apply for the interpretation of this Order as it applies for the interpretation of an Act of Parliament.

This Order may be cited as;
"The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading \& Unloading and On-Street Parking Places) (Amendment 16) (Riverhead \& Chevening) Order 2009
and shall come into operation on the ?? ???????? 2011.
Given under the Seal of the Kent County Council
This ?? ${ }^{\text {th }}$ day of ???????? 2011

THE COMMON SEAL OF THE
KENT COUNTY COUNCIL was
hereunto affixed in the
presence of:-

Authorised Signatory

## Agenda Item 4

APPENDIX 5 - CHEVENING

| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Barnfield Road | Northeast | From its junction with Witches Lane, south-eastwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0001 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Bessels Way | Both | From the southern kerbline of Westerham Rd (A25), southwards, following the edge of carriageway, for 20m. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0002 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Bessels Way | East | From a point level with the boundary of 11/12 Bessels Way in a south then easterly direction for 28 m | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0003 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Bessels Way | West | From a point level with the boundary of 11/12 Bessels Way in a south then westerly direction for 22 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0004 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Bessels Way (Southern arm) | North | From a point 1 m west of the boundary of $22 / 23$ in a westerly direction for 26 m | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0005 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Bullfinch Close | Both | From its junction with Chipstead Lane, north-westwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0006 |
| $0$ | Chevening | 1 | Bullfinch Lane | Northwest | From its junction with Chipstead Lane, north-eastwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0007 |
| $\stackrel{Q}{D}^{5}$ | Chevening | 1 | Chipstead Lane | North | From a point 15 m west of its junction with Bulfinch Close, eastwards to its junction with Bullfinch Lane. | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0008 |
| $\checkmark 5$ | Chevening | 1 | Chipstead Lane | South | From its junction with Witches Lane, westwards for 40 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0009 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Chipstead Lane | South | From its junction with Witches Lane, eastwards for 30 m . | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0010 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Chipstead Lane | Southeast | From a point in line with the southeastern boundary of No. 41 Chipstead Lane, south-eastwards for 45 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0011 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Cold Arbor Road | Both | From its junction with Westerham Road (A25), southwestwards for 28 m | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0012 B B B |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | High Street | Southeast | From a point in line with the southeastern boundary of 41 Chipstead Lane, southeastwards to the northern boundary of 63 Chipstead Lane | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Larkfield Road | North | From a point level with the boundary of 10/12 Larkfield Road, in a westerly then northerly direction for 21 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | $\text { App 5-0014 } \overline{\frac{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbb{D}}}$ |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Martin's Shaw | Both | From its junction with High Street, southeastwards for 10 m | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0015 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Westerham Road (A25) | Both | From its junction with Worships Hill (A25), southwestwards, following the kerblines to a point 7.5 m east of the | No waiting | All times | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Every } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0016 |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | boundary of 6 \& 8 Westerham Road. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Westerham Road (A25) | South | From a point 18 m east of the eastern kerbline of Bessels Way, westwards to a point 17 m west of the western kerbline of Bessels Way. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0017 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Witches Lane | Both | From its junction with Chipstead Lane, southwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | Every <br> day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | $\text { App 5-0018 } \frac{(\mathrm{D}}{\mathbf{Q}}$ |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Witches Lane | East | From its junction with Barnfield Road, northwards for 25 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0019 |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Witches Lane | West | From its junction with Worships Hill (A25), northwards to a point 4 m north of the boundary of 24a \& 26 Witches Lane. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0020 $\frac{\text { D }}{\frac{1}{3}}$ |
| 5 | Chevening | 1 | Worships Hill (A25) | Both | From its junction with Westerham Road (A25), northeastwards to the parish boundary with Riverhead Parish | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 5-0021 |

APPENDIX 23 - RIVERHEAD

|  | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty \quad 23$ | Riverhead | 1 | Aisher Way | North | From its junction with London Rd in a westerly direction to a point 51 m east of the eastern kerbline of The Floats | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0001 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Aisher Way | South | From its junction with London Rd in a westerly direction to a point 51 m east of the eastern kerbline of The Floats, excluding the bus stop area | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0002 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | East | From the southern kerbline of Shoreham Lane, southwards to the boundary of the Parish of Riverhead and the town of Sevenoaks. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0003 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From the southern kerbline of Worships Hill (A25), southeastwards to the southern boundary of Townsend Chambers | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0004 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From a point 6 m northwest of the northern kerbline of Barrow Way, southwards to a point 7 m southeast of the southern kerbline of Barrow Way | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0005 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From a point 47 m southeast of the southern kerbline of Barrow Way, southeastwards to the northern kerbline | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0006 |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | of Shoreham Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From a point in line with the boundary of White Cottage and Townsend Chambers, north-westwards for 60 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0007 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 3 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From a point 2 m southeast of the northern flank wall of Modern Forge, southeastwards to a point 6 m northwest of the northern kerbline of Barrow Way | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 2hours (no return within 1 hour) except permit holders | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B4, B5, } \\ & \text { B6, C1 } \end{aligned}$ | R | N/A | App 23-0008 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 3 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From a point 7 m southeast of the southern kerbline of Barrow Way, southeastwards for 40 m | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 2hours (no return within 1 hour) except permit holders | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B4, B5, } \\ & \text { B6, C1 } \end{aligned}$ | R | N/A | App 23-0009 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 4 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Northeast | From the southern boundary of Townsend Chambers, southeastwards to a point 2 m southeast of the northern flank wall of Modern Forge | Bus stop clearway | 7am-7pm | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0010 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | Southwest | From a point 20 m north-west of its junction with Shoreham Lane, northwestwards to a point 15 m south-east of its junction with Montreal Road. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0011 |
|  | Riverhead | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Amherst Hill } \\ & \text { (A224) } \end{aligned}$ | Southwest | From a point 10 m north-west of its junction with Montreal Road, northwestwards to its junction with Worships Hill (A25). | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0012 |
| ${ }^{1} 23$ | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | West | From a point 15 m south of a point opposite the junction of Shoreham Lane in a northerly direction for 50 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0013 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | West | From its junction with Montreal Road, in a southerly direction for 10 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0014 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Amherst Hill (A224) | West | From its junction with Montreal Road, in a northerly direction for 10 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0015 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Barnfield Road | Southeast | From its junction with Witches Lane, north-eastwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0016 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Blackmead | Both | From its junction with Aisher Way in a northerly direction from the outside kerbline of the roundabout, following the kerbline for 17.5 m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Brittains Lane | Both | From its junction with London Road (A224) southwards to a point 25 m south of its junction with its southernmost junction with Lyndhurst Drive. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0018 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Bullfinch Lane | Northeast | From its junction with Chipstead Lane, north-westwards and north-eastwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0019 ${ }^{+}$ |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Bullfinch Lane | Northwest | From its junction with London Rd in a south westerly direction to its junction | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0020 |
| The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places) (Amendment 16) (Riverhead \& Chevening) Order 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | with Baden Powell Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Bullfinch Lane | Southeast | From its junction with London Rd in a south westerly direction to the northern kerbline of the lay by outside of 74 Bullfinch Lane | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0021 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Chipstead Lane | Northwest | From its junction with Bullfinch Lane, north-eastwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | $\text { App 23-0022 } \frac{\mathrm{D}}{2}$ |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Cranmer Road | Both | From the northwestern kerbline of Worships Hill (A25), northwestwards, following the kerblines for 16 m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0023 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Rd | East | From a point 14 m north of the northern flank wall of 38 Blackmead in a southerly direction to a point 42 m north of its junction with Scotts Way | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0024 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Rd | West | From a point 14 m north of the northern flank wall of 38 Blackmead in a southerly direction to a point 10 m south of its junction with Bullfinch Lane | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0025 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} 0^{23} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | Riverhead | 3 | London Road | Northeast | From a point 5 m south-east of its junction with The Patch, southeastwards to a point 15 m north-west of its junction with Scotts Way. | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 2hours (no return within 1 hour) | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0026 |
| $23$ | Riverhead | 3 | London Road | Northeast | From a point 15 m south-east of its junction with Scotts Way, southeastwards to a point 5 m north-west of its junction with Linden Square. | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 2hours (no return within 1 hour) | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0027 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 3 | London Road | Northeast | From a point 5 m south-east of its junction with Linden Square, southeastwards to a point 98 m south-east of its junction with Linden Square. | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 2hours (no return within 1 hour) | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0028 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Both | From a point in line with the boundary between the parish of Riverhead and the town of Sevenoaks, northwestwards to a point 90 m northwest of its junction with Brittains Lane. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0029 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Both | From 6m north of its junction of Hamlin Road, northwards to the south end of the parapet of Longford Mill Bridge, (excluding the lay-by on the east side of London Road situated between a point 82 m and a point 112 m north of its junction with Hamlin Road). | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0030 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | East | Between its junctions with Amherst Hill (A224) and Maidstone Road (A25). | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0031 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | East | From a point 5 m south of its junction with The Patch, northwards to its | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0032 |
| The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places) (Amendment 16) (Riverhead \& Chevening) Order 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | junction with Hamlin Road. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Northeast | From a point 90 m north-west of the boundary between the Parish of Riverhead and the town of Sevenoaks, north-westwards to a point 10 m southeast of its junction with Shoreham Lane. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0033 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Northeast | From a point 15 m south-east of its junction with Scotts Way, northwestwards for 30 m . | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0034 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Northeast | From a point 5 m south-east of its junction with Linden Square, northwestwards for 10 m . | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0035 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | Southwest | From a point 90 m north-west of the boundary between the Parish of Riverhead and the town of Sevenoaks, north-westwards to a point 15 m southeast of its junction with Shoreham Lane. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0036 |
|   <br> 23  <br> 0  <br> 0  | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | West | From its junction with Amherst Hill (A224), northwards to a point 70 m south of its junction with Orchard Road excluding the lay-by. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0037 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 0 \\ 0 & 23 \\ D & \\ 0 & \\ \hline 10 \end{array}$ | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | West | From a point 61 m south of its junction with Orchard Road, northwards to a point 10 m south of its junction with Bullfinch Lane. | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0038 |
| $\pm 23$ | Riverhead | 1 | London Road (A224) | West | From a point 70 m south of its junction with Orchard Road, northwards to its junction with Bullfinch Lane, a distance of approximately 140 m . | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0039 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 3 | London Road (A224) | West | Within the lay-by that is situated between the junctions of London Road with Amherst Hill (A224) and Maidstone Road (A25). | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 20mins (no return within 40mins) | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0040 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 3 | London Road (A224) | West | Within the lay-by situated on this side. | Limited waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.30 \mathrm{am}- \\ & 6.30 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Saturday | 20mins (no return within 40mins) | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-004 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From the western kerb line of Brittains Lane, westwards to the southeastern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (northern section) | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0042 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From the northwestern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (northern section), westwards to the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (northern junction) | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0043 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From the western kerbline of | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0044 |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Marlborough Crescent (northern junction), westwards to a point 9 m west of the boundary of 16 \& 18 Lyndhurst Drive. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (western junction), eastwards for 16 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From a point 9 m west of the boundary of 16 \& 18 Lyndhurst Drive, westwards to a point 3 m east of the boundary of 38 \& 40 Lyndhurst Drive | No waiting | 11am- <br> 12noon | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-00460 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | North | From a point 3 m east of the boundary of 38 \& 40 Lyndhurst Drive, westwards to a point 16 m east of the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (western junction) | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11am- } \\ & \text { 12noon } \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0047 |
|  | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From the western kerb line of Brittains Lane, westwards to the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (southern junction) | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0048 |
|  | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From the western kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (southern junction), westwards for 23 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0049 |
| N 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From the eastern kerbline of The Close, eastwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0050 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From the western kerbline of The Close, westwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0051 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (western junction), eastwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0052 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From a point 23 m west of the western kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (southern junction), westwards to a point 15 m east of the eastern kerbline of The Close | No waiting | 11am- <br> 12noon | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0053 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From a point 15 m west of the western kerbline of The Close, westwards to a point opposite a point 3 m east of the boundary of 38 \& 40 Lyndhurst Drive | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0054 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive | South | From a point opposite a point 3 m east of the boundary of $38 \& 40$ Lyndhurst Drive, westwards to a point 15 m east of the eastern kerbline of Marlborough Crescent (western junction) | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0055 |
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The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places)

| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive (northern section) | Northwest | From the western kerb line of Brittains Lane, southwestwards to the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0056 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Lyndhurst Drive (northern section) | Southeast | From the western kerb line of Brittains Lane, southwestwards to the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0057 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Maidstone Road | Both | From its junction with London Rd in an easterly direction for 112 m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0058 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (eastern service road) | East | Throughout its entire length | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to <br> Friday <br> (excluding <br> Bank <br> Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0059 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (eastern service road) | West | Throughout its entire length | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11am- } \\ & \text { 12noon } \end{aligned}$ | Monday to <br> Friday <br> (excluding <br> Bank <br> Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0060 |
| $\square^{23}$ | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (northern section) | East | From the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (western junction), northwards for 15m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0061 |
| $\hat{D}^{2}{ }^{23}$ | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (northern section) | East | From the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (central junction), northwards for 14 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0062 |
| $\hat{N}^{23}$ | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (northern section) | East and north | From a point 14 m north of the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (central junction), northwards and westwards to the boundary of $145 \& 147$. | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11am- } \\ & \text { 12noon } \end{aligned}$ | Monday to <br> Friday <br> (excluding <br> Bank <br> Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0063 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (northern section) | West | From the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (central junction), northwards for 14m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0064 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (northern section) | West and south | From a point 14 m north of the northern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (central junction), northwards and westwards to the boundary of $96 \& 98$. | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to <br> Friday <br> (excluding <br> Bank <br> Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0065 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (southern section) | East | From the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (western junction), southwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0066 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (southern section) | East and south | From a point 27 m south of the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive (eastern junction), southwards and westwards to the boundary of $57 \& 59$. | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11am- } \\ & \text { 12noon } \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0067 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough | West | From a point 2 m south of the boundary | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0068 |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Crescent (southern section) |  | of 93 \& 95 Marlborough Crescent, northwards to a point 4 m north of the boundary of 97 \& 99 Marlborough Crescent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Marlborough Crescent (southern section) | West and north | From a point 25 m south of the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive, southwards and southwestwards to the boundary of 48 \& 50 Marlborough Crescent | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-006 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Old London Road | East | From a point level with the southern edge of the centre island of the entrance roundabout in a northerly direction for 11 m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0070® |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Old London Road | West | From its junction with London Rd in a northerly direction to a point opposite a point in line with the northern flank wall of Saxon House. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0071 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Scotts Way | Both | From its junction with London Road (A224), north-eastwards for 10 m . | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0072 |
|  | Riverhead | 1 | Scotts Way | North | From a point 12 m east of its junction with A224 London Road, eastwards for 8m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0073 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | Riverhead | 1 | Scotts Way | South | From a point 12 m east of its junction with A224 London Road, eastwards for 8m | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0074 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | St Mary's Drive | East | From its junction with Worships Hill (A25), south-eastwards, following the kerbline to a point 3 m southeast of the boundary of Riverhead Mews and 3 St Marys Drive. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0075 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | St Mary's Drive | West | From its junction with Worships Hill (A25), south-eastwards, following the kerbline to a point opposite the boundary of Riverhead Mews and 3 St Marys Drive. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0076 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | The Close | East and southeast | From the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive, southwards for 15 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0077 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | The Close | East and southeast | From a point 15 m south of the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive, southwestwards to the boundary of $14 \&$ 16 The Close. | No waiting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11am- } \\ & \text { 12noon } \end{aligned}$ | Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0078 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | The Close | West and northwest | From the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive, southwards for 17 m | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0079 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | The Close | West and northwest | From a point 17 m south of the southern kerbline of Lyndhurst Drive, | No waiting | 4pm-5pm | Monday to Friday | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0080 |
| The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places) (Amendment 16) (Riverhead \& Chevening) Order 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Appendix | Parish | Schedule | Road | Side | Definition | Type of restriction | Time | Day | Max period which vehicles may wait | Scale of charges | Area | Types of vehicle | Unique Ref SDC 2009-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | southwestwards to the boundary of 14 \& 16 The Close. |  |  | (excluding Bank Holidays) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | The Square | North | Between its junctions with London Road (A224) and Chipstead Lane. | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0081 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Witches Lane | East | From its junction with Barnfield Road, south-eastwards for 15 m . | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0082 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Witches Lane | East | From its junction with Worships Hill (A25), northwestwards following the kerbline to a point opposite the boundary of $30 \& 32$ Witches Lane. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0083 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Worships Hill (A25) | Northwest | From the parish boundary with Chevening Parish, northeastwards, following the kerbline to a point 15 m northeast of the northeastern kerbline of Cranmer Road. | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0084 |
| 23 | Riverhead | 1 | Worships Hill (A25) | Southeast | From the parish boundary with Chevening Parish, northeastwards to a point 35 m southwest of the southwestern kerbline of Cranmer Road | No waiting | All times | Every day | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0085 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 0 & 23 \\ 0 & \\ \hline 0 & \end{array}$ | Riverhead | 1 | Worships Hill (A25) | Southeast | From a point 63 m south-west of its junction with St. Mary's Drive, northeastwards for 103 m . | No waiting | All times | All days | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | App 23-0086 |
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## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

To:
TR 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal
The Parking \& Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECD 15 FEB 2011
PARKING \& AMENITY
Kent
TN13 1 HG
Formal consultation response

am / an mat (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the Cranmer Road area of Riverhead.

