

# Public Document Pack



Democratic Services  
White Cliffs Business Park  
Dover  
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199  
Fax: (01304) 872452  
DX: 6312  
Minicom: (01304) 820115  
Website: [www.dover.gov.uk](http://www.dover.gov.uk)  
e-mail: [democraticservices@dover.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@dover.gov.uk)

06 October 2017

Dear Councillor

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the **SCRUTINY (POLICY AND PERFORMANCE) COMMITTEE** on Tuesday 10 October 2017 at 6.00 pm, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

- 11 **PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PARKING AT AYCLIFFE** (Pages 2 - 12)

To consider the report of the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets.

- 12 **PETITION SEEKING ADDITIONAL SPEED CONTROLS IN BEACONSFIELD AVENUE & SURROUNDING AREA** (Pages 13 - 18)

To consider the report of the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "Nicky", written over the text "Chief Executive".

Chief Executive

---

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PARKING AT AYCLIFFE</b>
<b>Meeting and Date:</b>	<b>Scrutiny (Policy &amp; Performance) Committee - 10 October 2017</b>
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Councillor Nigel Collor, Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing</b>
<b>Decision Type:</b>	<b>Non-Key Decision</b>
<b>Classification:</b>	<b>UNRESTRICTED</b>

---

**Purpose of the report:** To brief the committee on the options and costs involved in meeting the concerns raised by Aycliffe residents as set out in the petition, 'More Parking Spaces at Aycliffe' presented to the committee in June 2017.

---

**Recommendation:** The committee will need to consider what further action, if any, it wishes to take.

---

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Committee received a petition entitled 'More Parking Spaces at Aycliffe' from residents of Aycliffe at the meeting on 13 June 2017. The petition signed by 42 people, was presented by Mr G. Dodd, called for the creation of more parking spaces at Aycliffe through the widening of roads where there was the space.
- 1.2 The committee resolved that; 'the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets be requested to provide a report to the 12 September 2017 meeting of the Scrutiny (Policy and Performance) Committee.'
- 1.3 Due to pressure of business on the September agenda, the report has been held over until this meeting.

## 2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The petition, 'More Parking Spaces at Aycliffe' as presented in June set out the concerns of local residents that the current parking arrangements were considered insufficient and that this as a consequence had led to vehicles being parked in such a manner that obstructions were being created with consequent concern that this could affect the access for emergency service vehicles.
- 2.2 Mr Dodd in presenting the petition made it clear that he did not wish to see restrictive parking arrangements (such as double yellow lines) introduced as this would only move the problem on to other areas.
- 2.3 The discussions at the committee meeting in June had noted that the road layout and in particular the road width within Aycliffe limited the amount of on street parking, which given the growth in the number of vehicles per household since the estate was originally designed was causing problems.
- 2.4 The petition as submitted proposed the creation of additional spaces by the widening of the road at various locations within Aycliffe such as; Old Folkestone Road, St. David's Avenue, St. George's Crescent and elsewhere.
- 2.5 Members agreed to ask for a report to be brought back to Committee covering the following matters:
  - Issues of land ownership (Kent County Council, Dover District Council or Housing Revenue Account land);
  - Potential solutions for creating additional parking spaces; and

- The cost and feasibility of implementing the solutions for additional parking spaces.

## 2.6 Taking each of these points in turn,

### (a) Land Ownership

The discussions at the committee meeting in June focused on the possibility of creating additional parking bays within the grass verges or banks at various locations within Aycliffe.

The question posed was whether this was a matter for DDC as landowner of KCC as the Highway Authority. Having checked the Council's land ownership records, I can confirm that the majority of soft landscaped areas around the estate fall within DDC ownership, but are also included within the areas designated as 'public highway'.

Thus in terms of responsibility, whilst neither DDC or KCC have a duty to undertake works to alleviate the concerns raised, both have the power to do; subject to the consent of the other.

The land falling within DDC ownership is held with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and so any costs involved in providing additional parking would be a matter for HRA budgets.

### (b) Options for creating parking spaces

There are, as the petition has highlighted, a number of locations within the Aycliffe estate where additional parking bays could be created. These were detailed on the document presented to the committee in June (See Appendix 1).

Following the committee meeting, officers have reviewed these proposals and the issues associated with parking in Aycliffe. Previous works have been undertaken involving the construction of parking bays and the provision of grasscrete strips to allow vehicles to park partly on the verge. The photographs included at Appendix 2, show some examples of the parking issues and the current arrangements for managing these.

### (c) Cost and feasibility of providing additional parking spaces

There are clearly some opportunities to create additional parking but, as can be seen, many of the locations suggested involve cutting into grass banks to a greater or lesser extent, which would add to the costs indicated below.

In determining indicative costs of providing additional parking spaces, estimates have been based on the specification used for the additional car parking spaces provided recently at the Whitfield offices. These parking spaces were built into grass islands and verges around the site and the specification will be very similar for Aycliffe.

There will be additional costs for traffic management implications and possibly a site compound (although the equipment may well be bought to site on a daily basis) therefore the figures include an additional 15% allowance on top of the original costs to allow for both this and any inflation/contract cost increases.

