

**TO: SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**DATE: Monday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2007**

**SUBJECT: SITTINGBOURNE RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME  
(OUTSKIRTS)**

**BY: Head of Technical Services**

**Classification: Unrestricted**

---

**Summary:** This report informs Members of the formal consultation undertaken with respect to the residents comments on the proposed expansion of the Sittingbourne Residents Parking Scheme

**Decision Required:** **That Members note the results of the survey and recommend that:**

- Area's 1 and 2 – A residents parking scheme be introduced, subject to further engagement with residents in order to develop the detail of the scheme
- The scheme be extended to include Saturdays
- A report be submitted to the Sittingbourne Area Forum informing them of the consultation process and to seek funding to implement the scheme from the Parish Grant Allocation
- Officers be delegated, in conjunction with local ward members, to make minor changes to the scheme resulting from further resident engagement

---

Introduction

Consultations have taken place recently regarding a proposal to expand the Sittingbourne Residents Parking Scheme. The consultations were aimed at the area's that are within a close vicinity of the existing scheme. This report has been split into two parts covering both consultations.

**Part A – Consultation with residents on the outskirts of the existing scheme area asking whether they would like to be part of the scheme.**

**Part B – Consultation with a suggested plan layout of the proposed scheme and the area's proposed to be included.**

### Consultation - Part A

The first consultation, undertaken in March 2007, was with residents on the outskirts of the existing scheme area asking whether they would like their roads to be included within the scheme. A space for the resident's comments was included within the leaflet. A copy of the consultation leaflets has been included in Annex A and a location plan of the area's included within both consultations has been included in Annex B.

The roads included within this consultation were:

Rock Road  
Burley Road  
Epps Road  
Unity Street  
Belmont Road  
Valenciennes Road  
Connaught Road  
Ufton Lane (from number 81 - 189)  
Park Road (from number 75 – 269)  
Albany Road (from number 38 – 98)  
Victoria Road  
Well Winch Road

The results of the consultation exercise are broken down into the individual areas covered by the 4 separate leaflets. Within the areas the responses have been broken down into each individual street. The response rate is the proportion of households that responded to the consultation. The support or objection percentages are the views expressed in the responses received.

The results of the consultation is shown in the tables below:

#### Area 1

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Rock Road	47	71	24
Burley Road	30	96	4
Epps Road	48	81	19
<b>Summary</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>20</b>

#### Area 2

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Ufton Lane from numbers 81 to 127	37	47	27
Unity Street	37	88	0
Park Road from number 75 to 138	47	71	25
Albany Road from number 38 to 86	68	82	18
Belmont Road	67	100	0
Connaught Road	50	46	46
<b>Summary</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>20</b>

### Area 3

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Ufton Lane from number 131 to 189	21	50	38
Park Road from number 137 to 269	22	39	48
Valenciennes Road	21	50	50
<b>Summary</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>46</b>

### Area 4

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Well Winch Road	14	25	75
Victoria Road	53	71	24
<b>Summary</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>35</b>

Results from the consultation showed that area's 1,2 and 4 supported the implementation of a parking scheme. The results from area 3 were very close, but ultimately not in favour of being part of the scheme.

### Consultation Part B

Following the results of the initial consultation it was decided that areas 1,2,3 and 4 would be included in the follow up consultation that included a suggested layout plan and further details of the scheme. Although area 3 objected to being part of the scheme, the results were so close that a decision was made to include them in the next consultation for their comments on a more detailed possible scheme layout.

The consultation took place in June 2007 asking residents for their comments on a suggested layout of the scheme. There were 4 different consultation leaflets posted to the relevant areas with a plan of the suggested scheme layout. The consultation material is included in Annex C.

The results from the consultation is shown in the tables below:

### Area 1

Road Name	Response rate %	Support proposed layout %	Object to proposed layout %
Rock Road	42	77	20
Burley Road	33	74	13
Epps Road	33	38	54
<b>Summary</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>23</b>

### Area 2

Road Name	Response rate %	Support proposed layout %	Object to proposed layout %
-----------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

Ufton Lane from numbers 81 to 127	34	64	36
Unity Street	35	80	20
Park Road from number 75 to 138	37	82	18
Albany Road from number 38 to 86	56	79	21
Belmont Road	40	83	0
Connaught Road	38	60	40
<b>Summary</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>23</b>

#### Area 3

Road Name	Response rate %	Support proposed layout %	Object to proposed layout %
Ufton Lane from number 131 to 189	46	28	72
Park Road from number 137 to 269	34	20	80
Valenciennes Road	53	50	50
<b>Summary</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>73</b>

#### Area 4

Road Name	Response rate %	Support proposed layout %	Object to proposed layout %
Well Winch Road	64	50	50
Victoria Road	53	33	62
<b>Summary</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>56</b>

Results from the second consultation showed that area's 1 and 2 supported the suggested scheme layout and area's 3 and 4 objected. Area 3 had a significant number of objections.