Signed: $\quad \square$ Dated: $\mid 14 / 2 / 11$

## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

To:
TR 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal The Parking \& Amenity Team Sevenoaks District Council Argyle Road Sevenoaks
Kent TN13 1 HG


Formal consultation response

| Name: <br> (please print) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address |  | Cranmer Road <br> Riverhead |
|  |  |  |
| Rhone number: |  |  |
| Email! |  |  |

I am / am not (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the Cranmer Road area of Riverhead.

## Comments

We are concerned that the proposed parking restrictions alan witches Lane, will encourage school time traffic parents to park in Cranmer Road. Cranmer load is a narrow road a we already experience cars forking on the pavement (which they have to do in order to allow other vehicles to pass), which in turn, forces pedestrians, in curling school children to walk in the rad. we fear that the proposals will compound the problem and potential for an accident. Moreover, if parking + congestion increases in Cranmer


Road i t will be inpossizh for emergency vehicles to access Cramarer Read.

## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.


Formal consultation response


I am / (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the St Mary Drive area of Riverhead.

## Comments

- HE PROposAZ-15 MOST LNELOME, ESPACAALYY THE EXTENSION BEYOND THE FCCGP TO RIVERHEAD MEWS.
MOFORASHS IA AVE RELWARLY PARKED PARTLY ACROSS
THE ACCESS MAKING IT VERY DANGEROUS BOA
ENTERING + LÉMVING THAEAQGSSRGAD DUET TOT
LIMITED VISION AS. TO ANY VEACLE APBROACAHNG
In I THE OPQOSVE, DIRGCTON.



## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

```
To:
TRO2009 Amendment 16-Formal
The Parking & Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent
TN13 1HG
```

Formal consultation response


I am / (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the St Mary Drive area of Riverhead.

## Comments

 accidents while snow was on the ground! You have to back out onto man road to let cars ant.


## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

To:
TRO 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal
The Parking \& Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent
TN13 1HG


Formal consultation response


I am latiot (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the St Marys Drive area of Rlverhead.


From:
Posted At:
Conversation:
Posted To:
Subject: Proposed changes in Riverhead \& Chevening (Amendment 16) - Extension of Yellow lines on St Mary's Drive I am writing to voice my opinion of the planned extension of the yellow lines on St Mary's Drive. access to my property is via St Mary's Drive, and Riverhead Mews. There are 12 flats within Riverhead House and 6 properties on Riverhead Mews resulting in a large number of cars looking for places to park. Due to the parking issues not being fully considered when granting approval to build the 6 properties on Riverhead Mews some of us residents are forced to park on St Marys Drive as this is the closest that we can get to our properties. Luckily for us there is enough space at the bottom end of St Marys Drive for us to park without causing problems for the residents of this street.

Whilst I agree that there are on occasions issues with congestion at the entrance to St Marys Drive and agree that the yellow lines should be extended to prevent parking so close to the Junction with Worships Hill, I feel that the proposed extension is too far and will have a knock on effect on residents trying to park. This will ultimately force us to park even further up St Marys Drive which in turn will cause more problems for residents gaining access to their driveways etc.

I personally feel that there is a solutlon that will resolve both the congestion problems caused with cars parking too close to the Junction whilst also retaining valuable parking spaces for residents. I will try to explain this below and have also updated the proposal diagram to reflect my thoughts:

This explanation is based on entering St Marys Drive from Worships Hill.

- The Yellow lines on the Right hand side (west) are ok to be extended as shown in the proposal. - The yellow lines on the left hand side (east) should however only be extended to the drive way for number 2 St Marys Drive and not beyond as this would loose parking for at least two vehicles.

This change would allow more room for access to St Marys Drive from Worships Hill and keep valuable parking spaces.

Although congestion can sometimes be a problem, the proposals made will ultimately have a more detrimental effect on the road and its residents then the congestion itself. I have lived here for years and have only really encountered congestion on a handful of occasions whilst I struggle to parkon a daily basis.

I am more then happy to discuss this in more detail. Please feel free to contact me via email or on $\square$ should you require any further information.

Agenda Item 4


## Agenda Item 4

## Gary Connor

## From: <br> Posted At: <br> Conversation: <br> Posted To:

28 February 2011 15:07<br>Proposal of Double Yellow Lines<br>Passed on

Subject: Proposal of Double Yellow Lines

## Dear Sir/Madam

Mews. I believe there is a proposal to place double yellow lines from Worships Hill past the entrance to Riverhead Mews. I cannot see any sense in this. This would mean that 2-3 parking spaces will be lost in an area where parking spaces are very limited.

Cars only park on one side of St Mary's Drive and in the five years I have lived here, it has never caused any problems. As for easing congestion, which is stated in the proposal, this is a rather ridiculous clairn as it is a very quiet cul-de-sac which is never congested. Therefore, I want to formally object to this proposal and hope that these plans will be reconsidered.

## Gary Connor

## From:

Posted At:

## Conversation:

28 February 2011 15:06
http://www.sevenoaks.gov.uk/transport__streets/onstreet_parking/proposed_changes_to_ onstreet_parking/parking_restrictions/proposed_parking_restrictions/4252.asp Passed on

## Posted To:

http://www.sevenoaks.gov.uk/transport_streets/onstreet_parking/proposed_changes_to_ onstreet_parking/parking_restrictions/proposed_parking_restrictions/4252.asp

## Dear Sirs

I have lived in Riverhead Mews for the last years and have not come across any congestion coming in or out of the road.

The existing lines are more than adequate to allow cars access to the road without difficulty.
Any existing issues are due to people stopping on the existing yellow lines.
Placing lines as far along the road as detailed in the pdf file will just cause more Issues further along St Marys Drive for both residence and people looking to use the nearby park.

Therefore please take this as an objection to the proposed plans.
Regards

Gary Connor

From:
Posted At:
Conversation:
Posted To:
Subject:

28 February 2011 15:58
proposed extension of yellow lines in St Marys drive - objection
Passed on
proposed extension of yellow lines in St Marys drive - objection

I am writing with an objection to the proposed plans to extend the double yellow lines on St Marys Drive from the corner of Worships Hill right through past the end of Riverhead Mews to try and ease congestion at the entrance of the road. Firstly, having lived there at the property for over years, this is only a problem I have noticed a handful of times. In my experience the congestion is often caused during the school run with parents filling the bottom of St Marys drive around school dropping off/collection times perhaps this should be addressed before you block the right to park by local residents to the spaces.

The reason I object is that there are 12 flats within the block of Riverhead House as well as the Mews properties and opposite, and only a handful of communal parking spaces, so even with 1 car per household there is still not enough space for everyone to indeed park safely. It is inevitable that some flats will need to park outside on St Marys drive, to avoid congestion eg access for Fire brigade in case of emergency to Riverhead Mews. In addition, extending the lines this far would force us to park further up St Marys Drive which would cause more problems from other residents further up the road.

Vniwe faithfillu,

## Gary Connor

```
From:
Posted At:
Conversation:
Posted To:
01 March 2011 10:57
Proposal for yellow lines in St Marys drive
    Passed on
Subject:
Proposal for yellow Ines in St Marys drive
object strongly to any proposals that yellow lines are put in St Marys Drive.
```

Riverhead Mews is not a road repairable at public expense and it is where most of the residents of the mews and the house park.

There is however not enough space for everyone to park which means parking in St Marys Drive for those that come home late from work or miss a space at the weekend. Placing yellow lines further into the road would increase the distance people have to walk to their homes.

There are a number of elderly residents and families with young children who would be seriously inconvenienced if this were to go ahead. It would also stop parents parking their vehicles to walk up to the school on the main road.

I understand that a parish councillor lives in St Marys Drive. I would like to be assured that they have no part in the decision making process as they are clearly an interested party.

Regards

## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

To:
TR 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal
The Parking \& Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks

SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECD 16 FEB 2011
PARKING \& AMENITY

Kent
TN13 1 HG
Formal consultation response


I am / (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the Worships Hill, Westerham Road and Witches Lane area of Riverhead.

## Comments

Howence, the pedestrian entrance to Amherst schon Gas been moved and in now at the southern extent of the school keep clear signs/mankingas is it posioible to extend the schorl keep clear markings to the Traffic calming narrowing and perhaps reduce" its extent it the novthern end?


If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

To:
TR 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal
The Parking \& Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent

SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECD 17 FEB 2011
PARKING \& AMENITY

Formal consultation response

| Name: <br> (please print) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address |  |  |
|  | Witches Lane <br> Sevenoaks |  |
| Phone number: |  |  |
| Email. |  |  |

I am / am not (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the Worships Hill, Westerham Road and Witches Lane area of Riverhead.

