

This Report will be made
public on 15 May 2018

Folkestone

Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council



C/18/05

Report Number

To: Councillor Mrs Ann Berry, Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial
Date: 15 May 2018
Status: Non-Key Decision
Head of Service: Andy Blaszkowicz, Head of Commercial and Technical Services

SUBJECT: Report on the analysis of public consultation for a possible controlled parking zone in part of East Folkestone.

SUMMARY: This report sets out the results of the recent informal consultation for a proposed controlled parking zone (CPZ) in part of East Folkestone, as shown in appendix 1. There is parking congestion in many of the roads in this area and the council has received a number of representations from local residents. The consultation was designed to seek the views of residents and businesses within the local area about possible changes to the current parking arrangements.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial is asked to agree the recommendations set out below because:

- a) Based on the analysis of question 1 and 2, a majority of respondents do experience parking problems and are in favour of parking controls to be introduced in their road.
- b) The new CPZ will help to address the commuter/long-stay parking problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. To receive and note Report C/18/05.
2. That subject to statutory consultation on a draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), parking controls consisting of limited waiting and permit parking are introduced in all but Pavilion Road, where a significant majority did not support parking controls.
3. That officers report back to the Cabinet Member for Transport if there are any objections to a proposed draft TRO.

4. That the hours of operation of the CPZ be 8am-6pm Monday-Sunday (excluding bank and public holidays) as the majority of respondents indicated support for all-day controls.
5. That non-permit holders be allowed up to one hour free limited waiting in shared-use bays except in parking bays adjacent to Radnor Park in Radnor Park Road, St Johns Church Road and Boscombe Road where permitted waiting should be restricted to two hours.
6. That restrictions on permits replicate current arrangements for existing schemes:
 - Each household be restricted to two resident permits
 - The number of residents' visitors' permits per household be limited to 50 in any year
 - Residents and businesses with more than one car be entitled to buy a shared permit for the number of vehicles registered to them
7. That the fees for permits reflect those agreed by Cabinet in the current fees and charges schedule.
8. That all permit charges be subject to an annual review.
9. That the eligibility criteria be:
 - I. Resident permit
 - a) The applicant's usual place of residence should be in the CPZ
 - b) The vehicle is either a passenger vehicle or a goods vehicle of a height less than 3.2 metres (10ft 6ins) and length less than 6.5 metres (21ft 4ins) a gross weight not exceeding 5 tonnes.
 - II. Resident visitor permits
Applicant's usual place of residence should be in the CPZ
 - III. Business permit
 - a) The business operates from an address within the CPZ
 - b) The vehicle is essential for the efficient operation of the business
12. That a full review be conducted a year after implementation and the analysis reported to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The council first consulted on proposals for parking controls to be introduced in this part of East Folkestone in 2015. The results for the area north of the railway line were inconclusive so it was decided by the Cabinet Member for Transport to re-consult on revised proposals for this area but proceed with a parking scheme in the area south of the railway line (Guildhall North).
- 1.2 The Guildhall North scheme has been successful in removing long-term parking in the roads around there. However, there have been some displacement into roads north of the railway line, and officers have continued to receive representations about commuter/long term parking problems in the roads close to the Folkestone Central station.

2. CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The consultation took the form of a letter and a questionnaire posted on the 28th March 2018 to all properties within the proposed zone shown in appendix 1. Respondents were asked to return completed questionnaires by the 20th April 2018.
- 2.2 A total of 884 consultation documents were sent to all addresses within the proposed zone. The number of returned questionnaires received was 221. This equates to a 25% response rate, which is higher than rates for similar parking consultations. Response rates for this type of consultation across the country are typically between 15% and 25%.
- 2.3 It is important to remember that the process that is undertaken is not a referendum about parking, but the consideration of specific parking issues for residents and businesses in specific streets. Households and businesses have the option to participate in the consultation and fill in and return the questionnaire or not engage with the consultation process. Officers have assumed that residents or business owners who did not respond to the consultation have 'no opinion' about the parking proposals.

3. DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONS ASKED

- 3.1 The area is mainly residential so all questionnaires returned were from residents. In order to comply with the Data Protection Act, responses are not recorded against individual properties. The raw data for each question can be found in Appendix 2.
- 3.2 The key objectives of the consultation were to establish whether the residents experienced genuine parking problems and to gauge if there is widespread support for the introduction of parking controls in the area. The overall response to the key question to establish support is shown in the table below.

Would you like to see your road included in the proposed CPZ?			
	Yes	No	No preference
Responses	61%	36%	3%

- 3.3 As can be seen above, the overall results indicate strong support for parking controls to be introduced in the area. A full breakdown of responses by road is shown in appendix 2. Of the 18 roads consulted, a slim majority of respondents in

six roads namely Blackbull Road-part (between Radnor Park Road and Pavilion Road), Boscombe Road, Bournemouth Gardens, Radnor Park Crescent, Ship Street and Pavilion Road, are not supportive of the proposed parking controls.

