

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-01
Location		Granville Road (near No.5)	
Ward		Town & St John's	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks - 5 Granville Road - 260713	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The District Council has had a request to introduce new parking restrictions near to the access to No.5 Granville Road to prevent obstructive parking.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	2 (6.5%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks - 5 Granville Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	2 (6%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-03
Location	Dartford Road (outside Sackville Place)		
Ward	Town & St John's		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - Dartford Road - 260713		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

During the construction of Sackville Place, the parking layout in the lay-by was altered. This area used to be covered by 2 hour limited waiting, but during construction the layout of the area was changed, and since then the time limit has not been enforceable.

The Council is now looking to re-instate the 2 hour limited waiting in the laybys, along with the facility to issue parking permits. We are also looking to introduce new double yellow lines in the areas where parking would cause an obstruction.

**Requested by**

Local resident and KCC's Agreements Team

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	26	Responses	1 (3.8%)
Not in favour			1 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The objection suggested that there ought to be a different type of restriction introduced – that the area should be subject to pay and display parking and that some of the bays should be for the exclusive use of the residents of Sackville Place and Pavilion Gardens.

However, the Sackville Place and Pavilion Gardens developments already have their own private parking areas for their exclusive use. The intention is to return the parking bays to their former “limited waiting” usage, but with the addition of permit parking availability, similar to those parking bays at the eastern end of St Botolph's Road

Accordingly, it is recommended that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Dartford Road A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	26	Responses	2 (8%)
----------------------	----	-----------	--------

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

In favour of proposals	2 (100%)
------------------------	----------

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-04
Location	High Street (near the Oak Tree pub)		
Ward	Town & St John's		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - High Street Loading Bay - 260413		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has been asked to look at the parking restrictions in the town to see if better use can be made of them. As part of this process it was established that there was a lack of facilities for taxis during the evenings.

To address this we are proposing that the existing loading bay near the Oak Tree pub be used as a taxi rank overnight. This is a time when loading does not take place and where there is a high demand for taxis.

**Requested by**

Sevenoaks District Council's Licensing Team (who manage Taxi facilities)

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	28	Responses	1 (3.6%)
Not in favour			1 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The one comment against the proposal suggested that there should be a taxi rank provided in Blighs car park rather than on-street as there are a lot of pedestrians that cross the road near the Oak Tree pub in the evenings.

However, the issue relates to dealing with those emerging from the local pubs and restaurants, and the need to disperse them as easily and conveniently as possible to prevent public order issues. A taxi facility in Blighs car park is likely to be too far away to be practical.

Additionally, the car park is already used in to the evenings and introducing a taxi rank would reduce parking capacity.

Accordingly it is recommended that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – High Street Loading Bay – 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	28	Responses	2 (7%)
Not in favour			2 (100%)

The formal consultation responses indicate that the evening parking arrangements in Sevenoaks town centre are not straightforward, and a feeling that the stated need for taxi facilities at the proposed location was no longer in place due to a change in ownership and clientele of a nearby pub.

Additionally, one of the local Councillors for the area, Cllr Fleming indicated that he was not in support of the proposed change.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

Given the objections and the lack of support from one of the Councillors for the area, it is recommended that the objections are upheld and the proposals are abandoned.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-05
Location	High Street (near The Chequers pub)		
Ward	Town & St John's		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - High Street Market Bay - 260413		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has been asked to look at the parking restrictions in the town to see if better use can be made of them. As part of this process it was established that there was a problem with overnight parking in the layby by The Chequers pub on Friday nights. Overnight parking was causing problems for the Saturday Market stall holders, as the cars were often not moved by the time the market sets up.

To address this we are proposing that the restrictions are changed to prevent parking by all but market permit holders on Saturdays from 2am until 6.30pm, as this would allow us to issue penalties to any vehicles that are not associated with the market.

**Requested by**

Sevenoaks District Council's Direct Services (who facilitate the Market)

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	0 (0%)
----------------------	----	-----------	--------

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – High Street Market Bay - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	1 (3%)
In favour of proposals			1 (100%)

As the response was in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-08
Location		St Botolph's Road (near St Botolph's Court)	
Ward		Town & St John's	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks - St Botolphs - 070613	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

Residents of St Botolph's Court have reported visibility problems when emerging from their access when vehicles park too close. Accordingly we are proposing to alter the parking bays to improve visibility.

**Requested by**

Local residents

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	14	Responses	6 (42.9%)
In favour of proposals			6 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – St Botolphs - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	14	Responses	5 (36%)
In favour of proposals			4 (80%)
No view			1 (20%)

The responses were in favour of the proposal, though there was one that suggested that the change would not make much difference, and asked for a traffic mirror to be installed.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The comment relating to the installation of a traffic mirror is outside the remit of the District Council, and would be an issue for the Highway Authority to address.

Given the lack of any objection during the formal consultation process, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-09
Location		Mount Harry Road (near No.108)	
Ward		Town & St John's	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks - Mount Harry Road - 200613	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The resident of No.108 Mount Harry Road has reported visibility problems when emerging from their access when vehicles park too close. Accordingly we are proposing to alter the parking bays to improve visibility.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	39	Responses	4 (10.3%)
In favour of proposals			4 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The comments received were broadly in favour of the proposals, but 2 residents requested that the parking bays be further reduced.

Whilst we cannot accommodate a reduction to the extent that the residents wanted (as we have to maintain some facility in the area) we can reduce the bays further than originally proposed.

Accordingly, the proposals should be adjusted to reduce the parking bays, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Mount Harry Road A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	39	Responses	4 (11%)
In favour of proposals			3 (75%)
No view			1 (25%)

The responses were in favour of the proposal, though there was one that did not indicate a preference from a property on the opposite side of the road from the proposed

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

changes, that also raised the issue of traffic speed down Mount Harry Road and the limited visibility from their driveway.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The comments relating to visibility from the driveway opposite and vehicle speeds are outside the remit of the District Council – that side of the road already has restrictions to prevent parking and any measures to improve visibility would be within the resident's own property, and concerns about speeding would be an issue for the Highway Authority to address.

Given the lack of any objection during the formal consultation process, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-10
Location	Avenue Road		
Ward	Sevenoaks Eastern		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - Avenue Road - 200613		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

A new property has been constructed in Avenue Road, and Kent Highways have given permission for a new vehicle access on to Avenue Road. However, this new access requires the alteration of the existing permit parking bays in the road

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	12	Responses	3 (25%)
Not in favour			3 (100%)

Cllr Purves declined to comment as she is resident in the road.