## Comments

'No working at any time' com be enterpicted to allow percents to stop bifiew cars on the 'No wsicting' hints to allow their chilon to be dropped off ar picked up Their interpretation being 'they are not writing'
We notice on occasions child sen waiting at the entrance in our entrant Witches hame for a parent to arrive in the car, stop in our entrance while te chides get in and then dree off, wethowigh it is already marked with double yellow lines
 if $t$ is unforced $-\mathrm{m} \boldsymbol{u}$ regularly point oared.


## Agenda Item 4

If you wish to comment on the proposals, please return this completed form by 13th March 2011.

```
To:
TRO 2009 Amendment 16 - Formal
The Parking & Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent
TN13 1HG
```



Formal consultation response


I'am / amanot (delete where applicable) in favour of the proposed changes for the Worships Hill, Westerham Road and Witches Lane area of Riverhead.

## Comments

 pronusels ape mast dewndete They vind rade murh'iongostown ovotiving and aftesurown


## Agenda Item 4

## Andy Bracey

From: Andy Bracey
Sent: 15 February 2011 08:43
To: 'Cameron Brown'
Subject: RE: Parking Restrictions

## Dear Cllr Brown

With regard to Cranmer Road; The proposal is for 'no waiting at any time' - the restriction that is indicated on the ground by double yellow lines.

With regard to Witches Lane outside the school - we were asked to promote these proposals on behalf of the Highway Authority who hold the remit for safety issues on the Highway. The convenience of parking close to a school must always be a secondary consideration to the safety of vulnerable road users in those areas. The congestion and obstruction problems that occur outside the school have lead to conflict and aggressive driving between motorists (including school parents) who are obstructed by people picking up and dropping off. The proposals made by Kent Highways should reduce this conflict and improve safety.

I hope this clarifies ths issues.
Andy Bracey
Senior Engineer, Traffic \& Parking

From: Cameron Brown [mailto:ckdb@hotmall.co.uk]
Sent: 12 February 2011 20:01
To: Andy Bracey; Parish.Council, Riverhead
Subject: Parking Restrictlons
Dear Mr Bracey
Thank you for recent emall about parking restrictions.
My first observation Is that your map appears to be in error - in relation to Cranmer road It records that there will be proposed no waiting at any time - should this not record the fact that double yellow lines are proposed, as recorded in your statement of reasons? The same observation could be made around the parking proposals at school - it is not partlcularly clear.

In relation to parking outside the school I have to say that I disagree with this proposal and think it is misconcieved. While many parents walk their children to school there will be some who will need to drive. There is no parking directly outside the school already and I note that this has not been requested by residents - many of whom will no doubt be taking children to the school. What if a dlsabled parent wishes to park close to the school? Where does a parent park in the event of emergency? In short while there may be some congestion at peak times there are already restrictions to combat that.

I have no observations on the other proposed restrictions.
I would be grateful if could acknowledge recelpt of this emall.
Cllr Brown

## Agenda Item 4

rusleu mli 14 viarcil <Uld 1s:Uu
Posted To: Parking \& Amenlty (parkIngandamenity@sevenoaks,gov.uk)
Conversation: T/2009 Amend 16 Formal
Subject: T/2009 Amend 16 Formal

## Dear Sirs

I write in response to your letter dated $10^{\text {th }}$ February 2011 regarding the above referenced draft of the KCC's 'Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On Street Parking Places (Amendment 16) Order 2009'.

15/03/2011

Page 2 of 2

My Council wishes to record that it is opposed to the proposed 'No waiting at any time' parking restrictions in Witches Lane, as shown in orange on your 1:1000 scale plan dated 29/07/10 ref: T/Riverhead, which was enclosed with your letter of $10^{\text {th }}$ February 2011.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.
Regards
Derek Johnson
BSC CEng MICE
Clerk to Chevening Parish Council

