

This Report will be made public on 30 November 2018



Report Number **C/18/58**

**To:** Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial  
**Date:** 30 November 2018  
**Status:** Non- Key Decision  
**Head of Service:** Andy Blaszkowicz, Head of Commercial and Technical Services  
**Cabinet Member:** Councillor Ann Berry, Transport and Commercial

**SUBJECT: KINGSNORTH GARDENS PROPOSED PARKING CONTROLS CONSULTATION**

**SUMMARY:** The proposal is to extend the Guildhall North (Zone E) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Kingsnorth Gardens, part of Cheriton Road and Castle Hill Avenue as shown in appendix 1. This report puts forward the findings of the public consultation for the proposed extension and makes recommendations that reflect the responses received.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- a) Kingsnorth Gardens has been affected by long-term commuter parking problems and an extension of the CPZ (Zone E) to include this area will help address the issues residents are experiencing.
- b) The responses received indicate a majority of respondents are in favour of parking controls to be introduced.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To receive and note Report C/18/58.
2. That subject to statutory consultations, parking controls are progressed in Kingsnorth Gardens and part of Cheriton Road/Castle Hill Avenue as shown in appendix 1.
3. That the hours of operation for the permit restrictions replicate Zone E, Monday to Saturday (excluding bank holidays), 8am -6pm.
4. That non-permit holders be allowed free limited waiting for up to an hour.
5. That each household be restricted to two resident permits.
6. That the number of residents' visitors' permits per household be limited to 50 in any year but this limit be extended in exceptional circumstances.
7. That residents and businesses with more than one car be entitled to buy a shared permit for the number of vehicles registered to them.

8. That the fees for permits and eligibility criteria replicate current arrangements for existing scheme as follows:

Residents' Permit	£30 per year
Additional resident permit	£30 per year
Shared Resident permit	£30 per year
Resident Visitor permit	£5.20 per 5 sessions
Business permit	£60 per year
Replacement lost or stolen permit	£5.20
Special permit (Health & care workers)	Free

**Eligibility criteria:**

**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

9. That a proposed amendment traffic regulation order be advertised as soon as possible for the implementation of the recommended parking controls, and that the Transportation Manager reports back to the Cabinet Member if there are any objections.
10. That a full review of the extended area be carried out 12 months after implementation.

## **1 BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 A controlled parking zone application and a petition was received from residents of Kingsnorth Gardens in late 2016. The application was assessed by officers in 2017.
- 1.2 The assessment confirmed that there are long-term commuter parking problems in this road. The area scored the third highest number of points, and was selected as one of three areas to be prioritised for possible parking controls in the 2018/19 financial year.

## **2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 2.1 The informal consultations took place between the 2<sup>nd</sup> November and 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018. A total of 116 consultation packs were posted to all addresses within the study area. A copy of the consultation document is shown as appendix 2.

## **3. RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 A total of 43 questionnaires were returned. This equates to a 37% response rate which is good for this type of consultation. Response rates for parking consultations across the country are typically between 15% and 25%.
- 3.2 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 who did not respond to the consultation have 'no opinion' about the parking proposals.

## **4. LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR PARKING CONTROLS**

- 4.1 The questionnaire asked respondents if they would like their road included in the proposed controlled parking zone extension. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the level of support amongst residents. Appendix 3 provides a full breakdown of the responses to all questions.

**Table 1: Support for CPZ Extension**

	<b>In favour</b>	<b>Not in favour</b>	<b>No preference</b>
Residents	67%	26%	7%

- 4.2 As can be seen from the above table, a majority of respondents have indicated support for parking controls. It is therefore recommended that subject to statutory consultation, parking controls are progressed. It is further recommended that permit arrangements replicate those of Zone E.

## **5. ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM RESIDENTS**

- 5.1 The questionnaires gave respondents the opportunity to make additional comments about the proposals. Many residents reiterated their preference for parking controls and how it would benefit them. Others stated they also experience problems outside the proposed operational hours, and that this scheme will do little to address them. There were also a few comments about the costs of permits with some residents indicating they will not be able to afford them.

### **Officers Comments**

- 5.2 The council is currently not able to provide a 24 hour enforcement regime due to the significant costs for such operations. Also, problems at night occur in areas where some households own more than one vehicle, off-street parking is limited, and there is not enough space for the number of cars. What a CPZ will do is prevent commuter and long-stay parking and so increase the number of spaces for residents and businesses during the hours of operation.
- 5.3 The cost of a resident permit (£30 per annum) is one of the lowest in the county. The scheme will cost money to set-up, run and enforce. The charges for permits will go towards these costs.

## **6 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 In conclusion, there was a good level of response to the consultation with the response rate well above the normal level for this type of consultation. Overall, a majority of residents within the consultation area who replied to the consultation did support the extension of the CPZ into their roads, hence the recommendation to progress the parking controls.
- 6.2 Parking Services will continue to monitor the parking situation in this area. A further review will be conducted after a year with the analysis reported to Cabinet Member for Transport. This review will be used to gauge residents overall satisfaction and seek views on whether they would like to see any changes made to the CPZ operational hours and level of enforcement.

## **7 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The costs of introducing the new on-street parking controls will be around £1500. This can met from existing budgets. The costs include expenditure for new road markings, signing, and TRO work.
- 7.2 Enforcement of the extended CPZ would not need the Civil Enforcement Officers to deviate from their current patrol routes and could be absorbed within existing resources. The proportion of time spent at each road would be adjusted accordingly. Additional administrative work will be absorbed within existing resources.

- 7.3 Income generation from the scheme 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.

## **8. LEGAL/FINANCIAL AND OTHER CONTROLS/POLICY MATTERS**

### **8.1 Legal Officer's Comments (DK)**

Traffic Regulation Orders ("TROs") include but are not limited to residents' parking bays. Kent County Council ("KCC"), as the highways authority, has power to make TROs under sections 1 and 2 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Any TROs 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 and before it comes into force, the Council must ensure that traffic signs are placed on or near the road which provide adequate information about the effect of the TRO.

### **8.2 Finance Officer's Comments (RH)**

The financial implications have been addressed and costed by the author of this report in section 7.

### **8.3 Diversities and Equalities Implications (FM)**

There are no negative implications arising from this report, particularly in relation to holders of disabled parking badges, as the existing disabled parking bays will remain. The normal exemptions for blue badge holders would apply on yellow lines. Vehicles displaying a disabled person's badge would be permitted to park in permit holder bays without displaying a permit.

## **9. CONTACT OFFICERS AND BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

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

*Report Author, Frederick Miller- Transportation Manager*

*Telephone: 01303 853207. Email: frederick.miller@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk*

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

None

### **Appendices:**

Appendix 1 – Plan showing the proposed CPZ extension

Appendix 2 - Consultation document

Appendix 3 - Spreadsheet showing breakdown of responses by road