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

As the Highway Authority has given permission for a new vehicle access to be constructed, the District Council has little choice other than to agree the alteration to the parking bays.

The objections received from neighbours who have had other parking issues associated with a business that they operate from their property and a wish to widen their access and increase their own parking, and the fact that Kent County Council wished to charge them for the installation of a white access protection marking, rather than being relevant to the proposed change necessitated by the new vehicle access.

There was also comment that the proposed access should not have double yellow lines in front of it – that a white line may be all that is necessary, and that a yellow line would detract from the visual appearance of the area.

The inclusion of yellow lines in front of the access reflect calls that we have had in neighbouring roads to introduce similar lines to prevent obstructive parking, and would enable the District to take action against any vehicles parked there. The double yellow lines are not essential to the access, but would prevent obstructive parking in the future.

Given the lengthy legal processes involved with the promotion of a traffic regulation order, it would seem better to introduce restrictions to deter obstruction and enable enforcement at this stage when we are already engaged in the process, rather than potentially regret the omission of yellow lines in the near future, and not be able to

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

address the problem for some years, and at public expense rather than at the expense of the applicant.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Avenue Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	12	Responses	2 (17%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-11
Location	Vine Court Road		
Ward	Sevenoaks Eastern		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks – Vine Court Road - 260713		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

Residents on Vine Court Road have reported access problems when emerging from their access when vehicles park too close. Accordingly we are proposing to extend restrictions to prevent obstructive parking.

**Requested by**

Local residents

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	9	Responses	3 (25%)
In favour of proposals			3 (100%)

One of the local Councillors for the area, Cllr Purves commented with no objection.

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Vine Court Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	9	Responses	2 (22%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

One of the comments included a request for additional parking restrictions to protect the second vehicle access to No.31, but there has also been pressure to minimise the introduction of restrictions where possible, and one of the accesses to No. 31 is already protected by double yellow lines so access to the highway should always be available.

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented, but the request for additional restrictions should not be taken further.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-12
Location		Robyns Way	
Ward		Sevenoaks Northern	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks – Robyns Way - 200613	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to reduce the existing yellow lines in Robyns Way to prevent obstructive parking.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	7	Responses	2 (28.6%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Robyns Way - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	7	Responses	2 (29%)
In favour of proposals			2 (100%)

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-15
Location	Morewood Close		
Ward	Sevenoaks Kippington		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks – Morewood Close - 211113		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to make alterations to the existing parking arrangements in Morewood Close to accommodate the new vehicle access to the Redwood Place development on the former Police Station site.

**Requested by**

Developer & KCC Agreements Team

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	0	Responses	0
----------------------	---	-----------	---

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Morewood Close - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	63	Responses	0
----------------------	----	-----------	---

As there were no responses, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Edenbridge	Reference	Amend 2-19
Location	Hilders Lane & Ashcombe Drive		
Ward	Edenbridge North & East		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Edenbridge - Hilders Lane & Ashcombe Drive - 070813		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to introduce new restrictions to prevent parking around the junction of Hilders Lane and Ashcombe Drive.

**Requested by**

Councillor Jill Davison

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	13	Responses	7 (53.8%)
In favour of proposals			3 (42.9%)
Not in favour			4 (57.1%)

Cllr Jill Davison also commented on the proposal, that the restrictions were excessive and only “junction protection” was required.

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The responses received were mixed – some residents close to the junction welcomed restrictions, whilst others commented that the parking acted as a valuable speed-reducing measure. There were also concerns that parking could be displaced in to Ashcombe Drive.

Given these comments, we have reduced the extents of the proposed double yellow lines, and the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council’s website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Edenbridge – Hilders Lane & Ashcombe Drive A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	14	Responses	3 (7%)
In favour of proposals			2 (67%)
No view			1 (33%)

**TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries**

The responses were in favour of the proposal, though there was one that did not indicate a preference from a property further in to Ashcombe Drive, with concerns about potential parking displacement further in to the road.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

With any “junction protection” restrictions there is always a possibility of parking displacement in to the surrounding area, but parking at the side of a road, away from a junction is not uncommon, and is allowed where it does not cause an hazard or obstruction.

Given the lack of any objection during the formal consultation process, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Edenbridge	Reference	Amend 2-22
Location	Mill Hill (near Fairfield Close)		
Ward	Edenbridge South & West		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Edenbridge - Mill Hill - 260413		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to update the parking arrangements in Mill Hill near to the new access known as Fairfield Close to the development to the rear of Sheft's Croft.

**Requested by**

Developer and KCC Agreements Team

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	18	Responses	2 (11.1%)
In favour of proposals			1 (50%)
Not in favour			1 (50%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The objection commented that there were already restrictions at this access and that changes were unnecessary. However, this does not take in to account that there are more properties accessed by the new road, and that appropriate junction protection should be considered.

Accordingly, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Edenbridge – Mill Hill A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	18	Responses	0
----------------------	----	-----------	---

Edenbridge Town Council responded with “no comment” and Cllrs Orridge and Jill Davison both commented in favour of the proposal.

As the responses were in favour of the proposed changes and no objections were received, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-02
Location		Granville Road (near No.68)	
Ward		Town & St John's	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks - 68 Granville Road - 260713	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

No. 68 Granville Road is being redeveloped, and Kent Highways have given permission for a new vehicle access on to Granville Road. However, this new access requires the alteration of the existing permit parking bays in the road

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	26	Responses	1 (3.8%)
In favour of proposals			1 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks - 68 Granville Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	26	Responses	1 (4%)
Not in favour			1 (100%)

The one response was from a nearby resident, commenting that the parking change has reduced on-street parking by 2 spaces, and that with a minor alteration this could be reduced to the loss of one parking space.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The proposed changes to parking arrangements have been dictated by the layout of the vehicle crossover that Kent County Council had already given permission for, and that the resident of the property had already installed.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Whilst it may be desirable to maintain as much on-street parking as possible, reducing the loss of parking would affect the useability of the vehicle crossover and impinge on the householders right of access to the public highway.

Given that Kent County Council gave permission for the access, and thus established a right of access to the public highway, we cannot recommend other than to set aside the objection and to introduce the proposals as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-07
Location	Victoria Road (near Beech Road)		
Ward	Town & St John's		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - Victoria Road - 260413		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has received a request to alter the parking bays in Victoria Road as the property on the corner of Victoria Road and Beech Road has re-opened it's previously redundant rear vehicle access on to Victoria Road.

