

SHOREHAM

Parish Clerk:

Sarah Moon
8 High Street
Shoreham, Sevenoaks
Kent TN14 7TD

PARISH

07912 611048

clerk2012@shorehamparishcouncil.gov.uk

COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES of a MEETING of SHOREHAM PARISH COUNCIL

at Shoreham Village Hall on 18th January 2017 from 7:30pm

Present: R Blamey, P Dodd, A Hibbins, M S Parkes, and L Spence

Also Present: 41 members of the public

Clerk: Sarah Moon

1. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Collins (holiday) Cllr Histed (unwell) and Cllr McDonnell (holiday).
2. There were no disclosures of interest from members.
3. Traffic and Parking

Cllr Dodd opened the meeting by explaining the process to date as to how the Working Party had arrived at the recommendations outlined in 3b below. This included seeking professional advice from an independent consultant. Throughout the process the Working Party tried to adopt a positive approach to the issues of Traffic and Parking by trying to ensure that :

- Nobody without off road parking would be left with nowhere to park
- Nobody was to be less safe
- The rural setting was to be preserved as much as practically possible
- The bus company was consulted
- Access for emergency vehicles was considered
- Access for large farm vehicles was considered

Cllr Dodd explained that most of these recommendations would require funding and therefore once a set of proposals had been agreed by the Parish Council, these would then be put forward for further consultation with Kent County Council, Sevenoaks District Council and the residents of Shoreham. The agreement of these recommendations therefore marks the start of the process, not the end.

- (a) The recommendations made by the Traffic and Parking Working Group (see 3b below) were distributed amongst the audience and read out by the Cllr Dodd. Councillors and audience members were firstly asked to query any points for which they sought clarification and it was confirmed that ten white T marked parking bays could be created on Church Street. It was also explained that these marking could differ from the proposed ones if the AONB guidelines suggest otherwise. The meeting was then opened up for public debate and the following questions were asked:

Q1. Any recommendations need to take into account those who do not have off street parking? Will the extra spaces fill those lost?

A1. Any parking restrictions would only come into effect if extra parking spaces were provided.

Q2. Clarification of 3.1. Negotiation is difficult on a bend if someone is coming round a corner.

A2. Changing the surface to a buff colour acts as a visual hint to make people slow down.

Q3. But what if someone parks on it, then what?

A3. That would depend on whether there were yellow lines.

Q4 : 6

.8 Is this saying no parking Crown Road to Allotments

A4 : To the bungalows between Crown Road and the Allotments.

Q5 : Church Corner : Point 7 covers the church as well as the George. I do not want anything there. Also there is a brick path in the Church field which runs from the new dog poo bin up to kissing gate. This should be re- established.

Q6 : The Shoreham Society are concerned that the rural setting of the village risks being taken away by the arrangement of street furniture, signs, lines etc. We are unhappy about yellow lines in Mill Lane, Crown Road and High Street as well as the white t markings.

Q7 : Does buff surface increase noise?

A7 : If shell grip, no.

Q8: Is it out of question to install granite sets instead?

A8: Yes, it is too expensive. Also, that surface is not appropriate on a bend.

Q9: More parking bays could be marked out if it had been measured correctly. Also, it is not illegal to park on a pavement unless imposed by the local council.

County Councillor Roger Gough interjected with a few comments at this point.

i) Regarding the implementation of a 20 mile an hour zone, a speed survey was done some time ago and there was evidence to support this centrally in the village.

ii) Highways officers nervous about granite sets as they tend to get dislodged and are hard to maintain. iii)

(iii) For many of these recommendations there is a relationship between taking them forward, consulting on them and paying for them. There were some things last year that we were willing to fund.

(iv) We need to agree the point at which we want to have the consultation and then consult with Kent Highways to see what funding we get. It is a question of sequence.

Q10. How do you trial yellow lines?

A10. The engineer states that this is possible.

Q11. What signs do you need to accompany the lines?

A11. Unless restrictions apply 24 hours a day, 365 days a week, a sign indicating the times when parking is not permitted would be required.

Q12 : The idea of testing them out is a good one. If they don't work, don't use them. Has the Parish Council approached any landowners to sell land for parking or footpath.

A12 : There have been preliminary discussions with the golf club.

Q13 : Jeremy Tooley : 50% of solution is changing habits. Do you agree with that and if so, has it been incorporated in the recommendations?

A13 : We have tried to do this on several occasions via articles in the Gazette in which residents have been asked to park considerately and within the framework of the Highway Code. It has had little effect.

Q14 : Can priority be given over vehicles leaving the village? This has never been discussed.

