



Sevenoaks
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Despatched: 13.03.12

SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

14 March 2012 at 7.00 pm

Conference Room, Argyle Road, Sevenoaks

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

4. Waiting Restrictions Consultation Response - Shoreham (Pages 1 - 4)

To assist in the speedy and efficient despatch of business, Members wishing to obtain factual information on items included on the Agenda are asked to enquire of the appropriate Director or Contact Officer named on a report prior to the day of the meeting.

Should you require a copy of this agenda or any of the reports listed on it in another format please do not hesitate to contact the Democratic Services Team as set out below.

For any other queries concerning this agenda or the meeting please contact:

The Democratic Services Team (01732 227241)

This page is intentionally left blank

SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 14 MARCH 2012

WAITING RESTRICTION CONSULTATION RESPONSE – SHOREHAM

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Executive Summary: This report SUPPLEMENTS AGENDA ITEM 4 and describes the comments and objections to three proposed waiting restrictions in Shoreham. Members are asked to consider and resolve how to proceed.

Recommendations: That Members note the support and objections to the proposed waiting restrictions and consider whether the number of objections received, and the reasons for objecting to the restrictions, are sufficient to justify allowing drivers to continue to judge for themselves whether parking at the locations listed paragraph 1 would be a hazard to other road users.

Background

- 1 Following 2011's restructuring of Kent County Council's Highway and Transportation service, a handful of previously-promoted waiting restrictions require either implementing or abandoning. One of these proposals is to prohibit waiting at the three locations in Shoreham illustrated in Appendix A to this report. They were promoted at:
 - The junction of High Street with Mill Lane to ensure that buses terminating on route 431/432 have sufficient space to turn.
 - The junction of High Street and Crown Road to help drivers entering High Street from Crown Road see approaching traffic.
 - The bends on Church Street outside the Church to enable traffic to pass safely and to improve inter-visibility between drivers and pedestrians
- 2 The proposals were re-advertised by way of public notice on 10th February 2012 with a closing date for responses of 5th March 2012. Because this was after the publication of the Agenda for the meeting of this Board, this supplementary report has been prepared to assist Members in deciding whether to implement, modify or abandon any or all the above

Discussion

- 3 All three proposals have the support of Kent Police who consider they would be of benefit to road safety. The restrictions at Mill Lane are supported by Arriva who terminate the 432 bus service at this junction and so require space to turn their 14m-long bus. This service currently operates between 0756 and 1710 Mon-Fri and 0810 to 1312 on Saturdays. Shoreham Parish Council do not support the proposed restrictions in Church Street or at the Mill Lane junction, but do support

Agenda Item 4

restrictions at the Crown Lane junction. The Shoreham Society do not support any of the proposed restrictions.

- 4 All three proposals received very similar levels of written support from individual households (twelve each for Church Street and Mill Lane/High Street, with thirteen for Crown Road/High Street). The endorsement of the proposals centred around enhancing pedestrian safety; improving visibility for drivers; reducing congestion and helping that ensure emergency vehicles can access the village. Three emphasised the difficulties that bus drivers sometimes have when turning the 432 bus service when it terminates at Mill Lane and three wrote of their particular concerns at the lack of visibility when joining High Street from Crown Road. At Church Street, two highlighted the hazard of having to walk in the middle of the road around the blind corner when cars are parked opposite The George and two more mentioned that parked vehicles obstruct their private access. One commented that the yellow lines proposed in this report are at locations that the Highway Code tells drivers they should not park.
- 5 Twenty-one households wrote to object all three proposals; thirteen more objected only to the proposed restrictions in Church Street and five objected only to those in Mill Lane. No-one objected only to the proposed restrictions in Church Street. The reasons proffered for objecting to the proposal were similar for all three locations. Each are highlighted in **bold** in the following paragraphs, followed by officers' advice on the point raised.
- 6 **64% said people drive more slowly when cars are parked at these locations.** Officers agree that because parking in Church Street opposite The George effectively narrows the road to a single track, it does promote a slower-speed environment. However, it also reduces forward visibility to as low as 12 metres: the typical stopping distance for two vehicles approaching each other at 10mph. Because of this, notwithstanding that any resultant collision would be low speed, officers maintain that waiting restrictions would to the benefit of road safety.
- 7 **49% said that yellow lines are out of keeping with the village environment.** If, as a result of this consultation, Members decide that waiting restrictions are required then yellow lines must be painted. In light of this response, these new restrictions would be half-width (50mm instead of 100mm) and painted in primrose rather than bright yellow. N.B. there are already yellow line waiting restrictions in Church Street.
- 8 **46% said there was no evidence of the parked cars causing a safety hazard.** This is correct; there is a good record of road safety in Shoreham and in the last five years at these three locations, the only accident reported to the Police as resulting in personal injury occurred in 2006 at Mill Lane.
- 9 **33% said that a piecemeal approach to addressing any parking problems was inappropriate and that a village-wide approach to parking (and traffic) control was needed.** Whilst this would be preferable, resources to conduct such a review will not be available in the foreseeable future.
- 10 **29% pointed out that cars displaced by the yellow lines would park elsewhere and 18% were concerned that there is already too little parking for residents.** It is