The existing parking arrangements need to be altered to reflect this re-opened access.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	35	Responses	4 (11.4%)
In favour of proposals			3 (75%)
Not in favour			1 (25%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

Even though there was one objection, there is little grounds for the Council to do other than promote the change, as the applicant already has a right of access to the public highway that we have to accommodate.

Accordingly, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Victoria Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	35	Responses	4 (11%)
In favour of proposals			2 (50%)
Not in favour			2 (50%)

The two objections to the proposals were on the grounds that the access provides off-street parking for one car, but at the loss of two on-street parking places, and that parking pressures in the road were already high..

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

Whilst I understand the objectors' concerns about parking pressure and the potential loss of parking, there is little that we can do to address this. The location of the access is too close to the junction on Beech Road to allow a parking bay to be maintained between the access and the existing junction protection double yellow lines.

Given the existing right of access to the Highway that the resident now wants to exercise, there is little choice to the Council but to set aside the objections and to introduce the proposals as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-13
Location	Crampton's Road		
Ward	Sevenoaks Northern		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - Cramptons Road - 190214		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to alter an existing disabled parking bay on Crampton's Road. This would enlarge the parking bay in line with current national standards.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	34	Responses	8 (23.5%)
In favour of proposals			3 (37.5%)
Not in favour			5 (62.5%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The comments received mixed, with more against the proposal than in favour.

We have to look at the issues raised in more detail. There were comments from residents that the disabled person that uses the bay has alternative parking facilities, that the bay is large enough already and that the bay is not used at all times. There were also comments on whether the disabled person met the criteria for a disabled parking bay.

However, we are not considering whether a bay should be provided – it was provided over 10 years ago - but whether an existing bay should be brought in line with current legislation and standards.

The fact is that the bay is too small to meet current standards, and we have a requirement to enlarge the bay to the appropriate size.

We also have a requirement to consult on such changes to traffic regulation orders, whether the proposal be popular with residents or not.

Accordingly, the proposal should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Cramptons Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	34	Responses	4 (12%)
In favour of proposals			1 (25%)
Not in favour			3 (75%)

The first objection was from a nearby resident that “the current space is perfectly adequate as parking in the road is already very congested”.

The second and third objections were on a similar basis, but made comments about the level of disability of the disabled resident.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

It is evident that parking in the area is at a premium and that residents are concerned about any loss of parking. It is also reasonably evident that some residents have personal issues with the disabled person – but this is not the subject of the parking proposal.

The need for a disabled parking bay is also not being consulted upon – there is a blue badge holding resident in the area who wants to use an existing disabled parking bay.

The issue relates to the size of the disabled parking bay, and as the resident has only asked for the bay to be marked at the size that current regulations currently prescribe, there is little choice to the Council but to set aside the objections and to introduce the proposals as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-14
Location		Moor Road	
Ward		Sevenoaks Northern	
Informal consultation plan ref.		Sevenoaks – Moor Road - 190214	
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to alter parking arrangements in Moor Road, as the existing restrictions were introduced to service the now redundant Ambulance Station.

We are also updating the restrictions to allow more on-street parking in some areas, but also to prevent parking on the corner, and in front of the former Ambulance Station site that is to be redeveloped.

**Requested by**

Developer

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	21	Responses	1 (4.8%)
In favour of proposals			1 (100%)

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Moor Road - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	21	Responses	5 (20%)
In favour of proposals			3 (60%)
Not in favour			2 (40%)

The first objection was from a nearby resident, on the basis that other residents in the road have been allowed to have driveways, which has reduced the availability of on-street parking and that more residents have more than one vehicle.

The second objection was also about parking pressures in the area.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The changes to the parking arrangements are being forced upon us by the redevelopment of the former Ambulance Station and the advice in the Highway Code about not parking on bends or where it would cause an obstruction.

The opportunity has also been taken to remove some existing single yellow line restrictions that are no longer required to free-up more kerb space for parking.

Given the permissions have already been given to the redevelopment of Ambulance Station, there is little choice to the Council but to set aside the objections and to introduce the proposals as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Swanley	Reference	Amend 2-16
Location	Sycamore Drive		
Ward	Swanley White Oak		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Swanley – Sycamore Drive - 020813		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to make alterations to the existing parking arrangements at the southern end of Sycamore Drive to improve traffic movements. The proposal is to reduce the parking bays slightly to allow more room for queuing traffic at the junction.

**Requested by**

KCC Councillor Brookbank

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	77	Responses	6 (7.8%)
In favour of proposals			5 (83.3%)
Not in favour			1 (16.7%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The majority of the comments received were in favour of the proposal, however the one comment not in favour was on the grounds that Sycamore Drive should be widened and the junction with Bartholomew Way be altered, to accommodate the additional traffic that was generated by the extension of St Bartholomew's RC school.

However, alterations to the layout of the public highway are beyond the scope of the review, and are outside the powers of the District Council – this would be an issue for the Highway Authority to consider, but is still not a reason for not adjusting the parking as proposed.

Accordingly, the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Swanley – Sycamore Drive - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	76	Responses	4 (5%)
In favour of proposals			1 (25%)

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Not in favour	3 (75%)
---------------	---------

All three of the objections request that the parking arrangements in Syvamore Drive are amended by reducing the footway and creating a new off-carriageway parking area (lay-by) as this would maintain parking and still remove the congestion.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

Whilst there may be merit in the provision of a parking lay-by on the eastern side of Sycamore Drive, this is outside the remit of the District Council and would be an issue for the Highway Authority to consider.

The proposed change to the Highway to help reduce congestion and obstruction whilst queuing to the junction of Bartholomew Way was originally requested by Councillor Brookbank in his role as Kent County Councillor for the area.

With this in mind it is recommended that the proposals are considered by the Joint Transportation Board, with emphasis given to the views of the Highway Authority, *and if the Highway Authority deem the congestion and obstruction issues sufficiently serious*, to set aside the objections and to introduce the proposals as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Edenbridge	Reference	Amend 2-20
Location	Hillcrest Road		
Ward	Edenbridge North & East		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Edenbridge – Hillcrest Road - 200214		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to extend the existing double yellow lines on the south side of Hillcrest Road to prevent parking on both sides of the road at the same time as this causes problems for traffic near to the junction with Main Road.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	10	Responses	6 (60%)
In favour of proposals			4 (66.67%)
No view			2 (33.33%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The responses were broadly in favour of the proposals, with two responses asking that the lines be extended further on the south side, and one asking that the obstruction problem related to drop-off for the nursery be addressed (by extending yellow lines on the north side)

Given the lack of objection at the informal consultation stage, the proposals should be extended and proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Edenbridge – Hillcrest Road A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	11	Responses	6 (54%)
In favour of proposals			5 (83%)
Not in favour			1 (17%)

Councillors Orridge and Mrs Davison commented in favour of the proposals. The Town Council commented in favour of the proposal for restrictions on the south side of the road, but not the north.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

The objection was that the changes would have very little effect and that we ought to consider the whole of Hillcrest Road and Highfields Road, and that the existing restrictions were frequently ignored, and that there were problems with pavement parking in Highfield Road.