A14 : This would be tricky on Station Road because of the bend..

Q15 : 6.1 and 6.2 seem necessary but 6.3 would spoil the look of the street.

A15 : We do need to make compromises.

Q16 : Cluttering up the village with signage would spoil the look. It would be good money after bad to remove these if they were not required or did not work. Is there any way to go the behavioural route before doing this?

A16 : We could try but based on previous experience this has not worked.

Q17 : A turning point opposite the Mount would be beneficial. Ideally we would all like no cars and no markings but there are cars but the markings do create the ability to park sensibly, They only look unsightly when there are no cars there. We don't want an explosion of signage but we shouldn't be afraid to try things and if don't like them – change them again.

Q18 : I have lived here for 35 years and do not want the road painted. During the day there is hardly any traffic. What is the appetite for this? Where does it come from? If you don't like it the way it is, move somewhere else. The rural feeling of the village is why people want to live here.

A18 : The appetite from residents at a public meeting in the village.

Q19 : What were the specific aims and objectives of the working group?

A19 : There were a range of objectives, which were identified by people in the village. These included issues of safety, parking, illegal parking, traffic flow, relieving pressure points.

Q20 : It is worth checking whether any lines and signs which are implemented can be easily removed?

A20 : County Councillor Roger Gough agreed to investigate this further.

Q21 : Regarding the George Bend, there is lots of good stuff in the report and I support the notion of trying things. However, as you stated, there are yellow lines in Crown Road on which cars park all the time and this comment should be taken into consideration with these recommendations.....

Q22 : On what basis two cars opposite the T junction are recommended?

A22 : Parking here would not obstruct the view and would encourage traffic to slow down. Marked parking bays would also hopefully *discourage* from people from parking either side of them.

Q23 : Could we have buff throughout the village?

A23 : It wouldn't really work as it is supposed to signify change in environment and driving conditions.

Q24 : I live in Church Street. A passing space outside the Mount would stop people mounting the pavement on church street and whizzing past my front door.

Q25 : Report doesn't say much about Station Road. It is dark. Is there scope for traffic calming measure here?

A25 : We are hoping to create a proper footway up to the station and this would ensure pedestrians' safety.

Q26 : Were the Almshouses mentioned on the report?

A26 : Not specifically no.

Q27 : Also, the zig zag lines up to the car park have been left out of these recommendations.

A27 : It was felt that this particular issue may be better resolved by closer engagement with the school.

Cllr Dodd then closed the public session and summarised the discussion as follows:

- There is a clear concern that many people do not want too many markings;
- Some are for and some are against white T bar markings;
- The buff surface seems to be seen favourably;
- Parking at allotments has some support;
- There was not much discussion about passing space at Two Brewers but based on previous discussion this was looked upon quite favourably.

Cllr Hibbins stated that he preferred a sympathetic approach and would approve of a passing space outside Two Brewers. He voiced concerns about the Church Street/High Street junction

Cllr Blamey queried how a continuous path could be provided if the parking was created on the allotments. The pavement would go all the way along and you would have to drive over the pavement to access the parking spaces.

Cllr Dodd finished by stating that any existing guidelines/recommendations which are laid out for the AONB should be taken into consideration along with these recommendations.

- (b) The recommendations proposed by the Traffic and Parking Working Party were then agreed/not agreed by the Council to be taken forward for consultation as follows :

1. Speed and Large Lorry Restrictions throughout village:

- 1.1 That a 20 mph speed limit be implemented throughout village : Vicarge/Shoreham Place, from Filston Lane where 30mph sign is just before Mesne Way and outside Oxbourne House. **AGREED**
- 1.2 Lorries over 7.5 tons prohibited except for access. **AGREED**

2. Safe Footpath to avoid George bend

- 2.1 Seek to establish and possibly widen footpath along the bottom of Church Field to gate to Church path. **AGREED**
- 2.2 Seek to change kissing gate to gate that will permit children's buggies to pass through. **AGREED**
- 2.3 Seek to establish church path lighting to operate during winter time hours to encourage pedestrians to choose this route: e.g. between 4 and 8 p.m. **AGREED**

3. Change of Environment Road Surface:

- 3.1 Surfacing of roadways with buff non-skid asphalt to indicate an environment where negotiation between road and footpath users will be required, and parking discouraged except where indicated:
 - 3.1.1 On approach to George bend and down to Old George car park. **AGREED**
 - 3.1.2 Over bridge. **POSTPONE**
 - 3.1.3 Round junction of High Street and Filston Lane. **POSTPONE**

