

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

Chevening Road Proposal

Proposal 1	A 10-space “dual use” parking bay on the west side of Chevening Road near its junction with the A25 Main Road	
Informal Consultation Summary		
For	Against	No Comment
9 (28%)	23 (72%)	3

Church Road Proposal

Proposal 2	A 7-space “dual use” parking bay on the east side of Church Road north of its junction with the A25 Main Road	
Informal Consultation Summary		
For	Against	No Comment
8 (28%)	21 (72%)	6

Church Road Proposal

Proposal 3	New double yellow lines (no parking at any time) on the east side of Church Road at the junction with the A25 Main Road	
Informal Consultation Summary		
For	Against	No Comment
16 (52%)	15 (48%)	4

Officer Comments:

72% of the respondents who expressed a view were opposed to the introduction of “dual use” parking bays in Chevening Road and Church Road.

A very slight majority of the respondents who expressed a view were in favour double yellow lines on the east side at the junction with the A25.

The highway authority, Kent County Council, would have to decide whether double yellow lines are required in isolation of the abovementioned “dual use” parking bay proposals.

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

Officer Recommendation:	That the proposed “dual use” parking bays for Chevening Road and Church Road are not progressed to a formal (statutory) consultation. That Kent County Council officers be asked to investigate whether there is a requirement for them to introduce the proposed double yellow lines on the east side of Church Road at the junction with the A25 in isolation of the “dual use” parking bays.
--------------------------------	--

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA THE ONLINE SURVEY AND E MAIL

No.	Response Text
1	<p>Whilst the original conception appeared to be sound in theory residents who have no forecourt or garage feel that it is an imposition to only provide 7 bays when there are at least 20 cars in use in Church Road. Therefore they would be paying for something which is not guaranteed! Whilst we agree with a double yellow line 5 m rather than 10 particularly when the police will not ticket anyone and likewise the traffic wardens. Illegal parking on this corner is a hazard to motorists! All the other three corners on this junction have a double yellow! However, we still need to clarify this issue of the dropped kerb outside no. 3 and 5. We must reiterate that this dropped kerb has been in place for OVER 30 years. Car drivers have been ticketed and harassed over the past months since you have decided in your wisdom that this is now a mobility access!!! None of us now know what you intend to impose here - a blank on the consultation. If a non resident happens to park there - are they going to be ticketed, or as has been the case are only the occupants on no. 3 and 5 able to park there? A complete muddle. To have an unsuspecting person arrive and park there and then get a ticket when the house owners do not is unbelievable! That kerb was NEVER INTENDED for the purpose which you seem to want to propose! In that case the residents in Church Road would be subjected to another two lost parking places. Most of all this parking problem arises from offices in Main Road parking here all day because they have insufficient office parking to the detriment of local business and residents.. The same problem caused by the same company has arisen in Bessels Green! .</p>
2	<p>"The Parish Council see the need for the parking to be reviewed within Sundridge. However, we are opposed to the plans, as presented. The Parish Council had a large representation at our meeting regarding this matter. We feel that more community engagement would be beneficial to resolve this matter."</p>
3	<p>This seems an unnecessary expense and will push parking into other areas causing blockages at peak times, especially for emergency vehicles and dustcarts.</p>
4	<p>"The parking proposals if done as it says, in my opinion, will make things worse for residents in the surrounding roads by pushing 'outsiders' further away. You will be penalising local residents by charging them for something that they currently don't pay for - and not even a 'nominal fee' either! On the small number of occasions that residents cannot park easily in their road is not going to be remedied by charging them as this will not guarantee them a space still. There won't be the same number of residents' passes sold for the number of corresponding spaces available so you will be making extra money on the back local residents who still won't be able to find a space. What we should be looking at is providing more parking for everyone - not an easy fix but surely one worth looking at? Visitors parking vouchers only last for 2 hours (?); so, if someone has family around for lunch then they will be clock-watching all the time. What about if they stay for the day? The only benefit would be for the shoppers I think. The only part that I agree with is to put double yellow lines on the corner of Church Road as this will make sure that the corner is kept free of parked vehicles and safer for all road users and pedestrians. "</p>
5	<p>"I do not agree with dual use bays as I don't think residents will benefit from them. theres approx. 20 cars belonging to residents so with only 7 spaces guaranteed who will want the additional cost of a permit when we will all have to park in Chapmans road most of the time anyway. No dual use space intended for outside my house so whats going to happen? can anyone park there and keep getting</p>