Three responses echoed the Town Council's comments that the proposals should only be on the southern side of Hillcrest Road and the restrictions on the northern side should remain unchanged.

There was one response also requested that Hillcrest Road should be made in to a one-way street.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

At the informal consultation, we received a request to extend the restrictions on the northern side of the road, alongside the nursery and we included this in these proposals. However, it seems that this change does not have widespread support.

The request to make Hillcrest Road a one-way street is outside the remit of the District Council, and would need to be considered by Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

With this in mind it is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced as drawn, save for the deletion of proposal to extend the double yellow lines on the north side of the road.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Farningham	Reference	Amend 2-26
Location	High Street		
Ward	Farningham, Horton Kirby & South Darenth		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Farningham – High Street - 200214		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The existing bus stops are not enforceable, and there have been reported problems with cars parking in those areas that prevent the buses from getting to the stops.

**Requested by**

Bus operators and by observations from SDC's Civil Enforcement Officers

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	1 (3.2%)
Not in favour			1 (100%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The comment against the proposal was from a resident who did not want additional markings in the conservation area (though the main “bus stop” markings are already in place). The objector also went on to comment that the proposed bus stop restrictions would affect the business prospects of the pub and restaurant. However, the main point of their objection was actually about planning issues associated with redevelopment of the Farningham Mill site to residential properties and the potential overspill of parking.

The issues about the prospects of the pub and restaurant are addressed by the availability of other on-street parking nearby and the large pub car park.

The issue of additional markings in the conservation area is misleading – there should be no additional markings along the road – just the addition of a thicker “clearway” lines at the back of the existing bus stop cage markings. However, a bus stop clearway sign would be required at each bus stop, though this can be accommodated on the existing street furniture.

Accordingly it is recommended that the proposals proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Farningham – High Street - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	4 (13%)
In favour of proposals			3 (75%)
Not in favour			1 (25%)

Councillor Chetram commented in support of the proposal.

The one objection related to the use of the bus stops, and why the existing double yellow lines cannot already be enforced – and also suggestion that a red line be introduced. The objector also suggested that 1 hour’s parking should be allowed in the bus stops.

The objector also raised concerns about further signage in the conservation area, and that parking rarely occurred on the bridge, except for “special occasions”.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The objector raises points that are contrary to the intention of the restrictions – the bus companies have reported problems with obstructive parking, and the aim is to resolve this. Allowing parking in the bus stops for up to one hour would be directly in opposition to the reported problem.

The suggestion of a short length of red lines (instead of double yellow lines) is not possible as these are only available within the London metropolitan area.

With regard to the impact on the conservation area, the only change would be the introduction of a statutory “bus stop clearway” sign at each location, that could be mounted on the existing street furniture by each bus stop, and a minor alteration to the yellow lines on the road.

With this in mind it is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced as drawn

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-27
Location	The Drive (near No.53)		
Ward	Town & St John's		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Sevenoaks - The Drive - 130314		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

No. 53 The Drive is being redeveloped, and Kent Highways have given permission for a new vehicle access on to The Drive. However, this new access requires the alteration of the existing permit parking bays in the road

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	15	Responses	5 (33.3%)
In favour of proposals			3 (60%)
Not in favour			2 (40%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

As the Highway Authority has given permission for a new vehicle access to be constructed, the District Council has little choice other than to agree the alteration to the parking bays.

Some residents have chosen to take the opportunity to resurrect comments about the planning permissions that have already been granted, with discussion about the provision of a new access on to The Drive. However this is outside the scope of this proposal – the planning applications have already been determined, and the Highway Authority has given permission for the access.

There was also comment that the proposed access should not have double yellow lines in front of it – that a white line may be all that is necessary, and that a yellow line would detract from the visual appearance of the area.

The inclusion of yellow lines in front of the access reflect calls that we have had in neighbouring roads to introduce similar lines to prevent obstructive parking, and would enable the District to take action against any vehicles parked there. The double yellow lines are not essential to the access, but would prevent obstructive parking in the future.

Given the lengthy legal processes involved with the promotion of a traffic regulation order, it would seem better to introduce restrictions to deter obstruction and enable enforcement at the this stage when we are already engaged in the process, rather than potentially regret the omission of yellow lines in the near future, and not be able to

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

address the problem for some years, and at public expense rather than at the expense of the applicant.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

### Formal Consultation

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – The Drive - 260614

### Formal Consultation Summary

Properties consulted	15	Responses	6 (40%)
In favour of proposals			2 (33%)
Not in favour			3(50%)
No view			1(17%)

There was a strong response to this consultation, suggesting that parking in the area is of concern, both for those who want to park and for those who have problems with the parking and obstruction.

The resident at No.134 London Road commented had commented previously about concerns about their driveway (on to The Drive) becoming obstructed, and to address this we included double yellow lines in front of this access in this consultation. However, in their response to this consultation, they have asked for this element to be deleted.

### Analysis and Officer Recommendation

The proposed changes to parking arrangements have been dictated by the layout of the vehicle crossover that Kent County Council had already given permission for, and that the resident of the property had already installed.

Whilst it may be desirable to maintain as much on-street parking as possible, reducing the loss of parking would affect the useability of the vehicle crossover and impinge on the householders right of access to the public highway.

Given that Kent County Council gave permission for the access, and thus established a right of access to the public highway, we cannot recommend other than to set aside the objection and to introduce the proposals as drawn, save for the omission of the double yellow lines across the rear access to No.134 London Road.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Sevenoaks	Reference	Amend 2-06
Location	Barrack Corner area		
Ward	Town & St John's and Sevenoaks Eastern		

**Issue**

We received a request from Cllr Walshe as one of the ward members for the Sevenoaks Eastern ward to look at parking issues around Barrack Corner, with the aim of addressing issues raised by local businesses about parking difficulties for their customers.