- 3.4. Question 3 asked respondents that had indicated they did not support the proposals whether they would like to be included if parking controls were introduced in the road next to theirs. A significant number of respondents indicated they would then like to be included.
- 3.5 With the exception of Pavilion Road (on the boundary), the few roads with minority support are surrounded by roads that are strongly in favour of the introduction of parking controls so it is not possible to withdraw them from scheme, and it is quite obvious that parking will simply be displaced into them. In view of this, **it is therefore recommended that subject to statutory consultation, parking controls in the form of permit and limited waiting are introduced in all but Pavilion Road. Officers will report back to the Cabinet Member for Transport if there are any objections to the draft TRO.**
- 3.6 Question 4 and 5 asked respondents to indicate their preference for either all-day or two- hour parking controls and the days of operation. The majority of respondents indicated support for all-day controls, Monday-Sunday. **It is therefore recommended that the proposed operational hours be, all days, 8am-6pm (excluding public and bank holidays).** These hours will be exactly the same as the Guildhall North scheme, south of the railway line.
- 3.7 **Based on comments received, officers also recommend that shared use parking bays with one hour free limited waiting for non-permit holders are introduced in all but Radnor Park Road (only bays adjacent to Radnor Park), St Johns Church Road and Boscombe Road where two hours free limited waiting will be more appropriate. By installing 2 hour waiting restrictions in these areas, the council will be responding to the needs of people visiting Radnor Park in Radnor Park Road and those attending services in St Johns Church in St Johns Church Road.**

4. **ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM RESIDENTS**

- 4.1 The questionnaires gave respondents the opportunity to make additional comments about the proposals. These have been summarised and are also shown in appendix 2. The comments are quite varied, with many either reiterating the need for parking controls in the area or restating their opposition for parking controls to be introduced.
- 4.2 There were a few comments about the costs of parking permits. There were also comments about obstructive parking and congestion at night.

Officers Comments

- 4.3 A majority indicated support for the proposals hence the recommendation to progress the scheme subject to the TRO consultation. Yellow lines will naturally be installed in areas where it is unsafe to park when introducing a CPZ. Officers will also review the existing yellow lines and if any are found to be redundant, they will be removed.

- 4.4 Night parking controls will not be possible as the council does not provide a 24 hour enforcement regime. If there are acute problems at night as a few of the respondents in some roads are suggesting, it will be difficult to resolve as there may not be enough spaces for the number of cars owned by residents.
- 4.5 The scheme will cost money to set up, run and enforce. The permit charge, which is one of the lowest in Kent, will cover some of administration of the proposed system. By law, the costs need to be met by the scheme itself through selling of permits.
- 4.6 It is proposed that a full review be conducted a year after implementation with the analysis reported to the Cabinet Member for Transport. The aim of this review is to gauge residents overall satisfaction and seek views on whether they would like to see any improvements made to the scheme.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The introduction of a CPZ in this area will bring about significant benefits to residents. This is recognised by a majority of the respondents.
- 5.2 The recommendations represent the most appropriate action to balance competing requirements, meet the needs of local residents and facilitate the safe operation of the highway.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The costs of introducing the new controls will be around £6k and this can met from existing budgets. The costs include expenditure for new road markings, signing and TRO work.
- 6.2 Enforcement of the new CPZ could be absorbed within existing resources but this will be monitored closely in view of other schemes recently introduced. Additional administrative work will be absorbed within existing resources.
- 6.3 Income generation is anticipated to be very low as there are no 'pay & display' facilities with this scheme. It is therefore prudent not to allow for additional income in the budget at this stage.

7. LEGAL/FINANCIAL AND OTHER CONTROLS/POLICY MATTERS

7.1 Legal Officer's Comments (EC)

Kent County Council ("KCC"), as the traffic authority, has power to make Traffic Regulation Orders ("TRO") under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sections 1 and 2. Any TRO proposed by SDC must be approved and made by KCC in order to be valid. Once the TRO has been made, a notice must be published confirming the making of the TRO and its effect.

7.2 Finance Officer's Comments (RH)

All the financial implications are covered in the body of the report and can be met within existing budgets.

7.3 **Diversities and Equalities Implications (SS)**

There are no diversity or equality implications directly affected by this report.

8. **CONTACT OFFICERS AND BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Councillors with any questions arising out of this report should contact the following officer prior to the meeting

Officer: Frederick Miller, Transportation Manager
Telephone: 01303 853207
E-mail: Frederick.miller@shepway.gov.uk

The following background documents have been relied upon in the preparation of this report:

None

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Plan of Proposed new CPZ

Appendix 2 -- Spreadsheet showing the full results of the consultation

Appendix 3 – Consultation pack sent to residents