

This Report will be made public on 4 November 2021

Report Number **C/21/47**

**To:** Councillor Ray Field, Cabinet Member for Transport and Digital Transformation  
**Date:** 4 November 2021  
**Status:** Non- Key Decision  
**Head of Service:** Andy Blaszkowicz, Director – Housing & Operations

**Cabinet Member:** Councillor Ray Field, Transport and Digital Transformation

**SUBJECT: PROPOSED EXTENSION TO CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE G1**

**SUMMARY:** The proposal is to extend a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Folkestone Harbour Ward (G1) to include East Cliff and other adjacent roads as shown in appendix 1. This report puts forward 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 Transport and Commercial is asked to agree the recommendations set out below because:

- a) This area has been affected by long-term parking problems, and residents have reported that the implementation of zone G1 exacerbated the issues. An extension of zone G1 to include further roads will help address the issues residents are experiencing.
- b) The responses received indicate a majority of respondents in all but two roads are in favour of parking controls to be introduced.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To receive and note Report C/21/47.
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 Segrave Crescent and Thanet Gardens, where a significant majority did not support parking controls.
3. That the hours of operation for the permit restrictions replicate Zone G1, all days, 8am -8pm.
4. That non-permit holders be allowed free limited waiting for up to an hour in roads that can accommodate this.
5. That each household be restricted to two resident permits.
6. That the number of residents' visitors' permits per household be limited to 100 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:

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

**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 Specialist 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 Officers consulted on proposals to introduce controlled parking zone G1 in June this year. During this consultation, residents in adjacent roads made an application for parking controls to also be introduced in their roads.
- 1.2 The application for an extended zone was assessed, and it was decided to proceed with the consultation for a proposed extension. Further schemes were put on hold to enable officers to carry out this work.

## 2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The informal consultations took place between the 23<sup>rd</sup> September and 15<sup>th</sup> October 2021. A total of 636 consultation packs were posted to all addresses within the study area.

## 3. RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 3.1 A total of 294 questionnaires were returned. This equates to a 46.2% response rate which is extremely good for this type of consultation. Response rates for parking consultations across the country are typically between 15% and 25%. As the area is mainly residential, there were no business responses.
- 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 key objective of this consultation was 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. Appendix 2 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	65%	30%	5%

- 4.2 As can be seen above, the overall results indicate strong support for parking controls to be introduced in the area. However, examination of the granular data shown in appendix 2 shows that of the 11 roads consulted, respondents in both Segrave Crescent and Thanet Gardens, are not supportive of the proposed parking controls.

- 4.3 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. Again a significant number of respondents in Segrave Crescent and Thanet Gardens indicated they would prefer not to be included. It is therefore recommended that subject to statutory consultation on a draft TRO, parking controls are introduced in all but Seagrave Crescent and Thanet Gardens.

## **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. A few highlighted issues such as speeding that were outside the scope of this consultation. 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 especially those for visitors 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 within the zone 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. To address the concerns raised about costs to residents for limited visitor parking, it is recommended that shared used (permit holders and limited waiting) bays are introduced where possible. This would allow non-permit holders to park without charge for up to an hour.

## **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. With the exception of Segrave Crescent and Thanet Gardens, a majority of respondents are in favour of parking controls, hence the recommendations
- 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.

## **7 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The costs of introducing the new on-street parking controls will be around £4500. This can be 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 (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 (TM)**

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 - Spreadsheet showing breakdown of responses by road