The Barrack Corner area has a number of retail premises and offices, as well as a recently opened child care facility. These commercial ventures have asked if there are options for providing more parking opportunities.

**Requested by**

Local businesses and Cllr Walshe

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Sevenoaks – Barrack Corner area - 021014

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	119	Responses	25 (21%)
In favour of proposals			11 (44%)
Not in favour			6 (24%)
No view			8 (32%)

Cllr Walshe and Cllr Purves (who both represent the Sevenoaks Eastern ward) commented on the proposals, broadly in support, but with some suggested alterations.

Cllr Walshe thought the alteration of yellow lines in Cobden Road unnecessary, and that the removal of the parking controls on the west side of Dartford Road would encourage commuter parking.

Cllr Purves echoed the comments from Cllr Walshe, but added that 1 hour limited waiting was probably not long enough, and that those areas proposed for 1 hour limited waiting should be 2 hour instead.

There were other comments, suggestions and objections, but these tended to be outside the scope of this review, or not within the gift of the District Council, such as erecting signs indicating that Holly Bush Lane is unsuitable for larger vehicles, or that St John's Road and Bradbourne Road should become one-way.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

There was some detailed analysis of the parking situation done by a local resident, who compiled a constructive report on the issues. This identified some additional areas on the periphery of the Barrack Corner area where parking could be “squeezed” in.

The areas identified had already been considered, but the changes are not recommended.

- Creating additional parking on the south side of Mount Harry Road  
*This is problematic with the existing bus stop and property accesses.*
- Extending the parking area northwards towards Mount Harry Road on the west side of Dartford Road  
*This is a problem as northbound vehicle speeds are high and the approach from Mount Harry Road is uphill – this affects the ability for vehicles to turn out of Mount Harry Road, and the longer than standard double yellow lines are to provide sufficient visibility.*
- Creating one parking place in the lay-by on the eastern side of Dartford Road  
*This could generate one space, but would affect bus movements. It had been suggested that the bus stop could relocate slightly towards the town centre and this would free-up most of the lay-by for parking, though this is outside the scope of the review.*
- Providing an extended additional parking area on Bradbourne Road  
*This is an issue if the road remains available for two-way traffic, something that is not within the gift of the District Council.*
- Child centre car park used for public parking on Saturdays  
*This is not within our gift.*
- An extra bay on Hollybush Lane (prior to Cobden Road)  
*This would depend on the formalisation (adoption) of the area on the corner of Avalon music – whilst this is stated to be available it needs to be on a permanent basis.*
- Extending double yellow lines in to Bethel Road  
*This is beyond the remit of this review. The Council has previously proposed changes in this area but received objections about the loss of parking.*
- Extending parking bays on Holly Bush Lane up towards The Fiveways  
*This could be considered given the one-way nature of Holly Bush Lane, if a review of the Fiveways junction was proposed.*
- Additional parking bay restrictions could be created on Vine Court Road  
*The District had introduced this, but was asked to remove them by the local members.*

Additionally there were comments about parking in Cedar Terrace Road, and a request for restrictions to provide some form of priority for residents, along with comments that introducing limited waiting on Holly Bush Lane (rather than uncontrolled parking) would disadvantage residents of Cedar Terrace Road who often park there.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

It seems to be accepted that there are parking issues in the area and a will to try and resolve these.

It is suggested that the comments from Councillors Walshe and Purves are taken on-board and the proposals altered accordingly, i.e;

- The restriction on the parking bays in Dartford Road should be retained.
- The 1 hour limited waiting parking bays should become 2 hour limited waiting
- The proposed change in Cobden Road should be abandoned

As these changes are either the omission of a proposal, or the relaxation of a restriction, it is not thought necessary to re-advertise a new proposal.

Accordingly it is recommended that the discussed alterations are made to the proposals and that they are implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Swanley	Reference	Amend 2-17
Location	Oakleigh Close		
Ward	Swanley White Oak		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Swanley – Oakleigh Close - 190913		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to introduce new parking restrictions in to Oakleigh Close to prevent obstructive parking on the access road in to the area and at the junction.

**Requested by**

Local resident

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	124	Responses	11 (8.9%)
In favour of proposals			10 (90.9%)
Not in favour			1 (8.9%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The one comment against the proposal actually commented that parking either side of the access to Kennet Court caused problems – suggestive that the resident circled the wrong option on the form.

Two residents asked that the restrictions be taken further, and accordingly we have amended the proposals to include single yellow lines to prevent all-day parking.

Accordingly, the proposals have been adjusted to include yellow lines for one hour during the day, Monday to Friday to prevent all-day parking, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Swanley – Oakleigh Close A - 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	124	Responses	18 (14.5%)
In favour of proposals			7 (39%)
Not in favour			9 (50%)
No view			2(11%)

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

There was a strong response to this consultation, suggesting that parking in the area is of concern, both for those who want to park and for those who have problems with the parking and obstruction.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The proposals required detailed analysis as to the location of the responders, and this produced a relatively clear pattern. Most of those who objected to the proposals were in the main part of Oakleigh Close, whilst most who supported the changes were in the access road in to the Close. This tends to confirm the issues that were initially reported about parking on the access road.

There was also an objection from the nearby school, as Oakleigh Close was being used by their staff to park all day (a problem that residents had also highlighted).

Whilst we have to consider the objections, we have to remember the purpose of the public highway – to allow vehicles to pass and re-pass, and that parking is only tolerated where it does not cause an obstruction, and whilst residents and those working at the local school may wish to park, if it causes a problem then we have to consider the appropriate response.

Given that the majority of the objections were from the main part of Oakleigh Close, the proposed slight extension of the double yellow lines alongside No's 9 and 49 could be omitted, but the rest of the restrictions should be implemented to maintain access.

With this in mind it is recommended that the objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced as drawn, save for the extension of the double yellow lines alongside No's 9 & 49.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Crockenhill	Reference	Amend 2-18
Location	Broadway		
Ward	Crockenhill & Well Hill		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Crockenhill – Broadway - 200214		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request from the Parish Council to make adjustments to the parking bays in Broadway to support the local businesses.

We were asked to look at reducing the length of stay (to allow more parking turnover for the local shops) and to extend the restrictions in to the evening period.

**Requested by**

Local businesses and the Parish Council

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	33	Responses	4 (12.1%)
In favour of proposals			3 (75%)
No view			1 (25%)

The Parish Council and the local District Councillor for the area, Cllr Lindsay were in favour of the proposal.

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

The comments received were broadly in favour of the proposals at the informal consultation stage, however, there was a request from the Parish Council, one of the local shops and the District Councillor for the area that the restrictions start earlier in the day (7am).

