

**TO: SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

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

**SUBJECT: SITTINGBOURNE RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME REVIEW**

**BY:** Head of Technical Services

**Classification:** Unrestricted

**Summary:** This report informs Members of the formal consultation undertaken with respect to the existing Sittingbourne Residents Parking Scheme

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

- The scheme be extended to included Saturdays
- Officers be delegated, in conjunction with local ward members, to make minor changes to the scheme resulting from further resident engagement.

---

Introduction

Residents have been consulted in relation to the residents parking scheme that was implemented in November 2006. The consultation asked residents if they thought the scheme was working. Residents were also asked to submit any comments they had regarding the existing scheme. The comments would help Officers to understand the current situation and where justified, alterations could be made to improve the current layout.

A copy of the consultation material is shown in Annex A.

Consultation Results

The consultation has attracted an average response from residents. The majority of residents consulted thought the scheme worked, although there were various comments on the current scheme layout on how to improve its effectiveness. One of the main comments in both areas has been to extend the enforcement times and include all or part of the weekend. The consultation areas have been included in Annex B. Other comments, in general, highlighted the need to look at the existing lining layout, parking restrictions and enforcement to be improved.

A petition has been received from a resident in Albany Road stating residents are abusing the scheme. The letter indicates that residents in other roads within the scheme area park their vehicles in Albany Road to get close access to the town centre, therefore, making parking for the residents of Albany Road a problem. Also it indicates that an increasing number of visitor permit vehicles are using Albany Road to park and walk into town. The petition is included in Annex C and a letter of response

from the Council is included in Annex D. The issues raised in the petition are covered after comment 9 in the discussion section of this report.

The results of the consultation exercise are broken down into the individual areas. 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 in the tables below:

#### Area 5

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Albany Road from number 2 to 36	26	100	0
Park Road from number 4 to 82	11	57	0
William Street from number 1A to 119	14	65	24
Addington Road	22	50	50
Ufton Lane from Hall to number 79	33	67	17
Nativity Close	18	40	20
Anselm Close	0	0	0
<b>Summary</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>14</b>

#### Area 6

Road Name	Response rate %	Support %	Object %
Hawthorn Road	14	50	50
Frederick Street	28	91	9
Gibson Street	35	83	0
Arthur Street	28	20	40
Laburnum Place	7	50	0
Chalkwell Road from garage to number 133	15	14	43
Barkers Court	13	50	0
<b>Summary</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>27</b>

The consultation shows there is broad support for the current scheme, although some minor changes probably need to be made to improve the effectiveness of the scheme. There have been comments from the residents in regards to pushing the parking problem to the outskirts of the existing scheme area. This issue should be resolved if approval is given for the implementation of an expansion to the current scheme into the surrounding areas as per proposed in the report "Sittingbourne Residents Parking Scheme (outskirts)".

## 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 - The scheme should be free – this is an additional tax

**Response** - The cost per permit is £30 per year, which is the same as that currently charged within Faversham. The income received from the issue of permits is spent upon the administration and maintenance of the scheme, but primarily to provide enforcement.

Comment 2 - Scheme operating times should be extended and Saturdays included

**Response** - The residents parking scheme is currently in force between 8am and 6pm, Monday through to Friday. There were several comments that the scheme would benefit from extending the enforcement times and include all or part of the weekend. The current enforcement times cover the majority of the average working day. The scheme would benefit from Saturday being included.

Comment 3 - Adequate enforcement must be provided

**Response** - The parking attendants on average enforce the scheme 2-3 times a week. This can be reviewed and maybe increased if necessary. If Saturday is included within the scheme then extra enforcement will be needed to cover this extension.

Comment 4 - Businesses should not be able to buy permits

**Response** - Businesses within the scheme area have as much right as the residents to apply for permits. The Council would like to encourage businesses to reside within various areas in Sittingbourne to strengthen to the local economy. If business users/customers cannot park near their premises then businesses may move out of the area. However, following discussion with Executive Member for Community Safety and Economic Development it has been agreed that businesses will not be issued with day visitor permits or be allowed to buy such permits. It has become apparent that some businesses are issuing visitors permits to staff who park all day causing a problem to residents. Customers will still be able to park near businesses as limited waiting is permitted throughout the scheme.

Comment 5 - Bays should be painted with a segregation line to encourage sensible parking

**Response** - The segregation of bays can be marked on site, but this can reduce the number of vehicle parking spaces. The Kent Vehicle Parking Standards advise bays to be 5.5 metres in length to allow for acceptable manoeuvrability. According to the standards published in 2003, the average car length is 4.4 metres; therefore, a bay of 5.5 metres will allow approximately 1 metre manoeuvrability within the bay. Smaller vehicles (less than 4.4m) will leave valuable space within the bay area that could be used if the bays were not segregated.

Comment 6 - Visibility at some junctions needs improving

**Response** - The current layout will be examined to see if visibility can be improved at junctions by extending existing double yellow lines. This may lead to a small reduction of overall parking spaces available.

Comment 7 - Planters in Frederick Street should be removed to maximise parking space

**Response** - There is a proposal to reduce some planter areas in Frederick Street to increase parking availability. The implementation of these proposals will be subject to an agreement by Kent County Council and may require an independent safety audit.

Comment 8 - Allocate parking spaces to each household

**Response** - Allocated parking bays for residents cannot be placed within the adopted highway.

Comment 9 - Parking in Albany Road should be for Albany Road residents only. Residents from other areas within the scheme park in Albany Road to get nearer to their place of work. A petition from residents has been received; a copy is included in Annex C.

**Response** - The implementation of resident's only parking in individual roads can cause problems. If there were no spaces left for residents in their road that would mean they would have to park outside the scheme area. Considering the average household may have 2 vehicles, the likelihood of this happening would be high. However, a survey of vehicles parked in Albany Road showed that only one vehicle was parked by a resident not living in the area close to Albany Road.

#### Recommendation

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

1. That the scheme be extended to include Saturday.
2. 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