inevitable that cars displaced by any waiting restrictions will park somewhere else in the village. From a road-users' point of view, the issue is whether the new locations that these drivers would park would be any less hazardous or obstructive. It is never possible to anticipate where drivers will park when they are prevented from parking where they want to. This is because people adopt a varying balance between convenience, economics, risk, mobility, etc. Members are advised that growing pressure on reducing public spending make it highly unlikely that KCC would be able to attach sufficient priority to remedy any problems of displaced parking that implementation of these restrictions would cause.

- 11 Three respondents considered that yellow lines were unnecessary because police have sufficient powers to deal with any obstructive parking and two more objected because any yellow lines would not be enforced. All the proposed waiting restrictions are at locations that the Highway Code tells drivers not to park. However, only parking within 10 metres of a junction at night is a specific (endorseable) offence. In all other cases an attendant police officer would need to demonstrate that the parked car was causing an obstruction. Since there are already yellow line waiting restrictions in Church Street, any new restrictions in the village would be enforced at the same frequency as those.
- 12 Yellow lines outside the church were opposed by one person concerned that it would mean a longer walk to the church and one because it would be a disincentive to potential customers of the public house. The proposed restrictions in Church Street would displace approximately six parked cars to other locations. If they parked the Station-side of the restrictions then drivers would be expected to have to walk up to 36metres further to reach the church or The George PH.
- 13 Many respondents also raised other parking or traffic related issues that they considered were either more pressing than these proposals or else were an alternative approach to addressing any problems they cause. These included: installing physical traffic calming or creating a "shared space" (9No.); introducing a 20mph speed limit (8No.); introducing a width limit on vehicles travelling through the village (3No.); install bollards to prevent parking on the pavement (3No.); install "please drive carefully through the village" signs (1No.) and build a residents' car park on land off Crown Road (1No.). Irrespective of practicality and any potential benefit any of these suggested improvements could bring, none achieve sufficient priority to be publicly funded.

Financial; Resource (non-financial); Legal etc.; Value For Money

- 14 KCC have budgeted £750 from their 2011-12 traffic management budget to make the necessary traffic regulation order and paint the yellow lines.
- 15 Because there are existing waiting restrictions in Church Street, the additional resources required by Sevenoaks District Council (SDC) to enforce those described in this report would be minimal.

Conclusion

- 16 The yellow lines proposed in this report are at locations that the Highway Code tells drivers they should not park. At each, specific hazards have been identified

Agenda Item 4

as being sufficient to warrant yellow lines that would help inform drivers of where their parked vehicles may cause an obstruction. Nonetheless, with no crashes at any of these locations having been reported to the police as causing injury in the last three years, the risk is not quantifiable. Members are asked to consider whether the number of objections received, and the reasons for objecting to the restrictions, are sufficient to justify allowing drivers to continue to judge for themselves whether parking at the locations listed paragraph 1 would be a hazard to other road users.

Sources of Information: The individual responses to this consultation are held on KCC files.

Contact Officer: Laura Squires, Kent Highway Services
08458 247 800

Director: John Burr – Kent Highway Services 08458
247 800