

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

19 September 2011

Report of the Director of Planning, Transport and Leisure

Part 1- Public

Matter for Recommendation to Borough Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)

1 PARKING ACTION PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Summary

The paper reports on implementation of Phase 6 of the general parking programme and on the results of a consultation in Zone M on Tonbridge.

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The current focus of the parking team is Phase 6 of the Parking Action Plan. However, in recent months there has also been some follow-up on a matter first reported to the Board at the June meeting last year. This concerns a petition to add an additional afternoon restriction to a number of roads in Zone M, Tonbridge.

1.2 Parking Action Plan - Phase 6

- 1.2.1 At the March and June meetings of the Board this year, the locations listed in Phase 6 of the Parking Action Plan were reviewed. Between each of these meetings, some initial assessment of a long list of sites was carried out and this had the effect of whittling the total number of locations under consideration down quite considerably.
- 1.2.2 Nevertheless, this phase of the plan still contains a significant number of sites and concentrating solely on it will inevitably delay other parking management works that might have more priority for the Council. This is especially relevant in the light of some steers coming from the recent meeting of the Car Parking Charges Advisory Board that have implications for the immediate priorities in the programme of work over the next few months.
- 1.2.3 Parking Management proposals at a number of locations, particularly in Aylesford and West Malling, would be effectively on-hold if all the focus was directed towards implementing Phase 6 in its entirety. However, this phase addresses a number of long standing commitments that have a great deal of local support and could be abstracted for promotion as 'quick wins'. A short list, containing ten selected sites, is contained in **Annex 1** together with summaries of the proposals and the results of a preliminary informal round of consultation at the eight

locations where the proposals are a significant change from the existing restrictions.

- 1.2.4 The response to the consultation provides a good example of just how hard it is to predict what is and what is not controversial as far as parking is concerned. It is clear from some of the comments, consisting in one instance of a petition, that we will receive objections at the next formal stage of statutory advertising of the proposals. If this happens, a report will be required to the next meeting of the Board so that these objections could be duly and fully considered. It does mean that the process is likely to be less 'fast-track' than originally envisaged but this is not problematic since it only serves to illustrate the wide range of views routinely encountered when dealing with parking management matters.
- 1.2.5 The remaining elements of Phase 6 will be dealt with through a second phase of implementation to follow on from consideration of the parking management environment in Aylesford and West Malling in the late spring of next year.
- 1.2.6 Subject to any further views of the Board, I am recommending that the proposals contained in Annex 1 be formally advertised and implemented if no objections are received. If there are objections, these will be reported to the next meeting of the Board.

1.3 On-street Parking Traffic Regulation (Consolidation) Order

- 1.3.1 From time to time it is procedurally beneficial to combine any Amendment Orders in to one on-street Order that represents the whole of the Borough. The process makes no changes to restrictions on street, but enables the Order to be presented in a more user-friendly format and for minor clerical errors to be corrected.
- 1.3.2 To accomplish this, the Consolidation Order must be duly advertised and placed on-deposit for six weeks.
- 1.3.3 Subject to the views of the Board, I am recommending that the Council take the opportunity presented by the statutory requirement to advertise the Phase 6A proposals to also advertise the consolidation of recent Amendments.

1.4 Zone M – Tonbridge Local Parking Plan

- 1.4.1 As part of the Parking Action Plan Progress Report to the June 2010 meeting of the Board, I alerted Members to a petition from some residents of Zone M seeking an additional permit-only parking restriction in their roads. The context for further comment on this matter is best explained by repeating my advice to the Board last year:-

1.4.2 *Tonbridge Local Parking Plan – Zone M – Petition*

- 1) *Residents of Springwell Road, Woodfield Road, St Marys Road, White Oak Close and Judd Road have presented a petition requesting permit controlled parking arrangements be extended to include an afternoon period between 1.30 pm to*

2.30 pm. The petitioners cite increasing difficulty for residents to find a parking place during weekday afternoons owing to an inflow of shoppers and workers for the rest of the day after the end of the current morning restriction.

- 2) Looking back at the consultation and surveys carried out for the Tonbridge Local Parking Plan in 2004/5, we identified an increasing trend in long stay parking affecting residential roads near the train station and town centre after the morning “permit holder only” periods had passed. Our proposed solution was to introduce a parallel afternoon one-hour restriction to improve parking availability for local residents.
- 3) The former South Tonbridge scheme was duly advertised as Zone M in 2006 with an additional afternoon restriction included. This prompted a petition from some of the roads in Zone M objecting to the proposal on the grounds that another ‘permit only’ period for the afternoon was unnecessary and it created additional cost for residents who had to purchase vouchers for afternoon visitors. The Board considered the petition in a meeting during 2006. It acknowledged that there was a considerable risk of opportunist all day commuter parking transferring from the roads in the Zone where there would be an afternoon restriction but, in view of the clear and unequivocal desire of the local residents in the particular streets, the Board decided to uphold the objections for the specific streets. The residents were advised accordingly and, in line with their wishes, we installed the measures throughout Zone M later that year with no additional afternoon restriction in the streets cited in the petition.
- 4) The predicted parking patterns that we forecast might develop have now happened so the latest petition requesting that the previous position be reversed is unsurprising. Acceding to the petitioners request would do no more than was originally intended for the whole of Zone M and it would restore a consistent approach across the area. For that reason, I am recommending the Board approves an afternoon one-hour restricted period for the few streets in Zone M where this does not currently apply and that I confirm to the petitioners that their request has been accepted but with one important proviso. The current Zone M afternoon restriction is from 1 pm till 2 pm. The request is for 1.30 pm till 2.30 pm. The recommended timing is for the afternoon restriction to be consistent with the rest of Zone M; that is 1 pm till 2 pm.
- 5) The procedure for introducing adjustments to the traffic order will provide all residents and businesses in the affected roads an opportunity to make representations when the changes are formally advertised. This can be carried out as soon as other current parking commitments allow.

1.4.3 The Decision was as recorded as follows:-

1.4.4 That the request of the petitioners to vary Zone M by introducing a one hour period of restriction each weekday afternoon **BE ACCEPTED** as set out in 1.4.4, the petitioners advised accordingly and the necessary changes be introduced.

1.4.5 An essential first step in implementing the decision of the Board was for us to consult the residents in those streets without the one hour afternoon restriction. There is no such restriction in those streets where the residents had made it clear

in 2006 that they did not wish one to be introduced. It is essential that any fresh proposal takes an integrated and comprehensive approach across the neighbourhood to avoid simply displacing problems from one location to the next. This consultation has now been carried out and the results have been most instructive.

- Total households receiving the consultation questionnaire: 707
- 46% did not respond
- 54% responded of which 26% wanted an additional pm restriction and 28% did not.

That is, just over a quarter of all the questionnaires were returned expressing a preference for an additional pm restriction. As such, this offers little support for introducing an afternoon restriction in line with the request from the petitioners. It may be worth looking at the break-down of responses street-by-street to see whether this suggests any deeper trend, bearing in mind however the need to avoid a piecemeal solution.

Street	No Reply %	Additional pm Hour – YES %	Additional pm hour – NO %
Judd	51	21	28
Quarry Rise	28	36	36
Springwell Road¹	43	40	14
St Marys Road	53	24	23
The Drive	35	25	39
Weald View Road	28	10	62
White Oak Close	24	38	38
Woodfield Road	39	50	11
Woodside Road	59	21	20

Note¹ – 3% of responses did not express a preference

1.4.6 Even in Woodfield Road, the heart of the area that generated the petition submitted last year, only 50% of the households have responded to say yes to an afternoon restriction. On any rational analysis, the figures in this table do not provide any justification for changing the current arrangements in these streets.

1.4.7 For this reason, I am recommending that the parking restrictions be left as they are and that the lead petitioner be informed about the Board's decision and

provided with a copy of this paper to explain the reason for it. We will also let all residents who responded to the questionnaire what the result if the consultation was.

1.5 Legal Implications

1.5.1 None for the Borough Council.

1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.6.1 Funding to implement Phase 6 is already contained within the Capital Plan.

1.7 Risk Assessment

1.7.1 Not applicable

1.8 Equality Impact Assessment

1.8.1 See 'Screening for equality impacts' table at end of report

1.9 Recommendations

1.9.1 That the short term prioritisation of the Parking Action Plan set out in the report **BE ENDORSED** (paragraph 1.2.5 refers).

1.9.2 That the consolidation of the on-street parking Traffic Regulation Order **BE ENDORSED** (paragraph 1.3.3 refers)

1.9.3 That, in the light of the response to public consultation, the parking management arrangements in Zone M of the Tonbridge Local Parking Plan be left unchanged and that the leader of the petition requesting an additional period of afternoon restriction be informed accordingly.

The Director of Planning, Transport and Leisure confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

contact: Michael McCulloch

Nil

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning, Transport and Leisure

Screening for equality impacts:		
Question	Answer	Explanation of impacts
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	No	The exercise of traffic regulation order powers is governed by statute to achieve specific purposes and these are unrelated to providing positive contributions towards equalities promotion.
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		N/A

In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above.