

SEVENOAKS JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 15 JUNE 2011

Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 10a - Parking restrictions near Knockholt Station, Halstead – Results of Public Consultation

Report of the: Community and Planning Services Director

Status: For decision

Executive Summary: This report brings to Members' attention the outcome of formal public consultation undertaken in respect to proposals to deal with parking along London Road, Halstead, in the vicinity of Knockholt station and requests that Members consider approving of the proposals for implementation.

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

Portfolio Holder Cllr. Hunter

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

Recommendation: It be RESOLVED that;

the comments and objections to the changes in the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 10a be noted and that the proposals be approved for implementation.

Introduction

- 1 Following formal consultation, In March 2010, Members of this Board considered a package of proposals to address commuter parking issues in London Road, Halstead, in connection with Knockholt Station and to improve road safety at junctions along London Road, and other associated improvements.
- 2 The safety-related measures only were approved for implementation by Kent Highways Services. These were installed in March 2011.
- 3 Since March 2010, the parking situation had worsened along London Road near the station and in areas where proposals were not to be implemented. In view of this, at the meeting on 15th March 2011 Members approved, for formal public consultation, proposals to deal with the deteriorating parking situation.
- 4 The proposals were subsequently advertised from 7th to 30th April 2011.

- 5 This report brings the results of the consultation to Members for consideration.
- 6 Plans detailing the proposals (Appendix A), as approved at the meeting on 15th March, will be displayed at the meeting along with the draft Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 10a.

Results of 2nd Formal Consultation

- 7 The responses from the 2nd formal consultation on the proposed parking changes show a mixed response – with stronger support for parking restrictions and management from local residents than from commuters.
- 8 The full text of the responses received are attached as Appendix C.
- 9 The proposals were broken down in to four areas, with responses as follows;

London Road & Sevenoaks Road

In support	Against	No view
38	17	3

Old London Road

In support	Against	No view
41	16	4

Watercroft Road

In support	Against	No view
42	14	4

Cadlocks Hill (at the junction with Watercroft Road)

In support	Against	No view
47	12	2

- 10 We also received 40 “other” responses that could not be directly classified as in favour or against proposals, often suggesting alternative solutions to the parking issues, or raising unconnected Highway or Planning issues.
- 11 Amongst the “other” responses there were a number of comments suggesting that the south side of Sevenoaks Road, London Road and Old London Road should have the restrictions as proposed, but that the parking bays on the north side should be omitted (as free unregulated parking) or be marked as parking places with no time restriction or charges, as this would maintain patronage of the station and maintain the viability and frequency of rail services stopping at Knockholt station.
- 12 There were comments that the proposal to introduce pay and display parking should be dropped as it seemed to be a revenue raising exercise on behalf of the District Council.

- 13 However, there were calls from residents of Knockholt and Halstead for permits to be issued to residents of those parishes to enable them to have discounted parking or parking areas reserved for permit holders only.
- 14 A number of comments suggested that off-street parking near the station could be increased, either by allowing full usage of the station car park (by removing the waste-transfer company), by developing land to the north side of the road or railway or by developing land (under compulsory purchase) within the curtilage of the Broke Hill Golf Club
- 15 There are several issues that make these additional comments impractical for the District Council;
- the station car park is privately owned and managed and the tenancy of that car park is a private issue. Also it falls outside the District Council's boundary and is part of the London Borough of Bromley;
 - all of the land to the north of the road is privately owned and some of that land also falls within the London Borough of Bromley. The land to the north of the road that is within the Sevenoaks District would not be suitable to be developed as a formal car parking area;
 - the development of land to a parking area within the bounds of Broke Hill golf course would entail the development of an area understood to be 'green belt' and also would entail the acquisition of the land by the District Council – something that the District Council has neither the funds or the requirement to do.
- 16 The District Council is only in a position to introduce restrictions and controls if there is no cost to the authority for the implementation or enforcement. The District Council's proposals included pay and display parking as a method of recovering the initial costs and the ongoing enforcement overheads.
- 17 Bromley Council commented on the proposals, objecting on the grounds that the proposals could cause displacement back to areas near to stations within their Borough where parking controls have already been introduced.
- 18 Two representatives from Kent Police commented in support of the proposals;
- PC Cave of the Traffic Management section commented that proposals to reduce the congestion and increase vehicle flow could have the effect of raising vehicle speeds from those currently observed;
 - PS O'Toole from the local policing team commented in support of the proposals and the assistance that patrols of parking bays in the area would have in reducing vehicle crime.
- 19 Arriva, the main bus company in the area welcomed the proposals.

