

SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Meeting Date	Monday 7 th March 2016
Report Title	Fairview Road Area, Sittingbourne – Parking Review
Cabinet Member	Cllr David Simmons
SMT Lead	Dave Thomas
Head of Service	Dave Thomas
Lead Officer	Mike Knowles (SBC)
Classification	Open

Recommendations	<p>Members are asked to note the contents of this report and recommend that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Residents Parking Scheme is not implemented in the Fairview Road area due to the percentages of support received• Officers continue to liaise with Kent Fire and Rescue and carry out further consultation with residents in the vicinity of any subsequent proposed restrictions in Fairview Road• Officers report the comments around enforcement to the Parking Enforcement Team to ensure resource is committed when required
------------------------	---

Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

1.1 Following the initial report to the Joint Transportation Board back in December 2015, this report provides a more detailed analysis of the recent informal consultation with residents and property owners in the Fairview Road, Lavender Court, Aubretia Walk, Heather Close and East Street areas of Sittingbourne.

2 Background

2.1 A petition containing 45 signatures was presented to the Swale Joint Transportation Board at the September 2015 meeting. Mr Lynch, a resident from the area who presented the petition, stated that he considered that parking in this area caused health and safety issues, and access for emergency vehicles was difficult.

3 Issue for Decision

- 3.1 Following the petition, an informal consultation leaflet was prepared and sent out to properties in and around the Fairview Road Area. A copy of the leaflet can be found in Annex A, and a plan showing the distribution area of the leaflets can be found in Annex B. The closing date for responses was 20th November 2015.
- 3.2 A total of 151 leaflets were hand delivered to properties within the consultation area, and a total of 46 responses were received, providing a response rate of 30%. Two of the responses did not provide a location so have been omitted from the results.
- 3.3 A summary of the responses from each road is detailed below, and further more detailed information on the responses can be found in Annex C.
- 3.4 Aubretia Walk
Of the 12 leaflets delivered to properties in Aubretia Walk, 5 responses were received giving a 42% response rate. Of these responses, 3 felt a Residents Parking Scheme would improve the parking situation. Based on the number of properties, this represents 25% of households supporting such a scheme.
- 3.5 Two of the responses reported problems with parking during the daytime, 1 at weekends and 1 at all times. One response stated there were no existing parking problems.
- 3.6 Fairview Road
Of the 28 leaflets delivered to properties in Fairview Road, 16 responses were received giving a 57% response rate. Of these responses, none of these residents felt that a Residents Parking Scheme would improve the parking situation, even though 12 of the responses all stated that parking problems occurred during the daytime only.
- 3.7 Heather Close
Of the 19 leaflets delivered to properties in Heather Close, 9 responses were received giving a 47% response rate. Of these responses, 5 felt that a Residents Parking Scheme would improve the parking situation, and 3 felt it would not. Based on the number of properties, this represents 26% of households supporting such a scheme.
- 3.8 Three of the responses reported problems with parking during the daytime, 4 reported problems at all times and one stated there were no existing parking problems.
- 3.9 Lavender Court
Of the 22 leaflets delivered to properties in Lavender Court, 10 responses were received giving a 45% response rate. Of these responses, 8 felt that a Residents Parking Scheme would improve the parking situation, and 2 felt it would not. Based

on the number of properties, this represents 36% of households supporting such a scheme.

3.10 There were mixed views on when parking problems occur, with 1 response stating daytime only, 1 stating weekends only, 5 stating daytime and weekends, and 1 stating there are parking problems at all times. One response stated there were no existing parking problems.

3.11 East Street

Of the 70 leaflets delivered to properties in East Street, 4 responses were received giving a 6% response rate. Of these responses, 1 response felt that a Residents Parking Scheme would improve the parking situation, and 2 felt it would not. Based on the number of properties, this represents 1% of households supporting such a scheme.

3.12 One response stated that parking problems are experienced during the daytime and one response stated problems occurred during the daytime and at weekends.

3.13 Annex C shows some of the typical responses received from each road. These comments provide further information on the views of residents, including the perceived problems and suggested solutions.

4 Summary

4.1 A plan showing the existing parking restrictions in the area can be found in Annex D. There are existing double yellow lines on the east side of the s-bend in Fairview Road, around the t junction of Fairview Road and along the south side of Fairview Road between the t junction and Lavender Court.

4.2 The width of the carriageway at the eastern end of Fairview Road, between Empire Court and Lavender Court, is not sufficient to allow the installation of parking bays, and therefore the formalisation of parking in Fairview Road would result in the loss of approximately 10 on street parking spaces.

4.3 Consideration could be given to extending the existing double yellow lines in Fairview Road from the t junction, west to the junction of Heather Close. However, this will result in the loss of approximately 6 on street parking spaces, and as no particular access problems along this section of road have been reported by Kent Fire and Rescue it is suggested that the area remains unchanged.

4.4 A site survey carried out on a Thursday morning at 9:35am revealed that the Fairview Road area was heavily parked with vehicles, but that none of these vehicles were parked on the double yellow lines, suggesting that any parking contraventions occur in the evening. Our Parking Enforcement Team will be made aware of the comments from the consultation to commit additional resources in the area if required.

4.5 Out of the 46 responses received, 17 supported a Residents Parking Scheme and 7 felt such a scheme would not help. As a percentage of households, 25% were in favour of a Residents Parking Scheme in Aubretia Walk, 26% in Heather Close, 36% in Lavender Court and 1% in East Street. There was no support for the introduction of a Scheme from residents of Fairview Road.

5 Recommendation

5.1 Members are asked to note the results of the consultation and recommend that:

- A Residents Parking Scheme is not implemented in the Fairview Road area due to the percentages of support received
- Officers continue to liaise with Kent Fire and Rescue and carry out further consultation with residents in the vicinity of any subsequent proposed restrictions in Fairview Road
- Officers report the comments around enforcement to the Parking Enforcement Team to ensure resource is committed when required

6 Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	Improving Community Safety through safer Highways.
Financial, Resource and Property	Costs associated with any Traffic Regulation Order and installation of additional lining on site.
Legal and Statutory	None at this stage.
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.

7 Appendices

- 7.1 Annex A – Copy of Consultation Leaflet
- Annex B – Plan of Distribution Area
- Annex C – Detailed Responses to Consultation
- Annex D – Plan of Existing Parking Restrictions

8 Background Papers

- 8.1 None