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

	tickets because of the dropped kerb? I want more information. DYL are totally unnesseccary. I do agree to the DYL for the 5m length on the corner of Church Road. "
6	"We object to the Chevening Road scheme on the following grounds: This scheme will just transfer a problem to other areas, such as Combe Bank Drive, which will be seen as a free parking option to both residents in Chevening Road and for the local businesses. This will cause severe blockages along the lane leading to Combe Bank School due to the parking in a narrow lane. The congestion here is bad enough anyway at school times. It could also cause congrstion further up Cheveing Road, where the parking will be free. This could also cause the same problem up Church Road. It seems very arbitrary to charge for ten random spaces, when cars will just be parked elsewhere and drivers will not use the designated bays. It seems unfair to charge local residents in Chevening Road now for parking and also workers in Sundridge businesses.
7	Not enough parkings bays. No guarantee that even if I get a permit that I can park. Just another cost.
8	The other problem that drivers face in Church Road is the parking from the turning to the church to the blind bend beyond the school.It may not be possible to reduce the parking particularly during school terms and in the morning as children are dropped off and in the afternoon when they are picked up. The number of near misses that happen daily would be reduced if there were signs beyond the corner warning of oncoming traffic approaching from the other direction. The 30 mile speed limit set further up the road is often obscured by foliage an regularly ignored with the result that vehicles approaching from the Ide Hill direction enter the bend to fast.
9	"Whilst I recognise that it is necessary to promote safety on the corner of Church Road and support local business, I strongly disagree with the proposal to limit parking as proposed in both Chevening Road and Church Road for the following reasons: 1.This reduces the number of parking spaces for an already overstretched parking area. Outside of normal working hours ALL the current spaces are regularly used - and therefore needed. Where are these residents expected to park if the number of bays are reduced? 2. The problem is not resolved by this proposal. It merely moves the problem to other streets in Sundridge, namely Chapmans Road, which will inevitably cause further parking difficulties in an already overcrowded road and no doubt disadvantage many more including those elderly and disabled residents in accommodations at the eastern end of Chapmans Road. 3. Paying for on-street resident parking with too few bays and therefore no guarantee of being able to park could be construed as purely income generation. 4. Having attended Sundridge and Ide Hill parish council meeting, this seems to have been proposed by one parish councillor with no consultation with the residents of Church Road or Chevening Road. It seems that he lives in Church Road and parks in this area and he would therefore appear to have a conflict of interest. Furthermore, as far as I can ascertain, residents in this area through custom and practice have ""self-managed"" their parking for a long time, ie. if there are no spaces available, they park elsewhere."
10	For the last few months parking on Chevening Road has not been a problem as the office behind us has been empty. When it was over capacity with workers then it was often difficult to park between 9am and 5pm. In the future if the majority of office workers park in their car park then parking on Chevening Road should not be an issue. We've lived on Chevening Road for over 6 years and for 90% of the time the parking has been OK. We would like to wait and see what the plans for the

