SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Meeting Date	Monday 10 th September 2018
Report Title	Petition - Parking Review – Conyer Road, Teynham
Cabinet Member	Cllr Alan Horton
SMT Lead	Martyn Cassell
Head of Service	Martyn Cassell
Lead Officer	Mike Knowles (SBC)
Classification	Open

Recommendations Members are asked to note the contents of the report.

1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

1.1 This report provides an initial response to the petition submitted to the Swale Joint Transportation Board in June 2018 by residents of Conyer Road, Teynham, requesting a review of the current on-street parking in the area. A copy of the petition, containing 14 signatures, can be found in Annex A.

2. Background

2.1 There is a long history of consultations which have taken place with residents in Conyer Road, Teynham, around on-street parking near the junction of Lower Road/The Crescent. The initial request for parking restrictions came from Teynham Parish Council back in 2005, when concern was expressed by the Parish Council that larger vehicles were experiencing problems accessing Conyer Road due to the on-street parking, and a series of consultations commenced to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

3. Issue for Decision

Consultation History

3.1 Following discussions between Teynham Parish Council and the then Principal Engineer for Swale Borough Council, Ian Lewis, an informal consultation took place with residents and the Parish Council back in August 2006 on proposals to install double yellow lines around the junction of Conyer Road and The Crescent/Lower Road and remove the existing single yellow line on the east side of Conyer Road outside of Bridge Cottages.

- 3.2 The response from the Parish Council, shown in Annex B, was that they felt that the proposals did not address the problems explained to Mr Lewis, and requested a meeting to discuss the issues further. A copy of the original consultation material from August 2006 can be found in Annex C. Of the 19 residents consulted, 8 responses were received, 7 supporting the proposals and 1 objecting.
- 3.3 Following the first informal consultation, a site meeting took place with Kent County Council Highways and Teynham Parish Council to discuss the issues, and Kent County Council recommended the installation of double yellow lines around the junction as per the consultation, but could not commit funding to undertake the work as there had not been a history of personal injury crashes at the location.
- 3.4 In February 2007, a second consultation took place with residents and the Parish Council, with proposals to install double yellow lines around the junction of Conyer Road and The Crescent/Lower Road, to remove the existing single yellow line on the west side of Conyer Road and replace the single yellow line on the east side of Conyer Road, outside Bridge Cottages, with a double yellow line. Of the 21 residents consulted, 12 responses were received, 6 supporting the proposals and 6 objecting.
- 3.5 A series of further discussions took place with the Parish Council and local residents in an attempt to reach a mutually acceptable proposal for restrictions, and in September 2009 an evening meeting took place with residents, farmers and the Parish Council to try to resolve the issues. Following this meeting, further communication took place with the Parish Council to agree an acceptable proposal for restrictions, and in March 2010 it was agreed that a third consultation would take place asking residents to comment on proposals requested by the Parish Council and proposals suggested by Swale Borough Council.
- 3.6 A total of 12 responses were received from the 21 residents consulted. 2 residents supported the proposals from the Parish Council and 6 objected to these proposals, and 6 residents supported the Swale Borough Council proposals and 1 resident objected. At their meeting on 14 June 2010, Members of the Swale Joint Transportation Board considered the responses and recommended that officers proceed with the Swale Borough Council proposals. Following the legal Traffic Regulation Order process, the restrictions came into force on 19 December 2011, some 5 years after the initial consultation began.
- 3.7 In 2014, the double yellow lines on the east side of the Conyer Road/Lower Road junction were extended following a request from Swale's Parking Operations Team as a result of the new development to the rear of Bridge Cottages, now Selby Court.

Points Raised in Petition

3.8 The petition received is a comprehensive document, detailing the current issues of parking in Conyer Road. Some initial responses have been provided to the points raised, and these can be found in Annex D.

- 3.9 Various suggestions to improve the parking situation for residents have been detailed in the petition document. The preferred option is for Residents' Parking to be introduced. The introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme can be considered to tackle issues with commuter parking and parking by visitors to nearby town centres. Such schemes are not introduced in single roads but are implemented in areas, as this ensures that there the maximum number of spaces are available for residents within the scheme and that effective enforcement can be undertaken. To introduce a scheme it would need to be demonstrated that the majority of residents supported the proposals, and in many previous cases this has not been the case with many residents objecting to the annual cost of a permit and the limitations placed on parking for visitors and other non-permit holders.
- 3.10 Residents' Parking Schemes cannot increase on-street parking capacity, and in the case of Conyer Road the main issue is the restrictions currently in place and the lack of available parking for residents. Since the introduction of the restrictions back in 2011, Kent County Council have converted a short section of the grassed verge in Lower Road/The Crescent to increase on-street parking capacity, and whilst residents of adjoining roads can park in Conyer Road, the opposite also applies where residents of Conyer Road can park in nearby roads when possible.
- 3.11 Since the original parking restrictions were introduced in 2011, local authorities such as Swale have had to strengthen their position with regard to the agreed Parking Protocol which states that Kent County Council are responsible for safety related Traffic Regulation Orders, to ensure that we make best use of the limited resources available to us. For information, Paragraph 4.2 of the Parking Protocol document reads as follows:-
- 3.12 "For clarity Safety Related TROs are considered to include maintaining vehicle movements and driver visibility at road junctions and similar locations, maintaining road width to prevent obstruction or hazards to road traffic and prevention of footway obstruction to maintain pedestrian safety, including school keep clear zones"
- 3.13 Having said this, we will liaise with both Kent County Council and the Parish Council to consider the issues at this location, and will report back to the Joint Transportation Board with a further update. Having been through a previous consultation period of over 5 years in an attempt to resolve issues in the Conyer Road area, it is imperative that our limited resources are used effectively.

4. Recommendation

4.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Substantial resource used to date to conclude this matter, will need to carefully manage to avoid future resource issues.
Legal and Statutory	Consultation and drafting of Traffic Regulation Order and associated lining and signing costs for any revision to current restrictions.
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.

6. Appendices

6.1 Annex A - Copy of Petition Received
Annex B - Copy of Letter from Teynham Parish Council – August 2006
Annex C - Copies of Previous Consultation Documents
Annex D - Initial Responses to Issues Raised in Petition

7. Background Papers

7.1 None