

<b>SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD</b>	<b>Agenda Item:</b>
---	---------------------

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Monday 6 <sup>th</sup> September 2021
<b>Report Title</b>	Informal Consultation Results – Extension of Residents’ Parking Scheme – Edith Road, Faversham
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Cllr Richard Palmer, Cabinet Member for Community
<b>Head of Service</b>	Martyn Cassell, Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Mike Knowles (SBC)
<b>Classification</b>	Open

<b>Recommendations</b>	Members are asked to note the results of the recent informal consultation and recommend that the possible extension of the existing Residents’ Parking Scheme to include Edith Road, Faversham <b><u>either</u></b> be progressed <b><u>or</u></b> abandoned.
------------------------	---

## **1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

- 1.1 This report provides details of a recent informal consultation undertaken with residents of Edith Road, Faversham, on the possible extension of the existing Residents’ Parking Scheme, following the previous report and recommendation by the Swale Joint Transportation Board in March 2021.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 Copies of the informal consultation material sent to residents can be found in Annex A and the responses received can be found in Annex B.

## **3. Issue for Decision**

- 3.1 At the request of a resident, the Ward Member conducted a survey with residents of Edith Road in Faversham, asking if they would like to see the parking control zone (Residents’ Parking Scheme) extended to include Edith Road. The residents were given three options in this survey, including no change to the current parking arrangements. The results of the initial survey were 9 responses indicating no change to the current arrangements and 16 responses requesting inclusion in the Residents’ Parking Scheme.

- 3.2 The results of this survey were reported to the Swale Joint Transportation Board at their meeting in March 2021, where Members recommended that an informal consultation take place with residents of Edith Road.
- 3.3 The informal consultation was undertaken in May and June, avoiding the pre-election period. The results of the informal consultation can be found in Annex B. Of the 32 properties consulted, a total of 19 responses were received, giving a response rate of 59%. Of the 19 responses, **9 (47%)** supported the possible extension of the current scheme to include Edith Road and **10 (53%)** objected to the extension.
- 3.4 The comments received from residents, included in Annex B, demonstrate that there were strong opinions both for and against any extension to the current scheme area to include Edith Road. In addition to the consultation responses, several enquires were received from residents of neighbouring streets who had been made aware of the informal consultation, and expressed concern that vehicles would be displaced into these adjoining roads should the scheme be extended to include Edith Road.
- 3.5 Ward Member Comments: One Ward Member has provided the following comments: *“The results of the council consultation do not match the results received by Ward members when undertaking a similar survey of residents views in the late summer of 2020 between lockdowns. Ward members received responses from 26 (84%) of the 31 households on Edith road, with 9 (35%) objecting to any changes to existing parking arrangements, 16 (62%) indicating their support for the introduction of permit controls and 1 (3%) indicating both support and objection. It may well be that some households have changed their minds between the ward members informal survey and the council’s informal consultation, or that a number of those in favour have failed to respond to the council’s consultation. There are valid points from both sides which the committee should consider when deciding whether to progress or abandon the extension of the Residents Parking Scheme to Edith Road.”*

## 4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the results of the recent informal consultation and recommend that the possible extension of the existing Residents’ Parking Scheme to include Edith Road, Faversham **either** be progressed **or** abandoned.

## 5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Cost of Drafting and Advertising Traffic Regulation Order, Cost of Installing Lines and Signs on site, Cost of Administrative Changes to Accommodate New Scheme Area Permits. Potential for further consultation in surrounding roads should Scheme be implemented.
Legal and Statutory	Advertising of Traffic Regulation Order, reports back to JTB with formal objections, and 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	The introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme in Edith Road, Faversham, may improve the mental wellbeing of some residents who currently feel that on-street parking capacity is reduced due to parking by non-residents, and may allow them to park closer to their properties, reducing the distance to walk from their vehicles. However, stress to some residents may be increased by the introduction of the Scheme if they are own more vehicles than they can accommodate with the Permit Scheme, forcing them to park further from their properties. The mental wellbeing of residents in adjoining roads may be impacted by the displacement of vehicles into their roads, reducing available on-street parking capacity. Some residents may also find the annual cost of the permits to be an additional financial burden.

## 6. Appendices

- 6.1 Annex A – Copy of Consultation Material
- Annex B – Results of Informal Consultation

## 7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None