#### Discussion

Consultees raised a number of other issues. The key comments included are stated below. Responses to the comments are included below each individual comment

Comment 1 - Reduce double yellow lines to maximise parking

**Response** – Double yellow lines are generally installed to improve visibility. Proposed yellow lines will be reduced if possible to maximise parking.

Comment 2 - Parking problems occur in the evenings and weekends

**Response** - Parking in the evening is predominately by residents so extending the scheme time to cover evenings will have no benefit. This report asks Members to consider an extension to the existing scheme restrictions to include Saturday

Comment 3 - Need assurance the scheme will be enforced

**Response** – If the scheme is progressed enforcement will be provided to cover the extended areas.

Comment 4 - Road not adopted

**Response** – All roads included in the proposed scheme are adopted. The access road to Johnson House off Burley Road is not adopted and therefore will have no restrictions or parking bays.

Comment 5 - Permits should be cheaper or free

**Response** – The cost of a permit is £30. This is a standard Residents Parking Scheme fee throughout the Swale Borough. The fee will cover the cost of administering and enforcing the scheme

Comment 6 - Development at Johnson House Off Burley Road will disrupt the scheme

**Response** – The scheme will not be disrupted by the proposed development. Parking at the proposed development will be self-contained and in accordance with the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards 2006. Properties within this new development will not be issued with permits.

Comment 7 - Introduce a one-way system within Burly Road/Rock Road

**Response** – Kent County Council are the Highway Authority that progress Traffic Regulation Orders for one-way roads and this request will be passed to them.

Comment 8 - Will the scheme cover Bank Holidays

**Response** – Currently the scheme does not cover Bank Holidays

Comment 9 - Restrict parking for commercial vehicles

**Response** – The proposed scheme would have a 2-hour parking restriction for non-permit holders. A complete ban on commercial vehicles is not practical as there are existing businesses in the area that may receive deliveries and use commercial vehicles for their business.

Comment 10 - The town would benefit from more car parks

**Response** – There are currently 9 public car parks within the town centre area. Two of the 9 car parks have recently been re-surfaced and lighting installed.

Comment 11 - Suggested parking bays will reduce parking areas

**Response** – The majority of the proposed parking bays will be located where existing vehicles usually park. The slight reduction in parking would be due to double yellow lines to improve visibility for road users, therefore, making the road safer

Comment 12 - A length of road in Ufton Lane between Homewood Avenue and West Ridge has no detail on the plans, is there free parking at that location

**Response** – The mentioned location is a misprint on the consultation material and will not be free parking. The location will be surveyed and parking bays or double yellow lines installed depending on the carriageway layout

Comment 13 - Traffic calming measures need to be introduced

**Response** – Kent County Council are the Highway Authority that installs traffic calming measures and this request will be passed to them.

Comment 14 - Non-permit holders should not be able to park free for 2 hours

**Response** – The scheme's objective is to reduce long term parking by non-residents, therefore increasing parking spaces at key times. Short parking times such as 2 hours should not have an impact on residents and will allow a non-permit holder sufficient time to park.

Comment 15 - If the scheme is implemented it will push the problems to roads on the outskirts, like Regency Court

**Response** – If the scheme is implemented in Victoria Road and Well Winch Road then the impact on parking in Regency Court will be monitored, if the scheme does have an impact the results will be submitted to the Joint Transportation Board

#### Scheme Implementation

Subject to the approval of the Board the expansion of the scheme could be implemented by December 2007. Funding of the changes to the Traffic Order and the installation of the signs and lines may be possible through the income generated through the residents scheme and parking enforcement. If when detailed cost estimates are prepared there are insufficient funds available within the existing budget then a report will be submitted to the Sittingbourne Unparished Grants Committee for consideration.

#### Recommendation

That Members note the results of the survey and recommend that:

- Area's 1 and 2 - A residents parking scheme be introduced, subject to further engagement with residents in order to develop the detail of the scheme
- The scheme be extended to include Saturday
- A report be submitted to the Sittingbourne Area Forum informing them of the consultation process and to seek funding to implement the scheme from the Parish Grant Allocation
- Officers be delegated, in conjunction with local ward members, to make minor changes to the scheme resulting from further resident engagement

Author - Brett O'Connell – Ext 7061

List of background documents –  
File