

SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD	Agenda Item: 8
---	-----------------------

Meeting Date	Monday 7 th December 2020
Report Title	Review of Residents' Parking Schemes in Swale
Cabinet Member	Cllr Richard Palmer, Cabinet Member for Communities
Head of Service	Martyn Cassell, Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure
Lead Officer	Mike Knowles (SBC)
Classification	Open
Recommendations	Report for Information Only

1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report provides details of the results of the recent survey undertaken on Residents' Parking Schemes in the Borough.

2. Background

- 2.1 At their meeting in March 2020, Members of the Swale Joint Transportation Board recommended that a full review of Residents' Parking Schemes in the Borough be undertaken, prior to considering a possible extension to the current Scheme in Sittingbourne.

3. Issue for Decision

- 3.1 Following discussions with Members, it was agreed that a survey be undertaken with residents of Swale on the current Residents' Parking Schemes. It was stated that the questions should be generic, to allow residents both within and outside of the current Schemes to take part and submit their views.
- 3.2 An introduction to the survey was produced, which also provided information on what Residents' Parking Schemes can and cannot achieve in terms of addressing parking issues, and a copy of this document can be found in Annex A.
- 3.3 The survey was based online, with links provided on our website, on social media and in the introduction document which was sent to Members to promote in their

respective areas. Paper copies of the survey were also made available to those residents who did not have access to the internet. The survey ran from Monday 26th October to Friday 20th November 2020

- 3.4 A copy of the survey questions can be found in Annex B.
- 3.5 A total of 119 responses were received to the survey, and a breakdown of the feedback to each question can be found in Annex C. The majority of responses were from the Faversham and Sittingbourne areas, which is as expected as these are the areas where there are existing Residents' Parking Schemes. For Faversham, 39% of responses were from residents within a current scheme, and of those responses 73% felt that they benefitted from being within the scheme. For Sittingbourne, 59% of responses were from residents within a current scheme, and of those 65% felt that they benefitted from being within the scheme.
- 3.6 The majority of responses from Faversham and Sittingbourne felt that the waiting limit for non-permit holders within the scheme areas should be 2 hours, although there was also significant support for a one-hour limit.
- 3.7 In terms of timing for the schemes, in Faversham the preferred start times were 9am (16 responses), 8am (15 responses) and 8.30am (13 responses). For Sittingbourne, the most preferred start time was 7am (13 responses), followed by 8am (10 responses) and 9am (9 responses). For the other areas, there was no clear preference. For finish times, in Faversham the preferred time was 6pm (16 responses) followed by 5pm (12 responses), in Sittingbourne it was 6pm (12 responses) followed by 7pm and 10pm (6 responses each). For the other areas, there was a slight majority for an 8pm finish time.
- 3.8 For both Sittingbourne and Faversham, the most popular suggested number of permits which should be available per household was 2 (37 responses in Faversham and 23 in Sittingbourne), followed by 3 permits (14 responses for Faversham and 15 for Sittingbourne). For the other areas the general consensus was 2 permits.
- 3.9 All of the responses received provided a general majority support for Residents' Parking Schemes, although there was a higher percentage of support in Faversham than in Sittingbourne.
- 3.10 Further data on the responses received can be found in Annex C, and a graphical representation of the results can be found in Annex D. A number of comments were also received in response to the survey, but these have not been included in this report to minimise volume of data. Should Members wish to see a summary of the comments received these can be provided, either directly to individual Members from Officers, or via a report to a future JTB Meeting.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Report for Information Only.

5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	None at this stage. Any changes to Residents' Parking Schemes would require a Traffic Regulation Order and amendments to on site lining and signing. Survey has taken significant response to prepare, and to compile and evaluate responses.
Legal and Statutory	Any changes to current Schemes would require a Traffic Regulation Order, including formal consultation process and Sealing by KCC.
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 – Copy of Introduction to Survey and Background Information
- Annex B – Copy of Survey Questions
- Annex C – Breakdown of Results of Survey
- Annex D – Graphical Summary of Survey Results

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None