## Andy Bracey

| From: | Janet Hawkins |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 14 February 2011 12:29 |
| To: | Andy Bracey |
| Subject: | FW: Riverhead - yellow lines |

```
-----Original Message--.--
From: Riverhead Parish Council [mailto:riverheadparish@tiscali.co.uk]
Posted At: 14 February 2011 11:24
Posted To: Parking & Amenity (parkingandamenity@sevenoaks.gov.uk)
Conversation: Riverhead - yellow lines
Subject: Riverhead - ye.llow lines
Dear Mr Bracey,
Riverhead Parish Council are pleased with the proposed changes and have no further
commentr to make.
Regards
Parish Clerk
Riverhead Parish Council

\section*{Working to keep Kent safe}

Mr Andy Bracey
Parking and Amenity Team
Sevenoaks District Council
Argyle Road
Sevenoaks
Kent TN13 1HG
Your Ref: \(\quad\) T/2009 Amend 16 Formal

SEVENOAKS DISTRICT COUNCIL
REC'D 18 FEB 2011
PARKING \& AMENITY

Our Ref: \(\quad 222 / T R O / 11618 / 11\)

Date \(\quad 15^{\text {th }}\) February 2011

\section*{The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On Street Parking Places (Amendment 16) Order 2009 - Riverhead}

Dear Mr Bracey
Thank you for your letter dated \(10^{\text {th }}\) February 2011 and enclosed drawing 'Riverhead St Marys Drive 140910.pdf' concerning the above subject.

Kent Police have no specific observations to make regarding this proposal, however in general terms we would expect the following:
- The application meets the necessary criteria.
- The introduction of prohibition of waiting complies in all respect with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.
- If being used for 'corner protection' the prohibition of waiting restriction is for a 24-hour period and extends for a distance of at least 10 metres from any junction. Thus preventing vehicles mistakenly parking during the hours of darkness and contravening provisions of the Roads Vehicles Lighting Regulations 1994.
- The introduction of such measures will not leave the Police with the task of carrying out constant enforcement issues such as obstruction by transferring the problem to other areas.
- The safety of other road users is not compromised by the introduction of these measures.

Civil Parking Enforcement will require your Authority to ensure resources are available to enforce this proposal.

Yours sincerely


Paul Cave
Police Constable 7981
Traffic Management Unit.
Page 41

\section*{Agenda Item 4}

Dear Sir

\section*{Acknowledgement of receipt}

Subject: Parking Restrictions - Riverhead and Chevening
Thank you for your letter dated 10 February 2011.
This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your communication.
The Kent Highway Services officer handling your correspondence is Mr Jiwaji and can be contacted on 08458247800.

Yours faithfully,


M Kent Highway Services

\section*{Andy Bracey}

From: Andy Bracey
Sent: 16 February 2011 15:12
To: 'From NU-VENTURE - your locally-owned bus company serving Kent \& Medway.'
Subject: RE: TRAFFIC ORDERS ETC, Riverhead/Chevening

\section*{Dear Mr Kemp}

Thank you for your comments. Go-Coach are also included within the consultation.

Andy Bracey
Senior Engineer, Traffic \& Parking

From: From NU-VENTURE - your locally-owned bus company serving Kent \& Medway, [mailto:nuventurecoachesitd@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: 16 February 2011 11:50
To: Andy Bracey; Parking \& Amenity (parkingandamenity@sevenoaks.gov.uk)
Subject: TRAFFIC ORDERS ETC, Riverhead/Chevening
Thanks for your letter of 10/2/10. These proposals do not affect any of our current operations so I have no comments on this occasion.

Go-Coach info@go-coach.co.uk is a new operator who do operate bus services in the local area concerned. Are they on your list of consultees?

Norman Kemp
Company Secretary

\section*{THINK GREEN - please print this e-mail onfy if necessary.}

Nu-Venture Coaches Ltd, Unit 2f Deacon Trading Estate, Aylesford, ME20 7SP.
Telephone 01622 882288. Fax 01622 718070. Website www.nu-venture.co.uk.

Registered in England Number 1239389.
A locally-owned and managed business operating local bus services in Kent \& Medway.
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\title{
SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - 14 DECEMBER 2011
}

PETITION - VALLEY ROAD, FAWKHAM

Report of the: Director of Kent Highways and Transportation
Status: For Consideration

Executive Summary: This report describes a petition received by the parents at Fawkham School. It requests action to lower the speed limit from 40 mph to 20 mph and for additional road safety measures along Valley Road.

This report supports the Key Aim of Reducing speed, encouraging safer driving and tackling known speeding crash hotspots. Also improving pedestrian safety, including measures to improve access for people with disabilities as indicated in the Sevenoaks Community Plan.

Chairman Cllr James London

Head of Service Kent County Council Highways and Transportation - Head of Transportation - Tim Read

\section*{Recommendations:}
i. That the highway authority does not pursue any changes in the road environment or a reduction in the speed limit along Valley Road in the vicinity of Fawkham School.
ii. Members note the provision of parking facilities and pedestrian access into the school is not the responsibility of the highway authority.
iii. That the lead petitioner is informed of this Board's decision.

\section*{Background and Discussion}

1 A petition signed by 135 people has been received from parents at Fawkham School. A copy of the petition (excluding signatories) is included as Appendix A.

2 The petitioners are requesting the following which have been addressed under separate headings below:
- The speed limit is reduced from 40 mph to 20 mph .
- Additional road safety measures including a pedestrian crossing, school crossing patrol, physical traffic calming measures and school keep clear markings.
- Constant maintenance of signage.
- Limited school parking capacity to be addressed.

\section*{Reduction in the speed limit}

3 The current speed limit of Valley Road outside Fawkham School is 40 mph . Kent Highway Services commissioned Jacobs to carry out automatic traffic counts on Valley Road in close proximity to Fawkham School in October 2010.

4 The Survey results for Valley Road showed that overall, the \(85^{\text {th }}\) percentile speed for northbound traffic was 38.3 mph and for southbound traffic was 38.3 mph . The \(85^{\text {th }}\) percentile is the speed not exceeded by \(85 \%\) of drivers and is the national standard measurement of drivers' speed. On this evidence, the current 40 mph limit is well observed. The corresponding speeds in the school drop off period (08:30-09:00, weekdays) were 31.8 mph for northbound and 32.4 mph for southbound traffic and in the afternoon pick up (15:00-15:30, weekdays) were 33.3 mph for northbound and 32.2 mph for southbound traffic.

5 A lower speed limit would require physical changes in the drivers' environment to ensure that it would be self enforcing.

6 Officers carried out a survey of the speed limits outside Fawkham School along Valley Road. Kent County Council follows national guidance laid down by the Department for Transport (DfT) in setting speed limits. The details are contained in a document called "Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits". An important principle of this guidance is that, "speed limits should be evidence led, self explaining and seek to reinforce people's assessment of what is a safe speed to travel. They should encourage self-compliance and not be seen by drivers as being a target speed at which to drive in all circumstances."
\(7 \quad\) Since the Police are responsible for enforcing speeds limits, any proposed change must have their support. In accordance with the DfT Circular 1/2006, officers consulted with the Police to assess the appropriate speed limit along the Valley Road outside Fawkham School. Appendix B contains a letter received from the Police. The Police have confirmed that they would not support a 20 mph limit outside the school however they would consider supporting a 30 mph speed limit with additional measures to ensure vehicle speeds are reduced to 30 mph . The grounds for the police not endorsing a 20 mph speed limit are in accordance with DfT Circular 1/2006.

8 To assess the justification for funding for the necessary physical works to achieve lower drivers' speeds, potential schemes are prioritised for inclusion in the Crash Remedial Measure (CRM) Programme. The 3 year crash record for Valley Road in the vicinity of Fawkham School show there is no consistent pattern of crashes which suggest lowering the speed limit would not reduce
the crash record. Accordingly this proposal will not be funded from KCC's CRM programme.

\section*{Additional safety measures}

9 Formalised crossing facility/school crossing patrol - Because of the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles at the existing school access, this is only feasible if a new pedestrian access into the school and corresponding changes to the footway are made. None of this would be funded by the highway authority. If the changes were made, then it would be for the school to consider whether to fund and operate a crossing patrol.

10 School Keep Clear Markings - The school Keep Clears are already marked for the appropriate length. The district wide School Keep Clear Order is currently being progressed as a Member Highway Funded scheme by Sevenoaks District Council.

\section*{Maintenance of signage}

11 Following on from the submission of the petition, the Highway Steward for area undertook an ad-hoc inspection of this section of Valley Road, and as a result of this inspection, arranged for the lining on this section of Valley Road to be refreshed; this included the edge of carriageway lining, 'School Keep Clear' and the 'School Slow' markings on the approach to the school. These works have now been completed.

In addition, the Highway Steward has also raised a job for approx 540m worth of 'siding' to be undertaken on the footway accessing the school to restore the full width of the footway, and some minor patching to the footway where necessary.

On completion of this additional work on the footway, this will complete the maintenance work in this section of Valley Road; however KCC Highways will continue to monitor Valley Road in line with the statutory inspection requirements, and undertake works as necessary.

\section*{School drop-off parking.}

12 Parking facilities for schools are not provided by Kent County Council Highways. Therefore any concerns should be directed to the school.

\section*{Key Implications}

\section*{Financial; Resource (non-financial); Legal etc.; Value For Money}

13 None for Sevenoaks District Council or Kent County Council as a result of this report.

\section*{Risk Assessment Statement}

14 None.

\section*{Conclusions}

15 The County Council's policy is that any proposed changes to speed limits or installation of speed-reducing measures need to demonstrate a quantifiable injury crash saving. Such schemes will need to be supported by the Police and prioritised for potential inclusion in the Crash Remedial Measure (CRM) Programme for 2012 / 13.

16 It is the case that the pattern of reported crashes in the last three years suggests that there would have been no fewer crashes had the speed limit been lower. Accordingly this proposal will not be funded from KCC's CRM programme.

17 Improvements to pedestrian access into the school, and parking for parents are for the school and not the highway authority to consider.

18 In light of the above Members are asked to agree the recommendations.

\section*{Appendices}

Appendix A - Copy of Petition.
Appendix B-Letter from the Police.

Sources of Information: The background papers pertaining to the report are held on KHS file WK/T/SEV/Fawk/01.

Laura Squires, Kent County Council
08458247800
Director:
John Burr - Kent County Council 08458247800

\author{
Fawkham School Road Safety Campaign
}

\section*{Background}

