

STATUTORY CONSULTATION - ON-STREET PARKING PROPOSALS

ARGYLE ROAD & GORDON ROAD, SEVENOAKS - TRO 2013 AMENDMENT 27

Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board - 6 June 2018

Report of Chief Officer, Environmental and Operational Services

Status: For Information Purposes

Key Decision: No

Executive Summary: To consider the relevant objections to the parking proposals drafted in:

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 27) Order 2018 (known as “TRO 2013 Amendment 27”)

This report supports the Key Aim of

- Caring Communities
- Sustainable Economy

Portfolio Holder Cllr. Matthew Dickins

Contact Officer(s) John Strachan/Jeremy Clark

Advice to Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board: That the Board considers

- a) the relevant objections received during the statutory consultation on proposals to amend the current parking arrangements in Argyle and Gordon Roads detailed in Appendix 2; and
- b) Officers’ comments and recommendations detailed in Appendix 3

Background

- 1 Following representations from residents, at its meeting on 6 December 2017, the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board directed officers to carry out a statutory consultation on proposals to amend the current resident and free limited stay parking arrangements in Argyle and Gordon Roads, by:

- Changing certain “dual use” parking bays (resident permit “A” parking and 2 hour maximum stay (no return within 1 hour) parking) to “resident permit “A” only” parking.
 - Changing the period of no return for vehicles parked without a permit in the remaining “dual use” parking bays from 1 hour to 2 hours.
- 2 The proposals were drafted in 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 27) Order 2018, referred to in this report as “TRO 2013 Amendment 27”.
 - 3 The statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 27 took place in a 3-week period from 15 March 2018.
 - 4 This report advises the Board on the responses received to the consultation.
 - 5 The Board is asked to consider the relevant objections received and Officers’ comments and recommendations detailed in Appendix 3.
 - 6 Officers can recommend the implementation of the same or lesser restrictions, but cannot recommend implementing a greater restriction.

Introduction

- 7 The Zone A permit parking scheme in Argyle and Gordon Roads provides “dual use” resident permit “A” parking and free 2 hour parking, with a 1 hour no return period.
- 8 The intention of the scheme is to help protect resident parking, while allowing a level of “free” parking for residents’ guests and visitors to organisations and amenities based locally, who rely on free limited wait parking to support their operations and activities, such as:
 - Churches and church halls
 - DVLA Driver Test Centre
 - Kent Police
 - Local businesses
 - Local schools
 - Sevenoaks District Council
 - West Kent Housing
- 9 In December 2016, the Joint Transportation Board (JTB) received a petition from a number of Zone A residents, requesting that some of the “dual use” resident permit “A” parking and free 2 hour parking bays in Argyle and Gordon Roads be converted to “resident permit “A” only” parking.

- 10 The petition also asked that the period of no return for vehicles parked without a permit in the remaining “dual use” parking bays be changed from 1 hour to 2 hours.
- 11 The Board asked officers to carry out a statutory consultation on the proposals from the petitioners.
- 12 These proposals were contained in a draft traffic regulation order entitled 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 27) Order 2018, hereafter known as “TRO 2013 Amendment 27”.
- 13 TRO 2013 Amendment 27 also included minor amendments to improve the current descriptions of the restrictions in the main traffic regulation order. These changes do not alter the existing markings and controls on street.

Consultation

- 14 The statutory consultation for TRO 2013 Amendment 27 was carried out over a 3-week period from 15 March 2018 to 6 April 2018.
- 15 For the statutory consultation, public notices describing the parking proposals and inviting representations were published in the local press and were displayed in each of the streets concerned.
- 16 Letters describing the proposals and inviting feedback were sent to 563 residential addresses within permit Zone A, providing a pro forma response and a link to an online survey page on the Council’s website.
- 17 During the 3-week statutory consultation period, 123 responses were received to the proposals from 100 addresses, 81 of which were residential addresses in Zone A. These are summarised in Tables 1 to 4 below.
- 18 The objections to and comments supporting the parking proposals are detailed in Appendix 2.
- 19 The parking proposals for Argyle Road and Gordon Road were as follow:
 - Proposal 1 - Changing certain “dual use” parking bays (resident permit “A” parking and 2 hour maximum stay (no return within 1 hour) parking) to “resident permit “A” only” parking.
 - Proposal 2 - Changing the remaining “dual use” parking bays (resident permit “A” parking and 2 hour maximum stay (no return within 1 hour) parking) to “dual use” (resident permit “A” parking and 2 hour maximum stay (no return within 2 hours), i.e. increasing the period of no return in those parking bays from 1 to 2 hours.