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

	office that Marker Study group occupied are and go from there. We are concerned at the cost of parking as we have more than one car and also the cost to our family and friends that visit. Would it not be possible to have a visitors pass instead of a book of tickets? as this could prove costly as we have many visitors. Why do the parking restrictions need to apply at weekends? The issue only arose Monday to Friday 9 to 5.
11	"Local residents find it difficult enough to park without extra restrictions. I moved here from Highgate, London, and the permits being proposed are more expensive than Camden, which is ridiculous. If anything, there should be some unnecessary double yellow lines removed. Also, there are Zigzags on Church Road, which not only cover a small garage and driveway, which is perfectly acceptable, but the whole width of a house, which gives one resident an exclusive space to park. Totally unnecessary. "
12	There is no need - parking has not been a major issue and this, it feels, is the result of specific, non-universal concerns and self interests. This is a conservation area and having bays and meters would be an eye sore without even guaranteeing parking for local residents.
13	I wish to rescind my previous submission as it has been brought to my attention that the demand for spaces greatly out weighs the availability and as such we would end up paying for parking with no guarantees of getting a space. As it is I can only park outside my own house a few times a month and to have to start paying for this "privilege" would not be in my interests.
14	I have several objections about proposal. Firstly, as far as I'm aware and based on consultations with my immediate neighbours, there's absolutely no support for this, bar one parish concillor, who lives on the same road. My understanding is that another member of Sevenoaks District Council is also backing this and doesn't even live in the area. Parking has never been an issue for me. If I can't park immediately outside my house, then I park around the corner in one of several areas. Secondly, I have been living in my property for over 7 years and I object, in principle, to having to pay to park my car outside my own house. Furthermore, I have absolutely no intention in doing so and will simply park elsewhere in the village because of this. Had this proposal been actioned when I was in the process of buying my house, I would not have moved into this village. Thirdly, the maths do not add up. At best, on my side of the road, there are about 7 slots in which to park but double the number of households. In a lot of these households there are couples who each have a car. Add to that your proposal to include local businesses too and you can see perfectly well this is ill conceived at best. I think that most people with a modicum of intelligence can see this proposal for what it is. Costs are being cut at the Council level and this is a pretty cynical attempt to provide an alternative means of raising revenue. Firstly, by asking people to now pay for a permit to park outside their own house and secondly, in the hope that people will not display a permit, so collect additional money in fines. I am pretty angry that this has gone to a proposal stage, without being consulted about that first. This proposal adds completely nothing. No extra bays. The numbers do not add up. No guarantee of a parking slot, so what is the point in paying for something I can currently do for free? No democratic consultation prior to this letter. All you will do is make things worse, by creating a problem and move it elsewhere in the village.
15	In my view the proposals do not go far enough to prevent the traffic chaos and danger at the junction. The parking bays will not reduce the problems of queuing traffic. It would solve the above problems if, where you show 'dual use' parking

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

	bay (blue) lines, they were made into Double yellow lines (red), i.e. on the west and east side of the A25. Residents, like myself would have to find alternative parking further up Chevening Rd or into Chapmans Rd
16	If you put double yellow lines we will not be able to park outside our house. We would lose 3 car parking spaces which would defeat the object of paying for permit
17	"The area available to park in this area needs to be reduced by increasing the number of double lines. As you approach the bend from the A25 in the direction of the entrance to the private school, it is currently necessary to drive over the centre line and rely on approaching traffic to be travelling slowly. The use of school buses accessing this road also causes problems. A mixture of your proposal and additional yellow lines would I believe be a safer approach. Furthermore drivers park on the road further down the road close to the bend and it is often necessary to stop rather unexpectedly. I would be concerned that displaced commuters may use this area. I use this route to access the A25 from my home in Chipstead to my work in Oxted since moving here last year and have been concerned regarding this."
18	"I think the proposals for parking restrictions north of the A25 on Chevening Road is a poor idea. It will only move the problem of cars parking in this area to another part of the local area, such as Coombe Bank Drive, which is already too narrow. The only likely users of the parking spaces on Chevening Road who are not residents or their guests are visitors to the White Horse, and the pub has adequate parking for its current requirements. The Council should have more regular traffic wardens checking that cars do not park too close to the Chevening Road/A25 junction, as this causes congestion with cars unable to turn into Chevening Road. Parking Charge Notices should be issued to offenders. I would also like to see a pedestrian crossing arrangement on the traffic lights, so there is safe passage for adults and children to cross the A25 safely in order to cross the road to walk to Sundridge school. The Council should have adopted more innovative planning policies, such as requiring use of the parking area at Sundridge House (former Chinese restaurant on A25)"
19	"I support the right of the residents to park on Church Road, Sundridge but would like the school and the parents of the children at the school to be able to park to drop off and collect their children safely from the school. At present this is barely possible due to the lack of parking on the road and the speed at which some cars drive down it. Although some of the parents are ignoring the requests, regarding the parking, from the school and residents this is a minority, and most of us parents try to get there as late as possible and leave as quickly as possible, therefore causing as little disruption as possible. Is there any possibility that provision can be made which will make it safer to get children to and from the car and school."
20	"As a long term local resident, it is appalling that we are now being asked to pay outside our own property. Part of the village charm is that we do not have to look out on to garish road signs and markings. This is a purely money making scheme, that only makes life more difficult for the residents of Church Road. Currently, there is no issue with availability of spaces or the duration/length of stay. I have always been able to park within eyesight of my property and have observed availability for passing trade and custom with regard to the two small shops at the end of the road, and for the hair dresser. Rest assured, that as a resident I would be the first to say if I was unable to park either in Church Road or Chevening Road. This is disgraceful and is not welcome with the vast majority of residents in