Fawkham School is located on Valley Road, which is a very busy country rat run and must be crossed opposite the school gates by anyone walking to school along its ondy footpath. The school lies in a \(40 \mathrm{mph} z o n e, 350 \mathrm{~m}\) from the 30 mph which is in place in Fawkham itself, Several accidents have oceurred along Valley Road and outside the school itself, road safety outside the school is appalling. The School and its parents have campaigned tirelessly for many years for the improvement of the road conditions, but nothing has been done, despite an agreement in Spring 2011 whereby Malcolm Appleby, the KCC Truffic Officer, agreed that he would prepare the paperwork for the speed limit to be reduced to 30 mph . Traffic Surveys have been carried out, but no conclusions shared. Other local schools have significantly better road safety conditions, Anthony Roper School in Eynsford, for example, recently stopped parents parking on the playground and now benefits from a pedestrian crossing," No Stopping" signs, a lollipop person and zigzags on the road.

Issues:
- Fawkham School and the crossing are situated just past sweeping bends in the road from both directions, where traffic speeds up with no view of the school or pedestrians.
- A jutting out hedge further obscures the school gates from the road, making exiting the playground for both pedestrians and drivers even more dangerous, You cannot see oncoming traffic until you are in the middle of the road. The school gates are effectively a concealed antrance.
- The lights on the "School" signage are frequently out of order, tree growth is left unchecked and signage repainting is not carried out on a timely basis.
- School drop-off parking, which is on the school playground, is severely limited and particularly inconvenient, with parents reversing elther in or out, adding to other drivers' confusion, tocongestion and also to the danger for pedestrians,
- Many of the pupils' families live in Fawkham, and chose to walk to school along Valley Road, a positive for the environment, and for congestion both on the road and on the playground. Parents push buggies and hold younger children by the hand, and this severely impairs their ability to cross the road quickly and safely in the face of fast oncoming treffic. When a parent accompanies more than two children, some as young as five have to cross the road without an available aduli's hand.
- When the playground parking is full, parents have to park along the road which causes impatient drivers behind them to pull past them, adding to confusion and danger for pedestrians and drivers exiting the school,

\section*{Propusals:}

The situation at Fawkham School should be dealt with as a matter of road safety priority:
\(\checkmark\) Lowering the speed limit is paramount; we propose that the limit be set a 20 mph to ensure the sifety of our children.
\(\checkmark\) Other road safety measures must be introduced, for example a pedestrian crossing, traffic calming initiatives like single file traffic / a lolipop person / no stopping zigzags.
\(\checkmark\) Signage must be constantly maintained in good working order.
\(v^{\prime}\) The severely limited school drop-off parking capacity must be addressed.

Agenda Item 5


Petition for lowering speed Ilmit from
And for addling
other road safety measures and reducing speed limit along valley Road.
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\title{
Traffic Management Unit, Tactical Operations, London Road, Aylesford, Kent ME20 7SL \\ Telephone: (01622) 798542 Fax: 01622798549
}

\author{
Ms Laura Squires \\ Kent County Council Highways \\ Transport and Development \\ Your Ref: \\ Our Ref: 101/SL/12127/11 \\ Date \(\quad 3^{\text {rd }}\) November 2011
}

\section*{Valley Road Fawkham - Petition for 20 mph Speed Limit}

\section*{Dear Ms Squires}

The introduction of any new speed limit is a very emotive subject, as is the antisocial behaviour of those motorists who exceed the present limits.

As with all new Traffic Regulation Orders we would look for their introduction to be in the main self-enforcing. Kent Police would seek that the advice and guidance given in Department for Transport Circulars 5/99 and 9/99, which specifically relates to 20 mph zones/limits, is complied with. These guidelines ensure that proposals maintain consistent and realistic speed limits.

In order to ensure credibility of a new speed limit we would expect all aspects of Circular Roads 01/2006 to be adhered to.

Any speed limit introduced outside of this guidance will not only be ineffective but will leave the Police with the task of carrying out constant enforcement, where previously an issue of excess speed did not exist.

Kent Police would seek that the legislation and advice given in the Traffic Signs Manuel Chapter 5, and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, is complied with.

Having studied the proposal and visited the area I make the following observations:
Circular 01/2006 states 'Successful 20 mph zones and 20 mph speed limits should be generally self-enforcing. Traffic Authorities should take account of the level of police enforcement required before installing either of these measures. 20 mph speed limits are unlikely to be complied with on roads where vehicle speeds are substantially higher then this.'

The speed data provided by KCC Highways show that there is currently a well observed 40 mph speed limit with mean speeds of 32.4 mph northbound and 32.6 mph southbound and \(85^{\text {th }}\) percentile speeds of 38.3 mph . Research into 20 mph speed limits carried out by TRL showed that where speed limits alone were introduced, reductions of only about 2 mph in
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'before' speeds were achieved. A 20 mph speed limit would not be appropriate at this location as there would be little if any chance of compliance. Kent Police would only agree to a 20 mph speed limit if it was implemented with physical traffic calming features sufficient to reduce vehicle speeds to below 20 mph .

Although the petition states 'Several accidents have occurred along Valley Road and outside the school itself, road safety outside the school is appalling' the collision statistics to the end June 2011 show there have been 3 injury collisions in the vicinity of the school in the previous 3 years. 2 of the collisions occurred on Saturdays when the school was closed and none of the casualties was a child. The 10 year data shows a total of 4 injury collisions (including the 3 detailed previously) the additional collision was at 20:30 hours on Friday \(22^{\text {nd }}\) July 2005, again when the school was closed. Whilst it is accepted that not all collisions are reported to the police there is no reason to believe that there is a higher level of underreporting at this location than any other within Kent. The collision record for valley Road in the vicinity of the school is not high.

Kent Police would therefore not support a 20 mph speed limit.

The speed data does suggest that a reduction in the speed limit to 30 mph could be considered. Although the school does sit outside the village centre it may be possible, with the introduction of enhanced signing, to achieve speeds suitable for a 30 mph limit. The signing would have to be carefully considered to avoid a situation where the gateway to the village is lost and vehicle speeds through the centre increase. Kent Police would be happy to discuss what measures would be needed should there be a proposal to reduce the speed limit to 30 mph .

Yours Sincerely

Paul Cave
Police Constable 7981
Traffic Management Unit

\title{
SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - 14 DECEMBER 2011
}

\title{
SEVENOAKS PEDESTRIAN GUARDRAILING ASSESSMENT
}

Report of the: Director of Kent Highways and Transportation

Status: For Consideration

Executive Summary: This report informs the Board of the results of a survey of pedestrian guardrailing in Sevenoaks and seeks comments on proposals to remove sections of guardrailing from some sites.

This report supports the Key Aim of improving pedestrian safety.
Chairman Cllr James London

Director Kent County Council Highways and Transportation

\section*{Recommendations:}

The Board is asked to consider and comment on the proposals to manage sections of guard railing in Sevenoaks.

\section*{Introduction}
1. On behalf of Kent County Council, Jacobs have carried out a survey of pedestrian guardrailing in Sevenoaks and are seeking comments on proposals to remove sections of guardrailing from some sites.

\section*{Background}
2. The main purpose of guardrailing is to improve safety by trying to prevent pedestrians from crossing the road at an inappropriate place or from straying into the road inadvertently. Guardrailing can also be used to offer some protection to pedestrians at locations where the swept path of large vehicles, such as buses and heavy goods vehicles, takes the vehicles close to the footway, sometimes overhanging it.
3. It is recognised that where pedestrian guardrailing is badly sited or over installed it not only alienates pedestrians but also looks unsightly, easily becomes damaged which in turn leads to increased maintenance costs and complaints. Indeed poor guard railing can lead to an increase in pedestrian crashes.
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4. A full report was presented to the Joint Transportation Board on June 15th 2011, and the following comments were agreed:
- \(\quad\) Site 1 - A225, Tonbridge Road, (outside Sevenoaks School \& junction with Oak Lane). These railings are to be retained.
- Site 2 - A224, London road / Tubbs Hill \& Hitchen Hatch Lane. A number of panels near the Station Access are to be retained until the additional cycle stands are installed at the station see plan for details.
- Site 3 - A225, Dartford Road junction with B2019, Seal Hollow Road. These railings are to be retained.
- Site 4 - A225 Dartford Road / High Street / Suffolk way / Pembroke Road. Railings to be removed.
- Site 5 - A225, High Street, (outside Tesco Metro). Railings to be removed.
- Site 6 - A225, High Street, (outside Tesco Metro). Railings to be removed.
- \(\quad\) Site 7 - A224, London Road, Railings to be removed.
- Site 8 - A224, London Road / Pembroke Road / Argyle Road. Railings to be removed.
5. Appendix 1 is a report with the final recommendations following comments received, and has copies of all the plans indicating the 8 different locations listed above.
6. Kent County Councils' contractor would be carrying out the removals with the panels being recycled. If decorative or ornate railings and panels are highlighted for removal the Borough Council will be able to retain these for repairs or future use.

\section*{Options available}
7. Members of the Board can:
a. Support the proposals to remove guardrailing at the sites identified in Appendix 1.
b. Reject some/all of the proposals.

\section*{Implications}

\section*{Financial}
8. Funding will be provided by Kent County Council. A budget allocation has not been secured specifically for this commission.

\section*{Programming}
9. It is proposed to undertake the works on a site by site basis where damage has occurred to existing barrier to achieve value for money and efficiency.

\section*{Conclusion}
10. The removal of guardrailing which is not required for pedestrian safety or for other reasons is in line with national guidance to de-clutter streets. It will also reduce on-going maintenance costs and help improve the appearance of the public realm.

\section*{Contact Officer}

Julian Cook 08458247800

\section*{Appendices}

Appendix \(1-\quad\) Report - following comments received
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\section*{Foreword}

An assessment of the pedestrian guard railing in Sevenoaks town centre was carried out in October 2010. A report on the findings and recommendations was sent to County Members, KCC's Transport and Development team and Sevenoaks District Council in November 2010.

Following this initial consultation the report was taken to the Joint Transportation Board on \(15^{\text {th }}\) June 2011. Each of the recommendations was discussed. This report details the final recommendations as agreed by JTB members.

This report contains recommendations to retain, partially remove or wholly remove pedestrian guard railing from 8 sites across Sevenoaks.

There is an increasing emphasis on improving the streetscape by removing street clutter and providing better pedestrian accessibility whilst still maintaining road safety. It is recognised that where pedestrian guard railing is badly sited or over installed it not only alienates pedestrians but also looks unsightly, easily becomes damaged which in turn leads to increased maintenance costs and complaints.