Table 1 - Zone A Residential Addresses		
Letters sent to Zone A	563	
Proposal 1		
Zone A addresses (incl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) that responded to Proposal 1	81/563	14%
Proportion of Zone A addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 24/563	4%
	Support 57/563	10%
Proportion of Zone A addresses (incl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) that responded objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 24/81	30%
	Support 57/81	70%
Proposal 2		
Zone A addresses (incl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) that responded to Proposal 2	80/563	14%
Proportion of Zone A addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 21/563	4%
	Support 59/563	10%
Proportion of Zone A addresses that responded (incl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 21/80	26%
	Support 59/80	74%

Table 2 - Argyle and Gordon Roads Residential Addresses		
Residential addresses in Argyle Road	39	
Argyle Road addresses responded to Proposals 1 and 2	15/39	38%
Argyle Road addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 2/15	13%
	Support 13/15	87%
Argyle Road addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 2/15	13%
	Support 13/15	87%
Residential addresses in Gordon Road	34	
Gordon Road addresses responded to Proposals 1 and 2	25/34	74%
Gordon Road addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 2/25	8%
	Support 23/25	92%
Gordon Road addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 5/25	20%
	Support 20/25	80%

Table 3 - Zone A (excl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) Residential Addresses		
Proposal 1		
Zone A addresses (excl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) that responded to Proposal 1	41	
Addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 20/41	49%
	Support 21/41	51%

Table 3 - Zone A (excl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) Residential Addresses (continued)		
Proposal 2		
Zone A addresses (excl. Argyle and Gordon Roads) responded to Proposal 2	40	
Addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 14/40	35%
	Support 26/40	65%

Table 4 - Non-Residents and Non-Zone A Addresses		
Proposal 1		
Non-residents and non-Zone A addresses that responded to Proposal 1	20	
Non-residents and non-Zone A addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 1	Object 18/20	90%
	Support 2/20	10%
Proposal 2		
Non-residents and non-Zone A addresses that responded to Proposal 2	19	
Non-residents and non-Zone A addresses objecting to/supporting Proposal 2	Object 11/19	58%
	Support 8/19	42%

- 20 Within permit Zone A, the response rate to the statutory consultation from residential addresses that were written to was 14% (81/563). Of these, 7% (40/563) were from residential addresses in Argyle Road and Gordon Road.
- 21 The majority of residents of Argyle and Gordon Road (80-92%) were supportive of both of the parking proposals (see Table 2).

- 22 However, there was no clear majority in favour or against the proposals from residents of the wider permit Zone A (see Table 3).
- 23 Of the responses received from non-residents and non-Zone A addresses, 19/20 (90%) were opposed to Proposal 1 and 11/19 (58%) to Proposal 2 (see Table 4). These included responses from organisations and amenities based locally, who raised concerns about the parking difficulties that the parking proposal would cause to their employees/visitors/customers.
- 24 The relevant objections received during the statutory consultation came from residents of neighbouring roads in permit Zone A, especially Eardley Road and Granville Road, and from organisations and amenities based locally. Both groups indicated that the competing demands for on-street parking already give rise to parking difficulties, and that this situation would be exacerbated by the parking displacement arising from the implementation of the parking proposals.

Additional Information

- 25 In response to earlier concerns raised by residents of Zone A about parking availability between 2015 and 2016, “beat” surveys were carried out in Zone A by independent specialist transportation consultants, the details of which were reported to the Board in December 2016.
- 26 A summary of the outcomes of the surveys undertaken in Argyle Road and Gordon Road can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 - Parking Availability in Argyle Road and Gordon Road		
	Average daytime “dual use” car parking space availability	
	Argyle Road	Gordon Road
First Independent Beat Survey - December 2015	11% (5/47 spaces)	22% (13/60 spaces)
Second Independent Beat Survey - November 2016	21% (11/52 spaces)	39% (24/61 spaces)

Next Steps

- 27 Redacted details of the written responses to the consultation objecting to and in support of Proposals 1 and 2 are contained in Appendix 2.
- 28 Officers’ comments and recommendations are contained in Appendix 3.
- 29 The Joint Transportation Board is now required to consider the relevant objections received during the statutory consultation, together with Officers’ comments and recommendations.

Other Options Considered and/or Rejected

- To uphold the objections either in part or in full and modify the parking proposals; or
- To set the objections aside and implement the parking proposals as drawn/published

(Note: it is only possible to amend proposals by reduction. Any increase in the extent/type of the proposed restrictions would form a new proposal and require re-commencement of the statutory consultation).

Key Implications

Financial

The costs incurred in implementing the proposals will vary depending on which proposals, if any, are taken forward, but if all the proposals in TRO 2013 Amendment 27 were taken forward, the estimated total cost would be in the region of £5,000. The District Council can meet this cost 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 (in this case, TRO 2013 Amendment 27).

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 objections made to the TRO received during this statutory consultation (other than frivolous or irrelevant ones) that are not withdrawn are reported to the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board.

The terms of reference for the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board allow it to provide advice to the Sevenoaks District and Kent County Councils, who will normally act in accordance with its views. If the Councils are minded to act otherwise, no decision will be taken until after a discussion has taken place between the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board and the relevant decision making body.

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 - For Information
Plan of Sevenoaks Permit Zone A

Appendix 2 - For Information - Parking Proposals -
Argyle Road & Gordon Road -
Description and plan, details of objections and
comments received

Appendix 3 - For Advice - Parking Proposals -
Argyle Road & Gordon Road -
Officers' comments and recommendations

Sources of Information:

The Traffic Signs Regulations and General
Directions 2016
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