- 20 There were other points raised during the consultation;
- there were calls from groups representing cyclists for the existing advisory cycle lanes to be converted to mandatory cycle lanes. It should be noted that mandatory cycle lanes would require parking to be excluded along their lengths. (The provision of cycle facilities is an issue for the Highway Authority to consider);
 - there were calls for better footway provision (and associated street lighting) from Knockholt and from Pratts Bottom as this would encourage pedestrian movements to and from the station (at present there is no continuous footway route from either location);
 - that speed of traffic along the road was still a concern when parking did not occur;
 - that the large number of waste lorry movements meant that there were high levels of dust and mud near the station and that road sweeping was hindered by the parking;
 - that the road surface was generally in poor condition and required maintenance;
 - that house prices in London made it impossible for low paid staff to live near to their workplaces and that they had no option but to commute.

Recommendations

- 21 At the meeting of this Board on 15th March 2011 it was resolved: “that the remaining elements of the Traffic Regulation Order 2009 Amendment 10 (as per the Sevenoaks Joint Transportation Board Item No. 9 of 16 March 2010) be implemented, subject to further formal consultation of the proposals.”
- 22 It should be noted that this is the second time that the District Council has brought proposals relating to parking issues in the area of Knockholt station to this Board for consideration. Significant costs in terms of officer time have been incurred in preparing the proposals, undertaking public consultation and reporting to this Board both on this occasion and previously in March 2010.
- 23 The current proposals were brought to the Board for approval in March 2011 at the request of the Chairman in response to requests for action to resolve the parking issues affecting the highway. The District Council has progressed these proposals on behalf of Kent Highways Services on the basis that costs incurred would be recovered through the pay and display element of the proposals. If the scheme as advertised is approved without the inclusion of the pay and display element, the District Council will have undertaken further work on behalf of the County Council for which it may seek recovery of costs already incurred. Responsibility for implementation and, if necessary, any

further investigation and consideration, would then pass to Kent Highways Services as the main issues relate to the safe use of the highway.

- 24 It should be noted that income from sources such as pay and display helps offset expenditure for on-going line and sign maintenance for all parking and waiting restrictions throughout the district. Under the terms of the Agency Agreement, responsibility for maintenance falls to the District Council irrespective of whether the restrictions result from District or County proposals.

Key Implications - Financial

- 25 The cost of implementing the whole scheme will be met from the on-street parking account, provided that the pay & display element of the scheme is approved.
- 26 The estimated cost of introducing all of the proposals is £25,000, which reflects the extensive changes to road markings over approximately 2.2km of road, the required signing, the purchase and installation of four Pay & Display machines and some necessary kerbing works.
- 27 If any of the elements of the scheme were to be introduced without the means of cost recovery, the costs would need to be met by the Highway Authority.
- 28 The pay and display charges will be set at the same tariff level as for Swanley, tariff A4 which is 60p for up to 4 hours and £3.00 for all day parking,

Community impact and outcomes

- 29 The proposals will improve the parking situation in the area to the benefit of local residents and all users of the main road by the station.

Legal, Human Rights, etc.

- 30 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.
- 31 There are no human rights issues or implications.

Risk Assessment Statement

- 32 By not introducing the measures proposed in the area of Knockholt station the parking problems and issues relating to road safety and obstruction currently being experienced will continue.

Sources of Information: Existing on and off-street parking traffic regulation orders held by the Parking and Amenity team

Contact Officer(s): Andy Bracey Ext.7323

**KRISTEN PATERSON
COMMUNITY AND PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR**