

This Report will be made public on 30 June 2021

Report Number **C/21/19**

To: Councillor David Godfrey, Cabinet Member for Housing, Transport and Special Projects
Date: 30 June 2021
Status: Non- Key Decision
Head of Service: Andy Blaszkowicz, Director – Housing & Operations

SUBJECT: PROPOSED PARKING CONTROLS CONSULTATION- EAST CLIFF GARDENS AREA

SUMMARY: The proposal is to introduce parking controls in the East Cliff Gardens Area, Folkestone Harbour Ward as shown in appendix 1. This report explains the findings of the recent public consultation for the proposed parking controls, 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 visitor and displacement parking problems. Parking controls 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/21/19.
2. That subject to statutory consultations on a proposed traffic regulation order (TRO), a new controlled parking zone (CPZ) is progressed to cover all the roads shown in appendix 1.
3. That the proposed TRO include 'permit holders only' parking in all but Dyke Road, as the majority of respondents have indicated support for such restriction. Permit holders only parking will maximise parking for residents in the area.
4. That shared use parking with 1 hour limited waiting spaces are proposed for Dyke Road (between North Street and Radnor Bridge Road) to enable some free limited waiting for non-permit holders.
5. That the hours/days of operation for the permit restrictions replicate the adjacent Zone G i.e. Monday to Sunday (including bank holidays), 8am -8pm, as the majority of respondents have indicated support for this.
6. That each household or business be restricted to a maximum of two resident or business permits.
7. That the number of residents' visitors' permits per household be limited to 100 in any year, but this limit be extended in exceptional circumstances.

8. That residents and businesses with more than one car be entitled to buy a shared permit for the number of vehicles registered to them.
9. That the fees for permits and eligibility criteria replicate current arrangements for existing schemes 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

10. That a proposed 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.
11. That a full review of the new controlled parking zone be carried out 12 months after implementation.

1 BACKGROUND & INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 An application and a petition for a controlled parking zone (CPZ) was received from residents of East Cliff Gardens and surrounding roads earlier this year.
- 1.2 The application was assessed by officers and 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 2021/22 financial year.
- 1.3 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
- 1.4 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.

2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 2.1 To gauge support for parking controls, the council undertook informal consultations between the 1st and 21st June 2021. A total of 169 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 **74** questionnaires were returned. This equates to a **44%** response rate, which is considerably high 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 The high response rate demonstrates that there are genuine concerns about parking in the area, and residents are keen to resolve them.

4. LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR PARKING CONTROLS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The questionnaire asked respondents if they would like to see parking controls introduced in their road. 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

	In favour	Not in favour	No preference
Residents	86.3%	8.2%	5.5%
Business	100%	-	-

4.1 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.

4.3 The questionnaire also asked respondents to indicate their preferred days/hours of control. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the responses.

Table 2: Preferred hours of controls

	Mon- Fri	Mon-Sat	Mon-Sun	8am-8pm	8am-6pm	Other
Residents	1.5%	4.4%	92.8%	56.5	21.8	13
Business	-	-	100%	-	100	-

4.4 The majority of respondents are in favour of the parking controls to be Monday- Sunday, 8am- 8pm. A few of the respondents indicated preference for parking controls to be at all times, which is not possible as we do not have a 24-hours enforcement regime.

4.5 Respondents were also asked to indicate their preferred restriction. Table 3 below provides a breakdown of the responses.

Table 3: Preferred Restriction

	Permit Holders only	Shared-use 1 hour	Shared use 2 hours
Residents	70%	22%	8%
Business	100%	-	-

4.6 In view of the above responses, it is recommended that a CPZ is introduced in the entire area shown in appendix 1 (subject to statutory consultation on the traffic regulation order), and the hours of control be 8am-8pm, Monday-Sunday (including bank holidays). This will be similar to the hours of control in the adjacent Zone G.

4.7 It is further recommended that 'permit holders only' parking is introduced in all but Dyke Road. Analysis couldn't be drawn from the one respondent in Dyke Road. However, considering this proposed section of Dyke Road has only six properties with possibly the least demand for permit spaces, it is

recommended that 1 hour shared use parking bays are introduced to allow non-permit holders some free but restricted parking.

- 4.8 Officers also recommend that the cost of permits, eligibility criteria and limit on permit numbers replicate current arrangements for existing CPZs.

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 the difficulties they were experiencing and their preference for parking controls to be expedited. There were also a few comments about the costs of permits with some residents indicating that this was just another stealth tax.

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

- 6.1 In conclusion, there was a very good level of response to the consultation with the response rate well above the normal levels.
- 6.2 The vast majority of respondents have indicated support for parking controls hence the recommendation to progress a CPZ in the area.
- 6.3 The TRO process includes a minimum of three weeks statutory consultation. Officers will engage further with residents and businesses within and outside the study area, 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 £4000. This can met from existing budgets. The costs include expenditure for new road markings, signing, and TRO advertising.
- 7.2 Enforcement of this 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. There will be additional administrative work, and a separate request has already been made for extra resources to cover workload.
- 7.3 Income generation from the scheme is anticipated to be very low as there are no pay & display facilities proposed. 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