4. Provision of additional parking along High Street

- 4.1 That a scheme for providing additional parking in the High Street be drawn up, approved and implemented on the land at the western end of the allotments site (adjacent to High Street) in order to:
 - 4.1.1 Create marked parking bays. **AGREED**
 - 4.1.2 Enable a viable footpath along the allotments boundary and along High Street to the Crown Road junction so that pedestrians, particularly those pushing children's buggies are not forced out into the street at its narrowest point. **AGREED**

5. Signage

- 5.1 New 20 mph speed limit signs to replace existing 30 mph signs after (and if) 20mph speed limit implemented. **AGREED**
- 5.2 Reflective yellow backing to chevron signs on approach to George Bend. **AGREED**
- 5.3 An additional sign directing visitors to car park be erected at the Mill Lane end of High Street. **AGREED**
- 5.4 Prohibition signs for lorries at the triangle entrance to the High Street and in Filston Lane. **AGREED** (need to seek advice about installation).

6. Roadway markings:

- 6.1 White T markings indicating 2 parking bays alongside Old Vicarage Wall past entrance to Old Vicarage Cottage. **AGREED BY MAJORITY VOTE**
- 6.2 White T markings indicating 1 parking bay outside 1 Church Cottages. **AGREED**
- 6.3 White T markings indicating parking bays down Church Street alongside wall of Shoreham House and beside river as far as the driveway to Riverside House. **AGREED** (although actual markings may differ if AONB guidelines indicate otherwise).

- 6.4 Two of these bays (opposite entrance to The Mount) to be reserved as a passing bay during the day and overnight parking only permitted (might depend on permission for signage to be installed on wall). **AGREED**
- 6.5 White T markings indicating 2 parking bays outside Vine Cottage and 1 High Street. **NOT AGREED**
- 6.6 White hatched lines indicating passing bays outside door to The Herons and Eyot House and opposite drive gates beside Rising Sun Cottage. **NOT AGREED**
- 6.7 Single primrose line along High Street from steps to Recreation Ground extending 27 towards village shop (opposite Two Brewers) prohibiting parking between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. This might be trialled as an experiment first. **AGREED**
- 6.8 Extending double primrose lines round Crown Road along High Street up to the bungalows after (and if) additional parking is provided at top of the allotments and viable footpath can be re-established. **AGREED** (but a shorter distance or something like 5m)
- 6.9 Painting double primrose lines (10 m in each direction) round junction of Mill Lane and High Street round Oxbourne Cottages after (and if) additional parking is provided at the top of the allotments. **AGREED BY MAJORITY VOTE**
- 6.10A passing bay cross hatched in white outside The Old Post Office (if it is not possible to fund buff surface). **NOT AGREED**
- 7 And **one of these 3 options in relation to the George bend** (as disagreement between Working Party members). Already agreed two spaces and one space.

Motion passed to extend the meeting past 10.00pm.

- 7.1 Follow Jonny Russell's advice i.e. *'As this was observed to be...the most critical part of the junction, parking restrictions would be strongly recommended. This would ideally take the form of double yellow line markings, which prohibit parking at any time, but allow loading as required'*. **NOT AGREED**
- 7.2 Or as an alternative offered by Jonny Russell i.e. *'An alternative would be to use single yellow line markings to limit the parking restrictions to critical times when larger vehicles are more likely. This would typically be from 7am to 7pm when traffic levels are lower and outside the business day'*. NB would require signage and would need to include restrictions at weekends. **NOT AGREED**
- 7.3 White T markings indicating viable parking bays at end of bend going up Station Road, where road straightens. **NOT AGREED**
- (c) The next steps including statutory consultation, non-statutory consultation, and the process to be followed once consultation has been concluded was discussed. It was firstly agreed that County Councillor Roger Gough should consult with Kent Highways as to which of the recommendations require which type of consultation. Once this is determined the Parish Council can have a conversation as to costs etc. Broadly speaking it would see likely that anything involving yellow lines would require statutory consultation but changing the surface to buff for instance would probably not. There must also be a consultation regarding the parking on the allotments and the Parish Council must look into the legalities of doing this on allotment land. Cllr Dodd agreed to seek advice from KALC on this matter. Finally, an item must be placed on the next council meeting agenda to discuss the consultation process in further detail.
4. Dates of next meetings (all starting at 7:30pm)
- (a) Planning and Council Meeting : Wednesday 1st February 2017, Shoreham Village Hall
- (b) Planning Meeting : Wednesday 15th February 2017, Shoreham Village Hall (if required)
- (c) Planning and Council Meeting : Wednesday 1st March 2017, Shoreham Village Hall