There was also a request from one of the local shops to have a parking permit for the area, as they wanted to park their commercial vehicle in the parking bays. However, this defeats the objective of maintaining the parking bays as short-stay parking for customers, and should not be taken forward. It may be that the business may need to make alternative arrangements for parking their van.

Accordingly, the proposals should be adjusted to start earlier, and proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Crockenhill - Broadway A – 260614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	33	Responses	2 (6%)
Not in favour		2 (100%)	

The formal consultation responses were surprising given the previous favourable comments at the informal consultation stage, and the previously stated support from the Parish Council and Cllr Lindsay.

One of the objections was from a nearby resident on the grounds that *“if any of the shops in future should offer a service i.e. hairdresser, beauticians etc, an hour’s parking would not be sufficient”* and that extending the restrictions to the evening, when the last shop closed at 7pm was unnecessary, and changing the restrictions was a waste of money.

One objection was from a business in Broadway, querying the reason for the change, and that having canvassed the local businesses, none seemed to have asked for any change. The objector also went on to comment that starting the restrictions at 7am was unnecessary as the first premises opens at 7:30am, and the stores close at 7pm (save for the Indian takeaway that closes later).

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The objections (that the changes are not necessary and a waste of money) are relatively weak – one relates to a potential change in businesses in the future and one cannot understand the need for the change.

However, given the lack of any other response during the formal consultation process, it is recommended that the objections are upheld and the proposals are abandoned.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Edenbridge	Reference	Amend 2-21
Location	Main Road & Brownings		
Ward	Edenbridge North & East		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Edenbridge – Main Road & Brownings - 070813		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The Council has had a request to update the parking arrangements in Main Road and around the junction of Brownings, to prevent parking near to junctions and to remove any redundant restrictions.

The restrictions on the west side of Main Road (near No.1) can be reduced to allow more parking as they originally reflected the need to protect the turning movements of vehicle in to and out of the former Dairy site. The proposals also deter parking on the narrow entrance in to Brownings.

**Requested by**

Local resident and Town Council

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	36	Responses	39 (108.3%)
In favour of proposals			4 (10.3%)
Not in favour			34 (87.2%)
No view			1 (2.6%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

There was a very strong response to the consultation, strongly against the proposal for increasing parking on the west side of Main Road, south of the Hilders Lane junction, and also against the restrictions in to Brownings.

There were also comments against the proposed double yellow lines on the east side of the road as this would affect the local shop's passing trade.

There were also objections to the establishment of a disabled parking bay on the west side of Main Road, but this is in response to a valid application from a disabled resident.

There was recognition for the need of some restrictions around the junction of Main Road and Brownings, but that these should not extend too far in to Brownings.

We have adjusted the proposals so that only standard junction protection is proposed for Brownings, along with a disabled parking bay outside The Row and a short length of double yellow lines on the hatched area on the west side of Main Road, south of The Row.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Accordingly, the proposals have been amended and reduced, and should proceed to formal consultation.

### Formal Consultation

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Edenbridge – Main Road & Brownings A - 260614

### Formal Consultation Summary

Properties consulted	62	Responses	15 (23%)
In favour of proposals			8 (53%)
Not in favour			7 (47%)

Councillors Orridge commented in support of the proposals, and Cllr Davison commented echoing the comments of the Town Council, suggesting that there was no need for the proposed double yellow lines on the west side of Main Road, near to Firs Lodge.

Edenbridge Town Council commented with no objection to the proposals in Brownings, and that the proposed double yellow lines on the west side of the Main Road should be long enough to cover the access to The Stables and Firs Lodge, but no further.

The objections covered a number of points;

- That the proposed yellow lines in Brownings go too far, and should only be 1.5m long,
- That the proposed yellow lines in Brownings do not go far enough, as there are problems with obstructive parking
- That the proposed yellow lines should only be single yellow lines, so that residents can park in the evenings
- That the proposed disabled parking bay is unnecessary, as residents didn't feel that there was a suitably disabled person in the area
- That the existing yellow lines on Main Road should be reduced to allow more parking.
- That the parking in front of The Row should be controlled by permits, one issued to each property.
- That the parking restriction at the entrance to Firs Lodge is unnecessary, and the loss of facility to park adjacent to the access was a problem that would affect residents.

### Analysis and Officer Recommendation

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

The proposal for double yellow lines on the western side of Main Road echoes the existing white hatch markings (installed by KCC to deflect traffic past parked vehicles in front of The Row), and maintains visibility to oncoming vehicles for vehicles emerging from the properties. Some residents may enjoy parking in this area, but it creates visibility issues for others. The argument that this will significantly effect the property values should not be considered valid, as the parking was never part of the property, and there is alternative parking less than 20m away, but given the comments from the residents and the local Member, the restriction could be omitted.

However, the white hatching would remain at this location as it is not part of the District's remit, and residents should be aware of the requirements of the Highway Code not to enter or park in hatched areas, and where visibility could be compromised.

The comments relating to the length of yellow lines in Brownings are in direct opposition to each other, showing the difference in opinion between those who want to park and those who want (and have a right of) access, as well as the minimum design standards for "junction protection" on the public highway that would be supported by the Police.

The comments suggesting that the yellow lines should be single yellow lines, (allowing parking overnight) is also in conflict with the calls for restrictions to maintain access and visibility.

The objections on the grounds that there is not a disabled person in the area should not be taken forward. Whilst we cannot distribute the personal details of a disabled resident, the Council has received an application for a disabled parking bay from a resident who meets the criteria for such a bay on the public highway as set out by Kent County Council, and comments about parking pressures in the area actually reinforce the importance of providing a facility for someone with mobility issues to enable them to park close to their property.

The call for the existing yellow lines on Main Road to be reduced was explored at the informal consultation stage, where approximately 3 more cars could have been accommodated, but this element attracted considerable opposition.

The call for permits to be issued to residents of The Row should not be taken forward – the purpose of a permit parking scheme is to provide priority for residents against a daytime influx of non-resident parking, and not to "ration" spaces amongst residents. A permit scheme is not appropriate to address issues where ultimate parking capacity has been reached by residents, and would only serve to introduce an annual charge to residents with no increases in parking capacity or opportunity.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the objections are noted, particularly those from the local members, and the proposals are reduced by the deletion of the proposed double yellow lines on the west side of Main Road, and the amended proposals are introduced.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Edenbridge	Reference	Amend 2-23
Location	Mill Hill, Ashbys Close, Victoria Road & Waterlakes		
Ward	Edenbridge South & West		
Informal consultation plan ref.	Edenbridge - Mill Hill 2 - 290513		
Informal consultation start	22nd March 2014	Informal consultation end	18th April 2014

**Issue**

The District Council has had a request to update the parking restrictions in Mill and around the junctions of Ashbys Close, Victoria Road and Waterlakes, as the existing single yellow lines are outdated and do not extend far enough at the junctions.

