

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

RED – UPDATED SINCE REPORT WRITTEN

Meeting Date	Monday 9 th September 2019
Report Title	Update Report – Petition – Park Road, Sittingbourne
Cabinet Member	Cllr Tim Valentine
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 this report and recommend that due to the overall low percentage of support from residents, that the existing Residents' Parking Scheme in Park Road not be extended.
------------------------	---

1. Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the petition from residents of Park Road in Sittingbourne which was submitted at the June 2019 Swale Joint Transportation Board meeting.

2. Background

- 2.1 A petition was submitted to the Swale Joint Transportation Board by a Ward Member on behalf of residents of Park Road in Sittingbourne, and a copy of this petition can be found in Annex A.

3. Issue for Decision

- 3.1 The petition requests that the existing Residents' Parking Scheme in Park Road, Sittingbourne, be extended from the junction with Valenciennes Road south to the junction with Gore Court Road/Ufton Lane. A total of 43 signatures have been collected on the petition, with 32 signatories supporting the scheme extension, and 11 people indicating that they would not support the extension. The petition also states that a total of 33 residents were either out or expressed no firm opinion either for or against the proposed extension.
- 3.2 At the meeting on 24th June 2019, Members of the Swale Joint Transportation Board accepted the petition and requested a report to be presented at a future meeting.
- 3.3 An informal consultation has now been undertaken with residents in this section of Park Road, between Valenciennes Road and Ufton Lane/Gore Court Road. With the

possible displacement of vehicles into the southern end of Ufton Lane by the requested extension of the scheme in Park Road, an informal consultation has also been undertaken with the residents living in Ufton Lane between the junctions of Homewood Avenue and Park Road. A copy of the areas included in the informal consultations can be found in Annex B, and copies of the consultation material can be found in Annex C.

- 3.4 Details of the responses received from residents of Park Road can be found in Annex D, and responses received from residents of Ufton Lane can be found in Annex E.

Park Road

- 3.5 A total of 94 properties were included in the informal consultation. At the time of writing this report, a total number of 41 responses were received, giving a response rate to the consultation of 44 percent. Of the 41 responses received, 23 supported the extension of the current scheme in Park Road, and 18 objected. As a percentage, this is 56% of responses supporting the extension to the scheme, and 44% objecting. Based on the number of properties in the area of the consultation, this represents 24% of residents supporting the extension to the scheme, and 19% objecting. All of the comments received to the Park Road consultation are detailed in Annex D.

- 3.6 Supporting Responses: Comments from those residents supporting the extension of the current scheme included the fact that residents within the current scheme park in this section of Park Road on Saturdays, commuters park in the area and customers of the Gore Court Arms Public House and commercial vans, and a comment that a resident would be happy to pay if they were guaranteed parking outside of their property. The question was asked by someone responding positively to the consultation whether the impact on adjoining roads, such as Roonagh Court, would also be considered.

- 3.7 Objecting Responses: Comments from those residents objecting to the extension of the current scheme included the fact that two cars per household does not equate, this would push the problem further up and into other roads which could create dangerous parking, residents should not have to pay for permits, a permit is no guarantee of a space, and that commuters do not park this far up Park Road. A substantial number of comments were received stating that there is not a parking issue during the day, and that the scheme would be ineffective as the majority of vehicles are owned by residents and park in the evenings and weekends.

Ufton Lane

- 3.8 A total of 37 properties were included in the informal consultation. At the time of writing this report, a total number of 14 responses were received, giving a response rate to the consultation of 38 percent. Of the 14 responses received, 11 supported the extension of the current scheme into the top of Ufton Lane, should the scheme be extended up Park Road, and 3 objected. As a percentage, this is 79% of responses supporting the extension to the scheme, and 21% objecting. Based on the number of properties in the area of the consultation, this represents 30% of residents supporting the extension to the scheme, and 8% objecting. All of the

comments received to the Ufton Lane consultation are detailed in Annex E.

- 3.9 Supporting Comments: Comments from those residents supporting the extension to the scheme to the top of Ufton Lane, if extended in Park Road, included the fact that they have commercial vehicle parking all weekend and obstructing their driveway in the evening, that in the last consultation it appeared that those residents reliant on on-street parking were outvoted by those with off-street parking, and that some people were put off the scheme because they were unsure whether they would have the option of a white bar marking across their driveway instead of double yellow lines.
- 3.10 Objecting Comments: Comments from those residents objecting to the extension included the fact that the residents' parking concept is flawed, as problems with parking occur at evenings and weekends when the scheme would not operate, and that during these times it is difficult to park due to vehicles from the nearby scheme, and the fact that their parked cars would simply be displaced into other streets as is already the case.
- 3.11 As reflected in some of the comments received during the consultation, any extension to the existing scheme would displace vehicles into adjoining roads. There have recently been two separate reports to the Swale Joint Transportation Board on parking issues in Lyndhurst Grove, and the extension of such a scheme within close proximity of this road would invariably return the issue of Lyndhurst Grove to future meetings.
- 3.12 Although both informal consultations produced more responses supporting the possible extension to the existing Residents' Parking Scheme than objecting, there is concern that the overall percentages, 18% for Park Road and 19% for Ufton Lane, are not representative of the majority of residents in the area. In addition to this, the responses for and against the proposals for Park Road only differed by two responses, and consideration to including all of Ufton Lane in the scheme would be subject to the extension of the scheme in Park Road. Without a clear majority support from residents, there is the strong possibility that a large number of formal objections could be made at the Traffic Regulation Order stage, after a considerable resource had been assigned to developing the scheme layout and design.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report and recommend that due to the overall low percentage of support from residents, that the existing Residents' Parking Scheme in Park Road not be extended.

5. Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Extensive resource required to develop and consult on scheme design and layout, funding to be sourced for extensive signing and lining works.
Legal and Statutory	Traffic Regulation Order to be drafted and formally consulted, requiring a majority support from residents.
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 – Plan Showing Areas of Informal Consultation
- Annex C – Copy of Consultation Material
- Annex D – Responses to Informal Consultation – Park Road
- Annex E – Response to Informal Consultation – Ufton Lane

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 None