

This Report will be made public on 6 August 2020



Report Number **C/20/29**

To: Councillor David Godfrey, Cabinet Member for Transport and Commercial
Date: 6 August 2020
Status: Non- Key Decision
Head of Service: Andy Blaszkowicz, Director – Housing & Operations

SUBJECT: FOLKESTONE HARBOUR PROPOSED PARKING CONTROLS CONSULTATION

SUMMARY: The proposal is to extend the existing controlled parking zone (Zone G) to include roads in the Folkestone Harbour area as shown in appendix 1. This report explains the findings of the recent public consultation for the proposed extension, and makes recommendations that reflect the responses received.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Transport and special projects is asked to agree the recommendations set out below because:

- a) The area has been affected by long-term commuter parking problems and an extension of the CPZ (Zone G) to include further roads 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/20/29.
2. That subject to statutory consultations on a proposed traffic regulation order (TRO), parking controls are progressed in the roads shown in appendix 1.
3. That the draft TRO includes restrictions for the rest of Tram Road, Dover Road (between Martello Road and Southern Way), Grove Road, Abbott Road, Morrison Road, Ormond Road, Folly Road, Rossendale Gardens and Rossendale Road, in light of the recent petition received for the inclusion of these roads.
4. That the proposed TRO include 'permit holders only' parking in all but Dover Road in order to maximise parking for residents.
5. That shared use parking and 1 hour free limited waiting spaces are proposed for Dover Road to enable parking for customers visiting local shops.
6. That the hours of operation for the permit restrictions replicate Zone G, Monday to Sunday (including bank holidays), 8am -8pm.
7. That each household or business be restricted to a maximum of two resident or business 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 Specialist reports back to the Cabinet Member, if there are any objections.
12. That a full review of the extended area be carried out 12 months after implementation.

1 BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 An application for a controlled parking zone (CPZ) was received from residents of Tram Road and roads adjacent to it in July 2018. The application was assessed by officers in 2019.
- 1.2 The assessment confirmed that there are long-term parking problems in these roads. The area scored the second highest number of points, and was selected as one of three areas to be prioritised for possible parking controls in the 2020/21 financial year.
- 1.3 Harbour Way was included in a previous consultation but the parking controls proposed at the time had been opposed by a majority of residents. Since the introduction of parking controls in other roads, officers received a number of representations about parking pressures, so it was decided to re-consult residents in 2020/21.
- 1.4 The main issues that have been raised by residents in the area over the years are:
 - Parking pressures caused by visitors to the harbour
 - Hazards caused by obstructive parking particularly at junctions, corners and in narrow roads
 - Nuisance caused by large number of commercial and abandoned vehicles
 - Displacement parking from adjacent CPZs
- 1.5 One way that may alleviate parking problems in addition to the introduction of waiting restrictions is to introduce a CPZ. The aim of a CPZ is to prioritise parking for residents by restricting non-resident and commuter parking. With an established CPZ (Zone G) covering adjacent roads in the area, an extension of this zone to include further roads, is the most logical approach to help address the issues.

2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 2.1 To gauge support for an extension of Zone G to include further roads, the council undertook informal consultations between the 6th and 24th July 2020. A total of 481 consultation packs were posted to all addresses within the study area, which is mainly residential.

3. RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 3.1 A total of **134** questionnaires were returned by residents. This equates to a **28%** 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.

- 3.3 During this consultation, the council received a petition signed by residents and an application for further roads to be included. The petition was submitted by Folkestone Town Council's Cllr Mary Lawes. It requested that the rest of Tram Road, Dover Road (between Martello Road and Southern Way), Grove Road, Abbott Road, Morrison Road, Ormond Road, Folly Road, Rossendale Gardens and Rossendale Road be included in the proposed parking scheme.

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 2 provides a full breakdown of the responses to all questions.

Table 1: Support for CPZ Extension

	In favour	Not in favour	No preference
Residents	71%	24%	5%

- 4.2 It is clear from the responses that an overwhelming majority of respondents are in favour of parking controls to be introduced. This reflects the volume of representations about parking pressures officers have received from residents over the years.

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 this would benefit them. There were also a few comments about the costs of permits with some residents indicating they will not be able to afford them. Unsurprisingly, comments were made on issues outside the scope of Parking Services such as speeding and road design, which are matters for Kent County Council and not relevant to this consultation.

Officers Comments

- 5.2 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 AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 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.
- 6.2 As can be seen from the above table 1, the vast majority of respondents have indicated support for parking controls. It is therefore recommended that subject to statutory consultation, parking controls in the form of 'permit

holders only' parking are progressed in all but Dover Road where shared-use/free 1 hour limited waiting is proposed. Permit restrictions will ensure parking spaces are protected for residents and businesses within the zone, and will encourage visitors to the area to use car parks. It is further recommended that permit arrangements replicate those of Zone G.

- 6.3 In light of the petition received during this consultation, it is also recommended that permit restrictions are included in the draft TRO for the rest of Tram Road, Dover Road (between Martello Road and Southern Way), Grove Road, Abbott Road, Morrison Road, Ormond Road, Folly Road, Rossendale Gardens and Rossendale Road.
- 6.4 The TRO process includes a minimum of three weeks statutory consultation. Officers will engage further with all residents and businesses within the study area (including those in the additional roads stated in 6.3), and at the end of this consultation, report back to the Cabinet Member for Transport, if there are any objections to the TRO.

7 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The costs of introducing the new on-street parking controls will be around £5000. This can be met from existing budgets. The costs include expenditure for new road markings, signing, and TRO advertising.
- 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 (NE)

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 FHDC 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.

8.2 Finance Officer's Comments (RH)

The financial implications have been addressed and costed by the author of this report in section 7 – all expenditure can be met by existing budgets, and due to the area there will only be a small amount of additional income received.

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 - Spreadsheet showing breakdown of responses by road