

SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Meeting Date	Monday 7 th March 2016
Report Title	Formal Objections to Traffic Regulation Order Am 17
Cabinet Member	Cllr David Simmons
SMT Lead	Dave Thomas
Head of Service	Dave Thomas
Lead Officer	Mike Knowles (SBC)
Classification	Open

Recommendations	Members are asked to note the contents of this report and consider formal objections to the Traffic Regulation Order, and recommend that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be progressed.
------------------------	---

1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report provides a summary of formal objections received in relation to the recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order Swale Amendment 17.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Traffic Order includes proposed amendments to various parking restrictions in the Borough, some of which have previously been reported to the Swale Joint Transportation Board and subsequently recommended for progression. A copy of the Traffic Regulation Order can be found in Annex A, with the proposals that have received formal objections highlighted. A copy of the formal objections received can be found in Annex B.

3. Issue for Decision

Grayshott Close, Sittingbourne – Proposed Single Yellow Line

- 3.1 An informal consultation took place with residents back in August 2015, on proposals to install a single yellow line on the east side of Grayshott Close following requests from residents. Of the 22 properties consulted, 13 responses were received all supporting the proposals.
- 3.2 The results of the informal consultation were reported to the Joint Transportation Board, and it was recommended that the proposed restrictions be implemented, plus a short section of double yellow lines around the turning head of the road and a

slight extension to the existing double yellow lines at the Highsted Road junction, both as a result of comments received during the consultation.

- 3.3 Three letters have been received regarding the advertised Traffic Regulation Order for Grayshott Close, from residents of Highsted Road and Farm Crescent. Only one of the letters received stated that it was a formal objection to the proposals, but in view of the comments made all three letters have been taken as objections.
- 3.4 All three objectors have expressed concern that the proposed restrictions in Grayshott Close will displace parked vehicles into nearby roads such as Highsted Road and Farm Crescent, and have asked that any restrictions are undertaken in conjunction with these adjoining roads and other nearby roads.
- 3.5 The parking issues in Highsted Road have previously been brought to the attention of Kent County Council Highways who at the time stated they would not support parking restrictions in Highsted Road as they felt it would lead to an increase in traffic speeds. It is also understood that there is not a history of personal injury crashes at this location and as such a scheme to introduce waiting restrictions would be unlikely to attract funding.

Church Road, Eastchurch – Disabled Persons Parking Bay

- 3.6 Also included in the advertised Traffic Regulation Order is a disabled persons parking bay outside of 30 Church Road in Eastchurch. The bay has been in place for some time as an advisory bay, and the proposed Traffic Order would formalise the bay to make it enforceable.
- 3.7 Two written objections have been received, both stating a number of reasons for the objections including the fact that there are already two existing disabled bays in this section of road. We have now written to the objectors to clarify that there is not a third disabled bay proposed for this location, and the Traffic Order is formalising one of the existing bays. The other bay, outside of the property next door, was included in a Traffic Order back in 2014.
- 3.8 The objectors have also been advised that the Borough Council works within the guidelines issued by Kent County Council, and if an applicant meets the necessary criteria we cannot refuse the bay. It is also KCC who issue blue badges and any eligibility issues should be taken up with the County Council.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report and consider formal objections to the Traffic Regulation Order, and recommend that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be progressed.

5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Costs associated with Traffic Regulation Order, and necessary lining and signing.
Legal and Statutory	Traffic Regulation Orders to be sealed by Kent County Council.
Crime and Disorder	None at this stage.
Risk Management and Health and Safety	None identified at this stage.
Equality and Diversity	None identified at this stage.
Sustainability	None identified at this stage.

6. Appendices

- 6.1 Annex A – Copy of Traffic Regulation Order with Objections Highlighted
- Annex B – Copy of Formal Objections Received

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None