

**STATUTORY CONSULTATION - MINOR ON-STREET PARKING PROPOSALS
CROCKENHILL, EDENBRIDGE, EYNSFORD, HALSTEAD AND WESTERHAM**

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board - 6 December 2016

Report of Chief Officer, Environmental and Operational Services

Status: For Decision

Key Decision: No

Executive Summary: The consideration of the results of the statutory consultation regarding minor on-street parking proposals for locations in Crockenhill, Edenbridge, Eynsford, Halstead and Westerham, within The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places)(Amendment 18) Order 2016

This report supports the Key Aim of

- Caring Communities
- Sustainable Economy

Portfolio Holder Cllr. M Dickins

Contact Officer Jeremy Clark

Recommendation to Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board:

- (a) That the results of the statutory consultation in respect of the parking proposals and the Officer comments/recommendations given in Appendices 1 to 5 be noted;
 - (b) That the parking proposal for Crockenhill (Green Court Road) described in the table in paragraph 12 of the report and shown in Appendix 1 be implemented as drawn;
 - (c) That the objections to the parking proposal for Edenbridge (Ashbys Close) described in the table in paragraph 16 of the report and shown in Appendix 2 be upheld and the proposal be abandoned;
 - (d) That the objections to the parking proposal for Eynsford (High Street (A225)) described in the table in paragraph 19 of the report and shown in Appendix 3 be set aside and the proposal be implemented as drawn;
-

-
- (e) That the Board notes that the parking proposal for Halstead (London Road & Old London Road) described in the table in paragraph 23 of the report and shown in Appendix 4 will be implemented as drawn (as no responses were received to this proposal during the statutory consultation);
 - (f) That the objection to the parking proposal for Westerham (Hosey Hill) described in the table in paragraph 27 of the report and shown in Appendix 5 be set aside and the proposal be implemented as drawn; and
 - (g) That the objectors be notified of the Board's decision.
-

Reason for recommendation: The parking proposals are aimed at providing better management of the Public Highway, in line with the Highway Code and current legislation.

Background

- 1 Following requests for the provision of new and/or changes to existing on-street parking restrictions at locations in the Parishes/Towns of Crockenhill, Edenbridge, Eynsford, Halstead and Westerham, parking proposals were developed by the District Council in liaison with the highway authority, Kent County Council.
- 2 The statutory consultation for these parking proposals was undertaken over a 3-week period during October/November 2016.
- 3 The purpose of this report is for the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board to consider objections, where received, and Officers' comments and recommendations, and to decide whether or not to proceed with some or all of these proposals.

Introduction

- 4 On 13th October 2016, the statutory consultation commenced in respect of The Kent County Council (Various Roads in the District of Sevenoaks) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading and Unloading and On-Street Parking Places)(Amendment 18) Order 2016, hereafter known as "TRO 2013 Amendment 18".
- 5 TRO 2013 Amendment 18 contained a number of minor on-street parking proposals at locations in the Parishes/Towns of Crockenhill, Edenbridge, Eynsford, Halstead and Westerham that had been developed by the District Council in liaison with the highway authority, Kent County Council following requests received from the community.
- 6 Details of the parking proposals for each of the locations concerned and their objectives are described later in this report, and are shown on the plans in Appendices 1 - 5.

- 7 For the statutory consultation, public notices describing the on-street parking proposals and inviting representations were published in the local press and were erected in each of the locations concerned.
- 8 In the interests of added publicity, information on the proposals for Crockenhill, Eynsford and Westerham was also sent to local addresses, which included a link to the parking consultation page the District Council’s website, providing an online method of responding to the consultation.
- 9 The 3-week statutory consultation period ended on 4th November 2016, and the responses, where received, in respect of the parking proposals are detailed in Appendices 1 - 5, together with Officers comments/recommendations.
- 10 The purpose of this report is for the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board to consider the results of the statutory consultation, together with Officers comments given in Appendices 1 - 5 of this report, and decide whether to:
- (a) Uphold the objections, where received, and abandon or modify some or all of the proposals; or
 - (b) Set aside the objections, where received, and implement some or all of the proposals
- (It should be noted that it is only possible to amend proposals by reduction only. Any extension to the proposed restrictions or change of type of restriction would form a new proposal and require re-advertisement.)
- 11 No decision is required from the Board in respect of the parking proposals for Halstead (London Road and Old London Road), where no objections were received, but these locations have been included for information.

In the Parish of Crockenhill

- 12 The parking proposal for Crockenhill included in the statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 18 is shown on the plan in Appendix 1, and consists of the following:

Road		Proposed changes
Green Court Road	West side, from its junction with Stones Cross Road, north eastwards following the kerb line for 182m	Introduce new length of “no waiting at any time” (double yellow line) restriction

- 13 This parking proposal was a community request that is being supported by County Councillor R Gough via Kent County Council’s Combined Member Grant.
- 14 The section of Green Court Road concerned is a busy classified road. Much of the kerbside road space has no parking controls. The nearby school and

playground attract parking on both sides of the road, especially during the morning and afternoon school runs. This section of road has a bend, undulations in the road and road junctions, which combined with parked vehicles, compromises the safety and efficient movement of traffic.

- 15 During the statutory consultation 6 responses were received, all of which were in support of the proposal. A summary of the responses is contained within Appendix 1 of this report, together with Officers' comments/recommendations.

In the Town of Edenbridge

- 16 The parking proposal for Edenbridge included in the statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 18 is shown on the plan in Appendix 2, and consisted of the following:

Road		Proposed changes
Ashbys Close	South side, between points 22.5m and 31.5m east of the eastern kerb line of Mill Hill,	Revoke length of existing "no waiting at any time" (double yellow line) restriction

- 17 The carers of an elderly resident of Mill Hill, whose detached garage is accessed via Ashbys Close, requested the removal of the section of double yellow line restrictions across the dropped kerb that serves the garage. This would enable them to park on the vehicle crossover if the driveway in front of the garage is occupied by another vehicle.
- 18 During the statutory consultation 3 responses were received, 1 of which was from Edenbridge Town Council in support of the proposal, and the other 2 were from residents, objecting to the proposal. A summary of the responses is contained within Appendix 2 of this report, together with Officers' comments/recommendations.

In the Parish of Eynsford

- 19 The parking proposal for Eynsford included in the statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 18 is shown on the plan in Appendix 3, and consisted of the following:

Road		Proposed changes
High Street (A225)	Southeast side, between points 7m and 15m north east of a point in line with the north eastern edge of carriageway of Priory Lane	Introduce new length of "no waiting at any time" (double yellow line) restriction

High Street (A225)	Northwest side, from a point 18m south west of the south western kerb line of Mill Lane south westwards for 95.5m	Introduce new length of “no waiting at any time” (double yellow line) restriction
--------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- 20 This parking proposal was a community request that is being supported by County Councillor R Gough via Kent County Council’s Combined Member Grant.
- 21 The proposal is required to improve the safety and efficient movement of traffic on the A225, High Street, which is often compromised during the school runs by inconsiderately parked vehicles belonging to parents of children attending the Antony Roper school nearby.
- 22 During the statutory consultation 14 responses were received, 12 of which were in support of the proposal, and the other 2 were objections to the proposal. A summary of the responses is contained within Appendix 3 of this report, together with Officers’ comments/recommendations.

In the Parish of Halstead

- 23 The parking proposal for Halstead included in the statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 18 is shown on the plan in Appendix 4, and consisted of the following:

Road		Proposed changes
London Road & Old London Road	Northeast side, from a point 20m east of the eastern kerb line of Wheatsheaf Hill, south eastwards, following the edge of carriageway, to a point 240m northwest of the northwestern kerb line of Badgers Rise.	This is a housekeeping exercise, to ensure that the existing “no waiting Monday to Friday, 11am - Noon” (single yellow line) restriction described in the traffic regulation order corresponds to the current extent of single yellow line marked on the road.

- 24 This parking proposal has arisen due to a discrepancy between the description of the single yellow restriction concerned in the traffic regulation order and the extent of the single yellow line marked on the road.
- 25 The proposal is therefore purely a housekeeping exercise to ensure that the physical representation of the single yellow line is consistent with the description.
- 26 No responses were received in respect of this proposal during the statutory consultation, and hence it can be implemented as drawn without the need

for a decision from the Board, and has therefore been included for information.

In the Town of Westerham

- 27 The parking proposal for Westerham included in the statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 18 is shown on the plan in Appendix 5, and consisted of the following:

Road		Proposed changes
Hosey Hill (B2026)	East side, from the northern boundary of the property known as “Lavenders”, northwards, following the edge of carriageway, for 34m	Introduce new length of “no waiting at any time” (double yellow line) restriction

- 28 This parking proposal was a community request that is being supported by County Councillor R Parry via Kent County Council’s Combined Member Grant.
- 29 The proposal is required to improve the safety of traffic using Hosey Hill, which is often compromised by vehicles parked on the bend at this location, thereby reducing the available road width and forward visibility between opposing traffic flows. This has led to sudden braking and incidents, including a recent fatality involving a cyclist.
- 30 During the statutory consultation 6 responses were received, 5 of which were in support of the proposal, and the other 1 was an objection to the proposal. A summary of the responses is contained within Appendix 5 of this report, together with Officers’ comments/recommendations.

Other Options Considered and/or Rejected

- 31 Officers have considered the feasibility and desirability of reducing the extent of or abandoning the proposals to which representations were received, and have made recommendations in the Appendices where this is considered appropriate.

Key Implications

Financial

The costs incurred in implementing the proposals will vary depending on the Board’s decision, but if all the proposals are taken forward, the estimated total cost would be in the region of £10,000.

The cost of the proposals for Crockenhill, Eynsford and Westerham, which is estimated at £8,000, is being funded by Kent County Council from the Combined Member Grant

The District Council can meet the cost of the proposals for Edenbridge and Halstead, which is estimated at £2,000, from its parking account.

Legal Implications

A traffic regulation order (TRO) must be made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984) to cover the proposed on- and off-street parking changes.

Section 1 of the RTRA 1984 states that a TRO may only be made for the following purposes:

- avoiding danger to persons or traffic (including for anti-terrorist purposes);
- preventing damage to the road or to buildings nearby (including for anti-terrorist purposes);
- facilitating the passage of traffic;
- preventing use by unsuitable traffic;
- preserving the character of a road especially suitable for walking or horse riding;
- preserving or improving amenities of the area through which the road runs; and
- for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

To meet one or more of the above, a TRO may prohibit, restrict or regulate the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic of any class. It may have effect at all times or at specified periods or times. Specific classes of traffic may be excepted.

Before making a TRO, a formal (statutory) consultation procedure must be followed in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

Any formal objections received during this statutory consultation would be reported to the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board for a decision to be made on whether to make the TRO as proposed, to vary it (by reduction) or to abandon it.

Equality

The decisions recommended in this report have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equalities Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

Risk Assessment Statement

There are no additional risks identified that are outside those already covered within the standard Risk Assessment for carrying out parking enforcement on the Public Highway.

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Crockenhill parking proposal - plan, statutory consultation responses and Officers' comments/recommendations

Appendix 2 - Edenbridge parking proposal - plan, statutory consultation responses and Officers' comments/recommendations

Appendix 3 - Eynsford parking proposal - plan, statutory consultation responses and Officers' comments/recommendations

Appendix 4 - Halstead parking proposal - plan, statutory consultation responses and Officers' comments/recommendations

Appendix 5 - Westerham parking proposal - plan, statutory consultation responses and Officers' comments/recommendations

Sources of Information:

The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/362>

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended.
www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/27

The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
www.legislation.gov.uk/cy/uksi/1996/2489/made

The Highway Code.
www.gov.uk/browse/driving/highway-code

Richard Wilson
Chief Officer, Environmental and Operational Services