**Requested by**

Sevenoaks District Councillor Orridge and local residents

**Informal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	62	Responses	31 (50%)
In favour of proposals			14 (45.2%)
Not in favour			17 (54.8%)

**Officer Recommendation after informal consultation**

There was a strong response to the consultation – particularly from residents of Katherine Villas and Katherine Road who have no alternative parking, objecting to the proposals.

However there were comments in favour of the proposals from the roads where parking had displaced to – Waterlakes, Victoria Road and Ashbys Close.

The proposals have been adjusted to retain some of the existing single yellow lines on Mill Hill, but also retaining (and in some cases extending) junction protection double yellow lines around the entrances to the cul-de-sacs.

The changes reflect the advice in the Highway Code about not causing an obstruction or parking near to junctions, and accordingly the amended proposals should proceed to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Edenbridge – Mill Hill 2 A - 260614

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	62	Responses	21 (34%)
In favour of proposals			11 (52%)
Not in favour			9 (43%)
No view			1 (5%)

The Town Council commented that the proposals should only be the statutory minimum on the corners. Councillor Orridge, who had previously supported the proposals, wanted the restrictions scaled-back, as the recent alterations to the public highway with the introduction of a new footway in the High Street had already reduced the available parking in the area.

From the responses there it is evident that there are parking problems in the area, both of obstructive parking, and of residential properties that have no off-street parking.

Generally there was support for the changes from the residents who had problem parking outside their homes, and opposition from those with no off-street facility (or who lived in properties with no road access at all).

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

It is recommended that a balanced approach is taken to the parking issues in the area – where possible parking should be maintained, but where the Highway Code suggests parking should not occur, this should be prevented.

It is proposed that the restrictions are adjusted as follows;

**Ashbys Close** – restrictions introduced as drawn

**Waterlakes** – double yellow lines on the north side for 10m from the junction of Mill Hill, and on the south side as drawn

**Victoria Road** – double yellow lines on both sides for 10m from the junction of Mill Hill, and 6m on the south side at the bend to prevent obstructive parking.

**Mill Hill** – double yellow lines for 10m either side of each junction.

This would provide junction protection restrictions and protect the areas where obstructive parking occurs, but would maintain as much parking as possible. As each adjustment is a reduction to the proposal, it is not felt necessary to re-advertise as a new proposal.

It is recommended that the proposals are reduced as discussed, the objections are noted and set aside, and the changes implemented as a practical solution to the parking issues in the area, though they may not meet all the requirements of each party.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Farningham	Reference	Amend 2-25
Location	Teardrop Centre		
Ward	Farningham, Horton Kirby & South Darenth		

**Issue**

Kent County Council operates a Highways Depot at the end of the access to the Teardrop Centre.

This depot is required for emergency responses to incidents on the Highway and for winter maintenance. Unfortunately there are problems with parking on the access road that can obstruct the vehicles responding to emergencies.

Due to the essential need to prevent obstructive parking at any time of the day, we are taking the unusual step of proposing restrictions to prevent parking and loading at all times in the areas where obstructive parking occurs, as this will enable effective enforcement.

**Requested by**

Kent County Council, who asked that due to the nature of the problems the issue be taken directly to formal consultation.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Farningham – Teardrop Centre - 070714

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	5	Responses	0
----------------------	---	-----------	---

No responses were received from the businesses in the area, but Cllr Chetram responded in support of the proposals.

Farningham Parish Council submitted comments on the proposals, but these were received outside of the consultation period. Their comments were that the proposals needed re-thinking following the recent closure of one of the commercial premises in the area, and that the proposals would not serve any purpose.

With regard to the Parish's comments – the introduction of restrictions to prevent obstruction is at the request of the Highway Authority, and reflects problems that they have already experienced. The closure of one of the businesses in the area may have a beneficial effect on traffic movements, but the obstruction issues could still arise,

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

affecting emergency response times and the parking impact of any new business that may take on the vacant property also needs to be considered.

Due to the type of restriction proposed, any substantive objection received during the statutory consultation period would be the trigger for a Public Enquiry, but as the Parish's response was outside of the published consultation, we are not obliged to carry out a formal public enquiry.

As there were no responses within the declared consultation period, it is recommended that the out-of-time response from the Parish be considered, but set aside, and the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Westerham	Reference	Amend 2-28
Location	Bartlett Road & Delagarde Road		
Ward	Westerham & Crockham Hill		

**Issue**

Bartlett Road and Delagarde Road are narrow cul-de-sacs off Croydon Road in Westerham. Residents of the roads have complained about non-resident parking during the day, as drivers try to avoid the parking charges that apply in Croydon Road.

Residents have asked that Bartlett Road and Delagarde Road be added to the existing W2 permit parking area, so that non-resident parking in the roads is controlled..

**Requested by**

Residents of both Bartlett Road and Delagarde Road.

**Informal consultation**

In 2013 we carried out a survey of residents in Bartlett Road, Delagarde Road and The Paddock to establish whether there was support for those roads to join the neighbouring permit parking scheme. The residents of Bartlett Road and Delagarde Road indicated that they would want to join the scheme, but the residents of The Paddock declined.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Westerham – Bartlett Road & Delagarde Road – 270614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	35	Responses	6 (17%)
In favour of proposals			4 (66.7%)
			1 (16.7%)
No view			1 (16.7%)

Westerham Town Council have responded in favour of the proposal.

The objection was that the restrictions were unnecessary in Bartlett Road, that the long-stay parkers generally arrive after the everyone has left for work, and go by the time people return, and that residents did not want the additional expense.

The “no view” response suggested that they were in favour of the proposal, but that the proposed double yellow lines in Delagarde Road (to prevent obstruction on the narrow entrance road) should be reduced.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The objection actually confirms that long-stay parking occurs in Bartlett Road, and this is what the other residents have raised as an issue. Whilst it is understood that an additional expense on residents is not popular, the additional parking protection should be a significant advantage.