Guard railing can be the right solution when the objectives of installing it (and in the right amount) are fully considered. The main purpose of guard railing is to improve safety by trying to prevent pedestrians from crossing the road at an inappropriate place or from straying into the road inadvertently. Guard railing can also be used to offer some protection to pedestrians at locations where the path of large vehicles, such as buses and heavy goods vehicles, takes the vehicles close to the footway, sometimes overhanging it.
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\section*{Methodology}

The assessments were conducted within an approximate 750 metre ( \(820 y\) yard) radius (1 mile diameter) of the High Street to incorporate the main pedestrian thoroughfares in the town centre (see figure 1). Following a request from \(T \& D\) the assessment was extended to cover the pedestrian guard railing in the vicinity of the Sevenoaks railway station.

Each site has been assessed by a fully qualified road safety auditor and a road safety engineer. Records of each site will be maintained by the KHS Highway Manager for West Kent.

The surveys have allowed sufficient adjacent road space to be included; the exact length of road surveyed to make up a site has been dictated by the existence of side roads, major entrances / exits and the current extent of the existing guard railing.

The type of pedestrian guard railing assessed has been categorised into one of three types as shown below:

'See through' type


\section*{Decorative type}


The decorative type of railing has a number of variations.
The site assessment was conducted by assessing the effectiveness of individual guardrails within the site and effectiveness as a whole. Photographs were taken and all technical data pertaining to the site was recorded including guard rail measurements, carriageway and footway width, proximity of junctions, type of pedestrian crossing and proximity to other crossings etc. Local trip attractors and generators have also been identified to assess pedestrian desire lines.

\section*{Agenda Item 6}

Where appropriate the width of the carriageway and its arrangement into lanes has been recorded as this relates to the degree of difficulty that people have in crossing.

The width of the available footway has also been taken and consideration given to the effect the guard railing has on reducing the effective footway width.

Illustrated diagrams indicating pedestrian guardrail locations, any proposals to install additional guardrail panels, the replacement of any damaged panels and to remove or retain the guardrails have been included.

Agenda Item 6
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\section*{Site 1 Location:}

Site 1 is located on the A225 Tonbridge Road outside the Sevenoaks School and the junction with Oak Lane.

Types of Guard Railing:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & & Yes \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Comments received}

Members of the Joint Transportation Board requested that the railings are retained as these posts and rails are part of the street scene and of historic / architectural benefit. Members thought the railings were helpful to guide school children in the area, especially as they wait for buses. They are also of a benefit to the elderly due to the close proximity to the Almshouses.

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

The guard railings are located outside the Sevenoaks School and the junction with Oak Lane. During peak times there is a high volume of vehicular traffic and the Pelican Crossing at the site has a high volume of pedestrian movement, in particular school children.

The post and railing type of panel installed offers little benefit as a guide or protective device for either pedestrians or vehicles. JTB Members requested that the railings are retained at the site.

The general condition of the post and railings are fair.
- It is recommended to retain the post and railing at site 1.

Illustrated Diagram of site 1
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\section*{Site 2 Location:}

Site 2 is located at the junction with the A224 London Road/Tubs Hill and Hitchen Hatch Lane.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & Yes & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Comments received}

The railings are used to chain up bicycles. The railings should not be removed until Network Rail had provided sufficient storage places for bicycles.

The Joint Transportation Board Members agreed they were in favour of the proposals subject to sufficient bicycle storage and that the station entrance does not become blocked with cars dropping people off.

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

The pedestrian guard railings are located outside the railway station where there is a high volume of vehicular traffic and the pelican crossing at the site has a high volume of pedestrian movement.

The majority of the pedestrian guard railing at the site offers little benefit as a guide or protective device and is mainly utilised by cyclists for securing their bicycles to the railing.

Site observations revealed a high number of pedestrians not using the controlled crossing but instead are crossing diagonally across the road to and from the railway station entrance. These movements' results in the pedestrians walking for a significant distance on the carriageway as the existing pedestrian guard rails prevent access onto the nearest footway.

The footway at the site varies between 1.5-4.5metres
There needs to be prior notification of the proposed guard rail removal date issued to cyclists.
- It is recommended to partially remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 2.
- The railings around the station should not be removed until alternative provision is made for cycle storage.

Illustrated Diagram of site 2
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\section*{Site 3 Location:}

Site 3 is located at the junction with the A225 Dartford Road and the B2019 Seal Hollow Road.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & Yes & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

The pedestrian guard railing is located at a complex junction and links two zebra crossings, one located at the junction with A225 Dartford Road and the other approximately 15 metres away on the B2019 Seal Hollow Road.

The guard railings guide pedestrians from the A225 Dartford Road footway away from the northern and southern exit and entry points of Seal Hollow Road to a safe point at the zebra crossing on Seal Hollow Road and visa versa.
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a moderate volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to retain the pedestrian guard railing at site 3.

\section*{Illustrated Diagram of site 3}
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\section*{Site 4 Location:}

Site 4 is located at the junction with the A225 Dartford Road and Suffolk Way/Pembroke Road.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & Yes & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Comments received}

Improvements may be made to the junction following nearby development. The pedestrian guard railing should be left in place until the junction is reviewed as part of the new development.

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

The junction is controlled by an automatic traffic light system with uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.
The pedestrian guard railings at this site offer little benefit as a guide or protective device.
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a moderate volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 4.

\section*{Illustrated Diagram of site 4}
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\section*{Site 5 Location:}

Site 5 is located on the A225 High Street out side the Tesco Metro.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & Yes & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

There are only 3 pedestrian guard railing panels at this site which offer no benefit as a guide or protective device
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a high volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 5 .

Illustrated Diagram of site 5
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\section*{Site 6 Location:}

Site 6 is located on the A225 High Street outside the Tesco Metro.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & Yes & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

There are 9 pedestrian guard railing panels located on the western side footway at the pelican crossing and no guard railings on the eastern side, the 9 railings offer no benefit as a guide or protective device, as pedestrians were observed crossing the road all along the High Street.
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a high volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 6.

\section*{Illustrated Diagram of site 6}
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\section*{Site 7 Location:}

Site 7 is located on the A224 London Road opposite the shop, Hospice of the Weald.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline Yes & Yes & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

There are 2 pedestrian guard railing panels located on the eastern side footway at the zebra crossing and no guard railings on the western side. There are also 2 panels located immediately inside the entrance to the car park which offer no benefit as a guide or protective device.
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a high volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 7 .

\section*{Illustrated Diagram of site 7}
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\section*{Site 8 Location:}

Site 8 is located at the junction with A224 London Road and Pembroke Road/Argyle Road.

\section*{Types of Guard Railing:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Standard & See through & Decorative & Post and Rail \\
\hline & & Yes & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Conclusions / Recommendations}

The site is located at a large busy crossroad junction with moderate pedestrian movements. The junction has three refuge island crossing points of which two are controlled, with the centre island guard railings and the footway railings offering little benefit as a guide or protective device.
The site has a high volume of vehicular traffic and a moderate volume of pedestrian movement.
- It is recommended to remove the pedestrian guard railing at site 8 .

\section*{Illustrated Diagram of site 8}
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\section*{SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - 14 DECEMBER 2011}

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PROGRESS REPORT

Report of the: Director of Kent Highway Services
Status: For Information

Executive Summary: This report describes the progress to date and anticipated progress over the next three months of all programmed highway improvements and those schemes that are expected to be included in Kent County Council's 2011-12 Capital Programme.

This report supports the Key Aim of Reducing speed, encouraging safer driving and tackling known speeding crash hotspots. Also improving pedestrian safety, including measures to improve access for people with disabilities as indicated in the Sevenoaks Community Plan.

Chairman Cllr James London

Head of Service Kent County Council Highways and Transportation - Head of Transportation - Tim Read

Recommendations: That Members NOTE the progress of programmed highway improvements.

\section*{Background and Discussion}
1. This report gives details of the specific schemes which will be progressed in Sevenoaks including the schemes carried over from the 2010/11 financial year, as well as new schemes identified as crash remedial schemes.
2. Appendix A summarises the schemes and gives an overview of the progress to date and anticipated progress prior to the next meeting of this Board.
3. Appendix B summarises the committed Member Highway Funds for each County Member as well as details of applications which are currently being progressed.
4. Polhill Crash remedial Measures - Proposal recommends 50 mph speed limit on Polhill and London Road but this subject to Police approval. If approval is not forthcoming then the remainder of the scheme will be implemented as planned in February. A report considering the speed limit would then be made to the next meeting of this Board.

