

This Report will be made  
public on 11 February  
2019



Report Number **C/18/76**

**To:** Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial  
**Date:** 11 February 2019  
**Status:** Non- Key Decision  
**Head of Service:** Andy Blaszkowicz, Head of Commercial and  
Technical Services  
**Cabinet Member:** Councillor Ann Berry, Transport and Commercial

**SUBJECT: INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS TO EXTEND  
CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES F & G.**

**SUMMARY:** The proposal is to extend the F & G Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) as shown in appendix 1. This report puts forward the findings of the informal consultation for the proposed extensions, 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) There are genuine long-term parking problems in the roads recommended for parking controls.
- b) The responses received indicate a majority of respondents in the roads recommended, are in favour of parking controls to be introduced.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To receive and note Report C/18/76.
2. That for the proposed zone F extension, parking controls are not progressed in the section Black Bull Road, and all roads to the east of it as there is little or no overall support for the introduction of restrictions in these roads.
3. That subject to statutory consultations, parking controls are progressed in roads west of Black Bull Road, except in Albert Road, Edward Road, and Bonsor Road where respondents have indicated no support for restrictions.
4. That for zone G proposed extension, subject to statutory consultations, parking controls are progressed in all but Harbour Way, where a majority of respondents did not support the proposed restrictions.
5. That the hours of operation for the permit restrictions replicate existing zones F & G.

6. That in roads where shared use parking is proposed, non-permit holders be allowed free limited waiting for one or two hours.
7. That each household be restricted to two resident permits.
8. That the number of residents' visitors' permits per household be limited to 50 in any year but this limit be extended in exceptional circumstances.
9. That residents and businesses with more than one car be entitled to buy a shared permit for the number of vehicles registered to them.
10. 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

11. 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.
12. That a full review of the parking in the extended areas, and the roads that have been excluded, be carried out 12 months after implementation.

## **1. BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Controlled Parking Zones F & G were introduced in 2018 and 2017 respectively. Since the introduction of the parking controls, officers have received a number of representations, petitions and applications for parking controls to be introduced in neighbouring streets.
- 1.2 Officers carried out assessments, which confirmed that there are genuine long-term parking problems in many of the roads shown in appendix 1. The two study areas scored the highest number of points, and were selected to be prioritised for possible parking controls in the 2019/20 financial year. However, many residents expressed acute parking problems so a decision was made to start the consultation earlier.
- 1.3 There were a few roads adjacent to busy roads that were not heavily parked when surveyed e.g. Fernbank Crescent and Linden Crescent. However, the decision was made to also consult residents in these roads as parking could easily displace into these roads if parking controls are introduced in the busy roads.

## **2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 2.1 The informal consultations took place between the 2<sup>nd</sup> January and 21<sup>st</sup> January 2019. A total of 1738 consultation packs were posted to all addresses within the two study areas. A copy of the consultation document is shown as appendix 2.

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

- 3.1 A total of 536 questionnaires were returned. This equates to a 31% 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**

### **Zone F Proposed Extension**

- 4.1 The questionnaire asked respondents if they would like their road included in the proposed controlled parking zone extension. The area is mainly residential. The handful of businesses that responded, did not support the proposal. Appendix 3 provides a full breakdown of the responses.
- 4.2 Residents of the proposed section of Black Bull Road, and all roads to the east (with the exception of Ernwell Road), did not support the proposed parking controls. It is therefore recommended that parking controls are not

progressed in any of these roads. Officers will continue to monitor parking in these roads and make suitable recommendations after a year.

- 4.3 Respondents in roads to the west of Black Bull Road (with the exception of Albert Road, Edward Road, and Bonsor Road) have indicated support for parking controls. The responses from Garden Road and Walton Road when considered with the responses to question 2 were indeterminate. However, a high number respondents indicated 'no opinion'. It is therefore recommended that with the exception of Albert Road, Edward Road and Bonsor Road, subject to statutory consultations, parking controls are progressed in all roads west of Black Bull Road.

### **Zone G Proposed Extension**

- 4.4 There was strong support for the proposed Zone G extension with 74% of respondents stating yes to this proposal. However, closer examination of the responses by road have shown that a majority of respondents in Harbour Way would not like their road to be included. When asked whether they would support the parking controls if introduced in adjacent roads, the vast majority (76%) stated they would still prefer their road to be excluded. Further analysis of the responses from the top and bottom section of Harbour Way also reveal a majority of respondents in both sections, are against the proposal.
- 4.5 Zone G proposed extended area is also mainly residential. Responses were received from some of the few businesses in the area. A majority indicated they did not support the proposals but the reasons for this are unclear.
- 4.6 As the majority of respondents in the entire study area are in favour of the proposals, it is therefore recommended that subject to statutory consultations, parking controls are progressed in all but Harbour Way. Officers will continue to monitor parking in Harbour Way and make further recommendations at a later date.
- 4.7 The proposed restrictions include limited waiting for non-permit holders so customers visiting businesses in the area will still be able to park without charge.

## **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 the problems occur 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, whilst others stated they would 'gladly pay to be able to park close to their homes'. Some residents also commented on matters not relating to parking e.g. pot holes, bins, planning issues etc.

### **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, respondents within the majority of the roads did support the extension of the CPZ into their roads, hence the recommendation to progress the parking controls in a limited number of roads.
- 6.2 Parking Services will continue to monitor the parking situation in both study areas. A further review will be conducted after a year, which will include the roads that have been excluded, and the analysis reported to Cabinet Member for Transport. This review will be also be used to gauge residents overall satisfaction, and seek views on whether they would like to see any changes made to the CPZs and level of enforcement.

## **7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The costs of introducing the new on-street parking controls will be around £6000. 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. A staffing request has been made to assist with the additional administrative work.
- 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 and share-use 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