The proposal for double yellow lines in the narrow access in to Delagarde Road is intended to prevent obstructive parking and the need for vehicles to “bump-up” on the footway to pass parked vehicles that would cause an obstruction, and to ease turning movements for vehicles turning in and out of the garage area.

Accordingly it is recommended that the objection is set aside and the comments are noted, and the restrictions are implemented as proposed.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Westerham	Reference	Amend 2-29
Location	The Green		
Ward	Westerham & Crockham Hill		

**Issue 1**

Kent Police have asked for the existing parking bay for police vehicles at the western end of The Green be relocated and enlarged, as it is currently only suitable for police cars, and not for larger police vehicles.

**Issue 2**

The Town Council have asked that the parking bays on the south side of the northern arm of The Green be altered to create a gap at the end of the footpath across The Green, as this would assist pedestrians and wheelchair users in crossing.

**Requested by**

Kent Police and Westerham Town Council.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Westerham – The Green - 270614

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	27	Responses	6 (22%)
In favour of proposals			2 (33%)
Not in favour			2 (33%)
No view			2 (33%)

The Town Council responded in favour of the change at the end of the footpath across The Green, but questioned whether the changes to the Police bay were required as the Police no longer used a mobile police station in the area.

The Police responded that they wished to continue with the proposal as when they had an operational need to park a larger vehicle in the area (whether the mobile police station or not) it was problematic to fit in the existing bay and a larger facility was required.

The responses against, or of no view related to concerns over the loss of parking on The Green by the introduction of a gap in the run of bays, and the potential obstruction to visibility that a vehicle in the proposed Police bay would cause. There was also a request to make the area that is proposed for a police bay into a loading bay for the local businesses (contrary to their prior argument about visibility).

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The proposal to adjust the parking bays alongside The Green is a minor change, reducing the parking bays by 2m. With the parking being distributed along a length, there should not be a significant loss to parking, whilst providing a better facility for pedestrians and people with mobility issues.

The Police's case for a relocated parking bay is valid to support their operational requirements, and the concerns about any obstruction to visibility needs to be set against the likely occupancy rate of the bay, which is likely to be relatively low.

Accordingly, it is proposed that the comments and objections are set aside and the proposals are introduced as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Westerham	Reference	Amend 2-30
Location	Black Eagle Close		
Ward	Westerham & Crockham Hill		

**Issue**

The District Council has had a request to address problems associated with obstructive parking in Black Eagle Close, where vehicles park on both sides and cause problems accessing the car parks to the commercial premises in the area.

**Requested by**

Local businesses and residents

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Westerham – Black Eagle Close – 200814

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	47	Responses	17 (36%)
In favour of proposals			12 (70%)
Not in favour			3 (18%)
No view			2 (12%)

The Town Council commented that residents felt that more double yellow lines were not necessary and would make the situation worse – and that vehicles might displace into the residential part of the cul-de-sac. The Town Council felt that the existing yellow lines should be extended slightly on both sides to improve sightlines.

Some objectors commented that they did not feel that there was an obstruction problem and that the proposals were unnecessary.

Residents also echoed the comment from the Town Council that parking might displace to the residential properties.

Some of the comments in favour of the proposal asked for additional restrictions in the cul-de-sac part of the close.

Some residents commented that should the restrictions be introduced, there would also need to be a free residents permit scheme for the cul-de-sac.

One resident commented that the proposals should be for single yellow lines rather than double yellow lines as this would deal with the day-time parking issue, but also

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

commented that there have been many times when refuse collection vehicles have not been able to collect, and a couple of occasions where ambulances were unable to attend properties.

One resident commented that the proposals were most necessary, and that all the residential properties in the road had designated parking areas/spaces/garages.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The proposals have been designed to be the minimum necessary to maintain access, so that as much on-street parking as possible can be maintained. I understand resident's concerns about parking displacing in to the cul-de-sac, but this is a much less significant problem to the obstruction of the road, especially as residents all have their own parking facilities.

It may be that in time a resident's parking scheme might be considered for the cul-de-sac parts of Black Eagle Close, but residents are likely to balk at the annual charge, as would not be eligible for the lower priced permits due to their off-street parking.

It is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced as drawn.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Westerham	Reference	Amend 2-31
Location	The Paddock		
Ward	Westerham and Crockham Hill		

**Issue**

We have had a request from a blue-badge holding resident for a disabled parking bay on the public highway in The Paddock.

As the resident meets the criteria for a disabled parking bay on the Highway, and the area is regularly used by school parents picking-up and dropping off for the nearby school, we are proposing the installation of an enforceable disabled parking bay.

**Requested by**

Local blue badge holding resident.

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Westerham – The Paddock - 021014

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	18	Responses	1 (6%)
In favour of proposals			1(100%)

As there were no objections, it is recommended that the proposals should (subject to the agreement of the Portfolio Holder) be implemented.

## TRO 2013 Amendment 2 – Location Summaries

Town	Westerham	Reference	Amend 2-32
Location	Farley Nursery		
Ward	Westerham & Crockham Hill		

**Issue**

We received a request from residents of Farley Nursery to address the problem of obstructive parking in the entrance road to Farley Nursery and around the junction of Westbury Terrace.

**Requested by**

Local residents

**Formal Consultation**

Formal Consultation was carried out on the proposals, from 13<sup>th</sup> November to 7<sup>th</sup> December 2014, with letters to frontagers, notices on-street and in the local newspaper and documents on deposit at the Council Offices. The proposals were also shown on the Council's website.

Formal consultation plan ref: Westerham – Farley Nursery – 180914

**Formal Consultation Summary**

Properties consulted	31	Responses	23 (74%)
In favour of proposals			6 (26%)
Not in favour			14 (61%)
No view			3 (13%)

The Town Council commented that it had received representations from a number of residents, none of whom supported the proposals and accordingly the Town Council did not support the proposal.

There were a number of response from the residents of Farley Nursery and Westbury Terrace, and a number from residents outside of the proposals in New Street.

There was support for the proposals, mainly from properties in the cul-de-sac that have to run the gauntlet of the parking, and opposition mainly from the residents of Westbury Terrace and New Street who did not want to lose the parking facility.

**Analysis and Officer Recommendation**

The proposals have been designed to be the minimum necessary to maintain access, so that as much on-street parking as possible can be maintained. I understand resident's concerns about the loss of parking, but the purpose of the public highway is to allow travel, not for the storage of vehicles.

Though it is against the wishes of the Town Council and the majority of those who responded, access to properties along the public highway has to be taken as its primary

purpose, and it is recommended that the objections be set aside and the proposals be introduced as drawn.