B2026 Hartfield Road junction with Station Road and Butterwell Hill "Cowden Cross"
In 2005, Kent County Council's annual monitoring of road traffic accidents highlighted a worsening in the number and severity of crashes at Cowden Cross, (the junction of B2026 Hartfield Road junction with Station Road and Butterwell Hill). To remedy this, a series of highway improvements were added to the 2006/07 crash remedial programme. These measures, and the actions taken are summarised as follows:
a) improve traffic signs and road markings: - \(2 x\) "Crossroads" warning signs on yellow backing and corresponding "slow" road marking laid April 2007.
b) improve road surface: - high friction surfacing laid on both B2026 approaches April 2007.
c) improve visibility to the south of Station Road: - agreement was reached in October 2007 with the land owner to remove hedge and this work was carried out that winter.
d) improve visibility to the north of Station Road: - for over four years, KCC have sought an agreement with the owner of this private land to remove the existing hedge and to plant a replacement further away from Hartfield Road. Although these negotiations have become frustrated, KCC continue to monitor the degree to which the existing hedge interferes with drivers' visibility. Any interference is dealt with in the normal course of the Highway Inspector's and Highway Steward's duties.
e) Move telephone pole north of Station Road out of visibility splay: - no action. This can only be carried out once the hedge in (d) above has been removed

6 The success of any crash remedial measure in assessed in terms of the number and severity of crashes that have caused injury since the works were completed. Police records show that no crashes resulting in personal injury have occurred at this junction since the first of the above improvements was carried out. Accordingly, there is no justification for continuing to incur professional costs in pursuing items (d) and (e) above. The solicitors and valuers acting for KCC on this acquisition have therefore been instructed to terminate their negotiations and close their files.

\section*{Key Implications}

\section*{Financial; Resource (non-financial); Legal etc.; Value For Money}
7. None for Sevenoaks District Council or Kent County Council as a result of this report.

\section*{Risk Assessment Statement}

8 None.

\section*{Appendices}

A Highway Improvement Schemes.
B Member Highway Fund Schemes.

Sources of Information: None

Contact Officer: Laura Squires, Kent County Council
Steven Noad, Kent County Council 08458247800

Director:
John Burr - Kent County Council 08458247800
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\section*{Highway Improvement Programme: Sevenoaks District 2011-12}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & A224 Polhill & Reduce speed limit to 50 mph , new traffic island, improve existing advanced signing, refresh existing carriageway markings \& cut back vegetation at Pilgrims Way Link Bridge. & Detailed design work has commenced. & Programmed for construction on the \(20^{\text {th }}\) February. See main body of report. & £25K & £25K & Laura Squires \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 10-ITS- } \\
& \text { SE-02 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
High Street, \\
Eynsford
\end{tabular} & Facilities to help pedestrians cross the road outside the primary school (2010-11 scheme) & Traffic Regulation Order was made on 16 October 2011. Works being programmed. & Works to be completed. This scheme will no longer be reported to this board. & £0k & £3k & Laura Squires \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \overline{0} \\
& \stackrel{1}{\phi} \\
& \Phi \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Toys Hill & Improved traffic signs. & Detailed design complete and works programmed for 21 November 2011. & Works to be completed. & TBA & TBA & Laura Squires \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD - 14 DECEMBER 2011}

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS \& TRANSPORTATION RESTRUCTURE

Report of the: Director of Kent Highway Services

Status: For Consideration
Executive Summary: This report sets out recent changes following a restructure of the department and highlights how Kent Highways and Transportation (KH\&T) will continue to focus on working with communities and ensure proper engagement with Members, Councillors, Parishes and local people.

This report supports the Key Aim of.
Chairman Cllr James London

Head of Service Director of Kent Highways \& Transportation

Recommendations: The Board is asked to note the report.

\section*{NEW STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS IN KENT HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION}
1. As a part of the County Council's strategy, Bold Steps for Kent, and wider national legislation and budget reductions, there have been changes across Kent County Council. This includes the work done in Kent Highway Services now called Kent Highways and Transportation (KH\&T). This report sets out recent changes following a restructure of the department and highlights how KH\&T will continue to focus on working with communities and ensure proper engagement with Members, Councillors, Parishes and local people.

\section*{Introduction}
2. As a part of the County Council's strategy, Bold Steps for Kent, and wider national legislation and budget reductions, there have been changes across Kent County Council. This includes the work done in Kent Highway Services now called Kent Highways and Transportation (KH\&T). This report sets out recent changes following a restructure of the department and highlights how KH\&T will continue to focus on working with communities and ensure proper engagement with Members, Councillors, Parishes and local people.
3. As a part of the county council's strategy, Bold Steps for Kent, and wider legislation around community engagement, the way KCC works is changing with an aim to improve all the services provided by the council and to enhance the service offered to communities in Kent.
4. Kent Highways and Transportation (KH\&T) - formerly called Kent Highway Services - will continue to focus on working with communities and are committed to proper engagement with Members, district councils, parishes and local people. In order to strengthen this area, meet the budget savings requirements and bring about efficiencies and effectiveness, changes have been made to the staffing of the department. This follows a two phased restructuring process.

\section*{New structure}
5. Prior to the restructure each district had allocated contacts within the Highway Operations teams, namely Highway Inspectors and Community Liaison Officers. From 1 July the new structure came into force and there are no longer community Liaison Officers. Instead we now have Highway Stewards and statutory Highway Inspectors. The Highway Stewards have been allocated to a specific area and they will deal with customer service enquiries, Member, parish and community contact. They have been empowered to carry out small maintenance jobs on site to rectify minor issues such as clearing round a sign / clearing a gully grate. In addition they will identify specific jobs that are deemed necessary for their area, which will be processed through our Highway Management Centre (HMC) at Aylesford. The process of the jobs can be prioritised and programmed in a timely manner with the designated team in the HMC, allowing the public facing staff to spend more time in the area, dealing with service requests. They will undertake parish visits, as agreed locally and will be working out in the community on a daily basis. The Parishes / Members and the general public should still report defects via the web site or our contact centre to ensure that they are recorded and entered into our system to be processed.
6. Highway Inspectors will continue to carry out statutory inspections and will highlight defects and ensure that these are repaired within the prescribed time periods. Inspectors and stewards will be supported by an efficient HMC which is situated on the first floor of our Aylesford Highway Depot.
7. A list of key staff for this district is attached at Appendix A, and a list of the full KCC Highways staff structure can be seen in Appendix B.

\section*{Conclusion and Recommendation}
8. KH\&T is committed to providing a high quality service to the communities in Kent. The recent changes will ensure that, despite budget reductions and other challenges, KH\&T will keep a focus on community engagement.
Members of this Joint Transportation Board are asked to note this report.

\section*{Legal Implications}
9. Not applicable.

Financial and Value for Money Considerations
10. Not applicable.

Risk Assessment
11. Not applicable.
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\section*{Sevenoaks Operations Team}

Highway Manager for West Kent: Carol Valentine
District Manager: Julian Cook

Highway Engineer: Mike Payton

\section*{Stewards: Sharon Clewes}

Andrew Walters
Mark Osborne
Allan Gibbons

Steward Areas:
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline Sharon Clewes & \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Andrew Walters } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Mark Osborne } & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{ Allan Gibbons } \\
\hline Sevenoaks & Swanley & Knockholt & Chevening \\
Riverhead & Crockenhill & Halstead & Sundridge \\
Seal & Shoreham & Dunton Green & Brasted \\
Sevenoaks Weald & Eynsford & Otford & Westerham \\
& Farningham & Kemsing & Edenbridge \\
& Horton Kirby \& South Darenth & West Kingsdown & Hever \\
& & Fawkham & Cowden \\
& & Hartley & Chiddingstone \\
& & Ash-Cum-Ridley & Leigh \\
& & Penshurst \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
David Latham \\
Roadworks \& Enforcement Manager
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
venoaks Joint Transportation Board - 14 December 2011 \\
Item No. 8 - Appendix B
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline Ian Lancefield \\
Countywide \\
Compliance \\
Officer
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|c|} 
Neil Campbell \\
Roadworks \\
Team Leader \\
(Canterbury, \\
Ashford \& \\
Swale)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|c} 
Neil Edwards \\
Roadworks \\
Team Leader \\
(Thanet, Dover \\
\& Shepway)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|c|} 
Alison Hews \\
Roadworks \\
Team Leader \\
(Gravesham, \\
Dartford \& \\
Sevenoaks)
\end{tabular} & Chris Seare \begin{tabular}{|c} 
Roadworks \\
Team Leader \\
(Maidstone, \\
TWells \& \\
Ton/Malling)
\end{tabular} &  &  \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{|c|} 
Maurice (Fred) \\
Cooper \\
Countywide \\
Inspector \\
Jonathan \\
Williams \\
Countywide \\
Data Officer \\
Elizabeth \\
McAdam \\
Melissa \\
Ramsey \\
Accounts \\
Officers \\
Joseph Lagrue \\
Data Support \\
Officer \\
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Eric Banning Kevin Dash Sharon Allister Coordinators \\
Phil Lightman TRO Coord \\
Andy Herbert Ray Parker Andy Bray Inspectors \\
Linda Barden Ellen Gillies TSO's
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Emma \\
Proudfoot Darren Wadhams Paul Sargeant Coordinators \\
lan Biggs Major Projects Co-ordinator \\
Andy Mackay Gary Hambrook Gary Croft Inspectors \\
Yasin Ziya Sue Bradshaw TSO's
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline Barry Frost \\
David Marshall \\
Andrew Rourk \\
Coordinators \\
\\
Richard \\
Highgate \\
Major Projects \\
Co-ordinator \\
\\
Alan Coffin (T) \\
Barbara \\
Westmacott \\
Shaun \\
Smallman \\
Inspectors \\
Manjit Jagpal \\
Joseph Mullen \\
TSO's
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Martin Burke Natalie Peach Coordinators \\
Louise Dilloway TRO Coord \\
Nigel Fermour (stand in) Trevor Southgate Danny Wood Inspectors \\
Jill Pearson Stephen Street TSO's
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Jamie Baker Carol French \\
Enforcement Officers \\
James Lee \\
Enforcement Officer Support
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Pam Kaur Sue Fletcher (p/t) \\
Sue Bickerstaff (p/t) \\
Maria Baker (p/t) \\
Vehicle Crossover Officers
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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