**Construct 3 parking bays 4.8m x 2.4 in grass verge – £3,660.00**

Works consist of the following: -

- Break out existing concrete kerbs – 7.2m
- Excavate existing grass verge to a depth of 250mm
- Dispose all material off site
- Roll to formation
- Supply and lay new HB2 kerbs bed and haunch – 12m
- Supply and lay geotextile membrane
- Supply and lay sub base, type 1 - 150mm thick
- Supply and lay D.B.M base course, 70mm thick
- Supply and lay D.B.M wearing course, 30mm thick
- Burn off existing DYL's (If required) – 7.2m
- Mark 3 new bays 2.4m x 4.8 in white thermoplastic paint – 16.8m

**Cost per bay - £1059.93 + 15% = £1,218.92, Say £1,220.00 per bay**

**3. Appendices**

Appendix 1: Copy of presentation document presented by the petitioners in June.

Appendix 2: Photos showing examples of the parking issues and the current arrangements for managing these.

**4. Background Papers**

None.

Contact Officer: Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets

## **Petition for Addition Parking at Aycliffe**

With the introduction by the government of fines soon for parking on pavements etc Aycliffe residents are very concerned due to lack of space for parking. The residents do not want parking restrictions or permits. Most households now have two or three cars. That is a fact of modern life. It is also natural for people to park their pride and joy outside their own house.

How many of you councillors have parking problems? If you do you understand the problem. One councillor at the last Aycliffe Forum meeting stated that they would find it difficult to enforce this law due to lack of parking and that DCC understood the problem.

I have asked several councillors who represented Aycliffe in the past to help but none were forthcoming in their assistance until now.

At Aycliffe we have had to endure the A20 built next to the estate.

We have lost two play parks, football pitch and the local pub.

A hostel which the residents of Aycliffe strongly objected has been built.

We now also now have had to put up with TAP causing havoc next to estate with diesel and noise pollution.

All the development for the town has been at the other end of town. In Whitfield, they will have the new Sports centre and new Shops etc. In River money has been spent on Kearsney Abbey and Russell Gardens). The only exception is the regeneration in the middle of town.

What we are asking at Aycliffe is something be put back into the community by DCC to improve the parking at Aycliffe. The knock-on effect is better parking and improved health and safety. This can be achieved by widening roads to provide better access for emergency services and more parking spaces.

1. Here is a photos of addition parking space at Old Folkestone Road at the bottom of St Richard's walk and St Patrick's road. This could be extended to increase parking on Old Folkestone Road. There are still cars having to park on the pavement. Notice how it was

cutting into side of the road. This was completed after the estate was built. I think in the late eighties early nineties.

2. St David's Ave parking was assisted by widening the curb. Again, this was completed I believe in early eighties/nineties
3. Parking could be improved at St George's Crescent. The cutting could be extended along all of St George's Crescent. This will provide addition eight to fifteen parking spaces along the road and stop people parking on the pavement. We do not need to restrict the parking because this will move the problem on to another part of the estate.

There is no parking for the residents of the 8 houses and 16 flats of St Giles Walk. They take up parking space at either St George's Crescent or St David's Ave. Up to six vehicles can be parked on the pavement when busy.

4. In Devonport, Plymouth, there is a road where the city made combination of walkway/road a shared area. This could be another idea on how to create additional parking places on St George's Crescent.
5. On the overhead map of Aycliffe I have placed crosses where additional parking for the residents could be made available. This would relieve the pressure of parking in these areas. I would gladly take the councillors around Aycliffe and show them what can be done.
6. Due to fact Aycliffe seems to have lost 42 tonnes lorries coming on the estate wider roads would further help by allowing lorries room to manoeuvre and not damage people's cars. this has happened in the past.

In conclusion with better parking and widening of roads this would improve the quality of life for residents of Aycliffe and it will also improve the situation for access of Emergency services. It can be done as shown by the photos.

It states on your website that roads and pavements are the responsibility of Kent County Council but as my elected local council I believe you can help Aycliffe and its parking problems.

Thank you for your time and any questions.

Gary Dodd

Dear councillors

8 COPIES

I have been a resident in Aycliffe for 9 years and the parking on St George's Crescent has progressively got worse.

As you can appreciate, this is an estate with a large family percentage and a large amount of children outside playing. In St Georges crescent we have a number of disability parking bays. The first is very faded and we as residents are unsure of its status. The second is actively used and the third, the people who have requested it have had their Blue badge and motability car taken away as they do not meet the criteria.

Some households up here have multiple vehicles, and I mean 4 vehicles. Some if these are work vehicle to be parked up here alongside private vehicles.

There is not enough space for all of these vehicles and for 2 spaces to be reserved (disability bays) and never get used. Some residents have taken to double parking and this makes it difficult to navigate around the crescent. So we now have to squeeze past double parked vehicles, whilst looking for children who like to run out from behind them.

Many times I have almost got from 1 and to the other of St George's crescent, to be met by a car coming the other way and being forced to reverse all the way back to the beginning again just so the other car can pass. This is reversing through double parked cars, navigating bends and hills whilst being mindful of playing children. These double parked cars also have a negative impact on delivery drivers, your refuse collection operatives and emergency vehicles.

