

SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD	Agenda Item:
---	---------------------

Meeting Date	Monday 7 th September 2020
Report Title	Parking Proposals Abbey Street Area, Faversham – Abbey Neighbourhood Association
Cabinet Member	Cllr Tim Valentine
Head of Service	Martyn Cassell
Lead Officer	Brett O'Connell (SBC)
Classification	Open

Recommendations	Update Report for Information Only
------------------------	------------------------------------

1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report provides an update following a document received from the Abbey Neighbourhood Association proposing parking and vehicle movement improvements in Abbey Street and Abbey Place in Faversham.

2. Background

- 2.1 A member of the Abbey Neighbourhood Association (ANA) submitted a document to the JTB in March 2020 proposing alterations to the parking in Abbey Street and Abbey Place. The document also included proposals to improve vehicle movements by forming passing places in Abbey Street. This report provides an update on the proposals.

3. Issue for Decision

- 3.1 A survey has been undertaken looking at the possibility of implementing the preferred choice of parking and moving vehicle management as per the ANA report submitted at the March 2020 JTB meeting. A copy of the proposed plans can be found in Annex A.
- 3.2 The plans show the extent of the current parking areas and proposed alterations to the layout, which includes areas of double yellow lines to manage passing places and segregating parking bays with lining.

- 3.3 The survey showed that by segregating parking bays into individual spaces with road markings there would be capacity for approximately 105 vehicles, this includes the two newly proposed bays in Abbey Place (south side). The smallest bays would be 4.7 metres in length, with the majority of the bays being 5 metres or more. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) states there is no longer a minimum or maximum parking bay size, except for disabled parking bays which should be no smaller than 6.6 metres. The smaller 4.7 metre long bays would struggle to accommodate an average sized vehicle due to manoeuvring into the space, but if these were made larger there would be fewer parking spaces.
- 3.4 Segregation of parking spaces can have both a positive and negative effect. Positive effects include promoting managed parking throughout the area, therefore minimising a vehicle not using the full extent of the area, for example, by parking 2 metres from the end of a bay and not allowing a big enough space for another vehicle. Negative effects tend to be that the size of the bay may be a lot larger than the vehicle parking there, especially in the case of smaller “economy” type vehicles, therefore taking up valuable space. The opposite could also occur where larger vehicles such as a van or pick up may not fit in one of the smaller bays and would overhang the next bay. If it is recommended that segregated bays are to be installed, I would recommend that no enforcement action is taken against vehicles not parked completely within one bay, and that these markings be advisory only.
- 3.5 The existing capacity of parking depends on the size of vehicles using the bays but based on an average sized vehicle of 4.5 metres in length this would equate to approximately 119 vehicles. This shows, on average, that a greater capacity may be achieved if you do not segregate the bays. It should be noted that the results of this report are approximate and will vary depending on vehicle sizes and how they are parked.
- 3.6 The plans contained in Annex A show proposed passing spaces of approximately 10 to 13 metres in length where vehicles will be able to pull in to allow another vehicle travelling in the opposite direction to pass safely. The spaces would be created by the installation of double yellow lines and would require a Traffic Regulation Order prior to implementation. This would be the simplest way of achieving a passing space. The ANA proposal consists of white lines, signing and lighting. This option would require a full and detailed design, to be approved by Kent County Council as Highway Authority, and funding would need to be sourced for the works.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this update report and recommend further discussions with ANA be progressed following this survey.

5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Cost and Resource to prepare Traffic Regulation Orders, cost of installing lining and signing.
Legal and Statutory	Sealing by Kent County Council.
Crime and Disorder	None at this stage.
Risk Management and Health and Safety	None identified at this stage.
Equality and Diversity	None identified at this stage.
Sustainability	None identified at this stage.
Health Implications	None identified at this stage.

6. Appendices

6.1 Annex A – Survey Plans

7. Background Papers

7.1 None