

SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 15TH MARCH 2011

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – TRO 2009 AMENDMENT 20 – TUDOR DRIVE & WELL ROAD AREAS, OTFORD

Report of the: Community and Planning Services Director

Status: For decision

Executive Summary: This report requests that Members approve the introduction of a traffic regulation order to introduce new parking restrictions in the Tudor Drive and Well Road areas of Otford.

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

Portfolio Holder Cllr. Williamson

Head of Service Head of Environmental and Operational Services – Mr. Richard Wilson

Recommendation: It be RESOLVED that

The comments and objections to the changes to the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 20 be noted and the amended proposals be implemented.

History

1. For a number of years the District Council has received comments from residents and local elected members regarding concerns over all-day parking in the Tudor Drive and Well Road areas of Otford.
2. The concerns mainly relate to difficulties associated with parking near to driveways and worries about emergency and large vehicle access along the road.
3. Residents also commented that the situation had worsened since the introduction of charge in the Southeastern car park at Otford Station and that the car park was rarely used to capacity
4. In light of these comments the District Council carried out formal consultation on new parking proposals to deter all-day commuter parking and any associated displacement parking.

Proposal

5. The proposals consist of a combination of double yellow lines preventing parking around bends and junctions at any time and single yellow lines, operating for one

Item No. 9

hour of the day (Monday to Fridays), with the hour of operation different on either side of the road.

6. These restrictions effectively prevent all day parking but allow residents who may need to park on-street all day to do so, though it may entail them to move their vehicle to the other side of the road between the two restrictions.
7. This type of restriction has proved effective in similar circumstances elsewhere in the District.
8. It should be noted that nearly all of the properties in the area (save for a few at the southern end of Tudor Drive) have off-street parking facilities, normally for more than one vehicle.
9. Details of the proposals are shown in the plans in Appendix A and the proposed traffic regulation order amendment 20 (Appendix B)

Formal Consultation

10. Formal consultation was undertaken on 18th November 2010 and consisted of letters to frontagers of the proposals, notices on-street, advertisements in the local press inviting comment and supporting documents placed ‘on deposit’ at the District Council Offices. Letters were also sent to the normal ‘statutory consultees’ including the emergency services. Additionally, the proposals were placed on the District Council’s web pages. The consultation period lasted for six weeks.
11. These formal consultations complied with (and exceeded) the statutory requirements set out in the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996.
12. As part of the formal consultation, letters were sent to all residential properties in Tudor Drive, Tudor Crescent, Evelyn Road, Well Road, Sidney Gardens and Hopfield Close. Additionally, letters were sent to properties on the junction of Well Road and The Old Walk / Bubblestone Road.

Consultation responses

13. The consultation produced a large public response. Details of each reply are set out in Appendix E (available in the Members Room and electronically via CMIS)

Response summary	
Number of properties directly written to	248
Number of responses received	145
Percentage response	58.47%

14. A normal level of response for this sort of consultation would be around 15-20%. The high level of response suggests that the issue has been well circulated to residents.

15. Residents were asked to express their support / objection / no opinion on proposals in Tudor Drive, Tudor Crescent, Evelyn Road, Well Road and Sidney Gardens. No proposals were made for Hopfield Close as this is a private road. Proposals were also made to prevent parking on corners (in line with the advice set out in the Highway Code).
16. The responses were as follows;

Tudor Drive		
Responses	132	
In favour of proposal	113	85.61%
Against proposal	13	9.85%
No opinion	6	4.55%

Tudor Crescent		
Responses	128	
In favour of proposal	108	84.38%
Against proposal	11	8.59%
No opinion	9	7.03%

Evelyn Road		
Responses	125	
In favour of proposal	95	76%
Against proposal	10	8%
No opinion	20	16%

Well Road		
Responses	123	
In favour of proposal	93	75.61%
Against proposal	10	8.13%
No opinion	20	16.26%

Sidney Gardens		
Responses	124	
In favour of proposal	92	74.19%
Against proposal	10	8.06%
No opinion	22	17.74%

Preventing parking on corners		
Responses	128	
In favour of proposal	112	87.50%
Against proposal	10	7.81%
No opinion	6	4.69%

In each of the areas the overwhelming response was in favour of the proposals.

There were 17 responses from non-residents, 12 originating from the remainder of the estate and 5 from residents from further afield.

Tudor Drive

17. The majority of responses were in favour of the proposals, though support was less strong at the southern end of the road where residents preferred to have no restrictions as some of those properties have no off-street parking availability.
18. The extents of the restrictions on Tudor Drive could be reduced, but this could be detrimental to the effectiveness of the proposals and could lead to commuter cars displacing to the southern end of the road, making the problem far worse for the residents than it is at present.
19. Comments were also received that the parking restrictions should be swapped over, so that the morning and afternoon times applies to the other sides, though it is not clear as to what this would achieve, as what would be good for one resident would not be good for another.

Tudor Crescent

20. The majority of the responses were in favour of the proposals. However one property wanted the double yellow line restrictions at the southern junction to be reduced so they could park in front of their own access more easily.

Evelyn Road

21. No specific objections were received to the proposals.

Well Road

22. No specific objections were received to the proposals.

Sidney Gardens

23. No specific objections were received to the proposals to control commuter parking, though one objection was received to the proposal to prevent parking on the corner of Sidney Gardens and Well Road, even though this is against the advice in the Highway Code. Indeed, other residents commented that parking at this location caused them problems.

The Old Walk, The Butts and Bubblestone Road

24. The comments from the 12 nearby residents suggested general support for the proposal, but a wish to have similar proposals introduced in The Butts, The Old Walk and Bubblestone Road.

Recommendations

Item No. 9

25. Following formal consultation and the responses received, it is recommended that the Sevenoaks Joint Transport Board consider all of the responses received and that:

- the restrictions in Tudor Crescent, Well Road, Evelyn Road, Sidney Gardens be introduced as proposed;
- the restrictions preventing parking on corners be introduced as proposed, save for a minor reduction in length outside no. 57 Tudor Crescent as shown in the amended proposal plan Appendix C;
- the restrictions in Tudor Drive be introduced as proposed, save for the section of single yellow line on the west side, running from No.76 to No.92, as shown in the amended proposal plan Appendix C

26. It is also recommended that proposals be made and consultations be carried out to introduce similar restrictions to prevent parking on corners and junctions in;

- The Old Walk
- The Butts
- Bubblestone Road (with a section of uncontrolled parking and double yellow lines near to the parade of shops and the junction with A225 Sevenoaks Road)

These proposals should be progressed separately, so as not to jeopardise the restrictions already proposed and consulted upon for the Tudor Drive / Well Road areas. Draft proposals are shown in Appendix D.

Key Implications - Financial

27. The estimated costs for the signing and lining works necessary for introducing the proposed restrictions in the Tudor Drive and Well Road areas of Otford are approximately £6,500 to be met from the Sevenoaks District Council's on-street parking account.

Key Implications - Community impact and outcomes

28. The proposals should alleviate the concerns of residents about perceived emergency access problems.

Key Implications - Legal, Human Rights, etc.

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

Key Implications - Risk Assessment Statement

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

Sources of Information:	Existing on and off-street parking traffic regulation orders held by the Parking and Amenity team
	Appendix A Plans of proposals
	Appendix B Traffic Order Amendment 20
	Appendix C Amended proposal plan
	Appendix D Draft proposals for additional areas
	Appendix E Formal consultation responses (available in the Members Room and via CMIS)

Contact Officer(s):	Andy Bracey Ext.7323
----------------------------	----------------------

**KRISTEN PATERSON
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR**