PARKING PROPOSALS CHEVENING ROAD AND CHURCH ROAD, SUNDRIDGE
Summary of Informal Consultation Responses and Officer
Recommendations/Comments

	Church Road. Who does this benefit? It is certainly not in the interest of residents as implied in the recent correspondence. By all means issue a permit, but charge us for it? Ridiculous!"
21	"I am undecided if the proposal will work in favor of the residents of Chevening Road or not. I am concerned there wont be enough bays to house all of the residents and local workers, especially if each household as 2 cars. If Chevening Road has 5 houses with 2 cars each, there isn't any space for guests or local workers. Or residents will be left without parking as another member of Chevening Road has a guest parking. I spoke to someone at Sevenoaks council and they stated that the left over bays on Chevening road would still be available without permits which is helpful but again this does not help if the all day parkers not associated with Chevening Road or the surrounding roads are still parking there. Perhaps the whole of the road should be permit holders, just for Chevening Road residents. This would remove any parkers that do not live or work there. I would appreciate more information and some security that I will still be able to park outside my property if made in to permit parking. I am very concerned that my husband and I would not be able to park if permits were issued and we had to share the parking with other roads. I understand this is an option now as no restrictions apply but if the spaces are reduced it may cause a problem. I am 8 months pregnant and will struggle if I cannot park down my own road. "
22	The proposals as they stand offer no benefit to local residents, most of whom are out at work all day and have no reason to park in the proposed dual use bays during working hours. The proposal to introduce these restrictions appears simply to be a money making scheme for the council. The main issue that we as residents have is a lack of parking spaces available in the evenings. If we are to be made to pay for parking permits then we would support a number of resident only bays with this restriction to be applicable at all times.
23	Adding a double yellow section by the junction would further reduce the limited number of parking spaces, better to utilise it as a "dual" space.
24	If this motion is a drive to support local businesses why will there be a charge for residents who wish to occupy a permit? This proposal could be implemented without a cost or fee to the existing residents, had this been the case I would have supported the proposal, particularly where small local businesses are concerned. I object to being expected to pay to park outside my own property!
25	Pleased to see that this is being reviewed. My views count less than those living and using the space as I live further up the road.
26	If parking restrictions are brought in, where are cars goes to park? If they park further up and nearer to my gate I will not be able to drive out into the road as my view will be blocked! Should I drive on to the road I will be put on to the wrong side of the road, facing traffic. Very dangerous. Surely the office block round in the main road should provide sufficient parking places for their staff. Though this not affect me, why should people who live down the road be restricted to 2 hours at a time during the day.?