Going forward I believe the grass bank on St George's Crescent should be removed to widen the road, this will allow for more car parking spaces and a greater distance between the double parked cars.

Please look into the parking up here.

Yours sincerely

Paul Mitton

[Redacted signature]



To Whom it may concern

I am writing this letter to support Mr Dodd, involving more parking in Aycliffe. There are a number of areas that are in need of more parking and better parking.

I raise the issues of safety, women and small children having to walk in the middle of the road, as they cannot walk on the path because of parked vehicles on the path, also it is a nightmare for emergency vehicles to get into these areas.

I identify these areas to be St George's Crescent and both Ropewalks, St George's being the worst, there is other areas that need minor improvements but these areas are priority.

Something needs to be done before someone is injured or dies because emergency vehicles cannot reach them

Thank you

Mr R. Williams

Chairman Aycliffe residents forum

Appendix 2: Photos showing examples of the parking issues and the current arrangements for managing these.









<b>Subject:</b>	<b>PETITION SEEKING ADDITIONAL SPEED CONTROLS IN BEACONSFIELD AVENUE &amp; SURROUNDING AREA</b>
<b>Meeting and Date:</b>	<b>Scrutiny (Policy &amp; Performance) Committee - 11 October 2017</b>
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets</b>
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Councillor Nigel Collor, Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing</b>
<b>Decision Type:</b>	<b>Non-Key Decision</b>
<b>Classification:</b>	<b>UNRESTRICTED</b>

**Purpose of the report:** To brief the committee on the options available further to the petition seeking the introduction of speed controls in Beaconsfield Avenue and the surrounding area presented to the committee in September 2017.

**Recommendation:** The committee will need to consider what further action, if any, it wishes to take.

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Committee received a petition seeking the introduction of speed controls in Beaconsfield Avenue and the surrounding area at the meeting on 12 September 2017. The petition signed by 118 people, was presented by Mr D Overal and Ms K Blackstock and called for speed restriction provisions to be installed on Beaconsfield Avenue, Dover (and the surrounding area).
- 1.2 The committee resolved that; 'the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets be requested to provide a report to the next meeting of the Scrutiny (Policy and Performance) Committee.'

## 2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The petition, as presented called for speed restriction provisions to be installed on Beaconsfield Avenue, Dover (and the surrounding area).
- 2.2 In presenting the petition to the committee it was suggested that for Beaconsfield Avenue, this could involve;
  - 2 x 20mph signs (either end) and the introduction of a 20mph limit
  - Speed cushions
  - Speed table at River Side Walk
- 2.3 The discussions at the committee meeting noted that this was primarily an issue for Kent County Council as the Highway Authority but equally noted that the Council could potentially assist the petitioners by adding it's support to the proposals should this be the wish of members.
- 2.4 Members therefore agreed to ask for a report to be brought back to Committee looking at the issues raised and the options available, which could potentially meet the concerns raised.
- 2.5 Following the Committee meeting in September, the Director of Environment & Corporate Assets has been in touch with Kent Highways' District Manager. She has advised that there are no plans now and to the best of her knowledge there never have been any plans to introduce any traffic calming measures here.
- 2.6 The most common option sought to deal with speeding traffic is the introduction of a 20 mph zone, which is often used in residential areas to keep traffic speeds low and is suitable for pedestrians and children out and about in these areas. In considering



the introduction of a 20mph zone, there are number of issues which need to be considered:

- The zones should be designed to be "self-enforcing" so that the traffic naturally keeps to the speed limit. This can sometimes be achieved without additional measures due to the physical layout of the road, on-street parking etc. otherwise physical traffic calming measures will be needed to go along with the introduction of the change in the speed limit.
- This can include gateway treatments, speed humps, chicanes, road narrowing, and other measures to both physically and visually reinforce the reduced speed limit. It is worth noting that while residents may support a 20mph zone in principle they often object to traffic calming measures near their home and design requirements often give little scope to adjust the location.
- Where existing measured traffic speeds are at or below 24mph it may not be necessary to install physical calming features however signing alone is unlikely to have a significant effect on traffic speeds (typically around a 2mph reduction to the mean speeds is all that is likely).
- No point within a 20mph zone should be more than 50m from a traffic-calming feature (this can be a natural feature such as a tight bend or an installed measure).
- A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the new speed limit will need to be advertised and if there are sufficient valid objections the County Council may decide not to allow the new limit to be implemented.
- Consultation will need to be carried out in relation to the speed limit change and traffic calming measures and a report to the JTB may be needed.
- There needs to be suitable locations to install the speed limit signing on all the entry points into the zone.

2.7 The cost of 20mph zones can vary significantly and will depend on the number of roads affected, the number of entry points into the zone and the type and amount of traffic calming required. Typical starting costs for the installation of a 20mph zone are;

- Traffic Regulation Order from £2,060 (required for all 20mph Zones);
- Zone entry treatment (2x pairs of signs on new posts plus carriageway roundel) from £850 each which will be needed for each entry point into the zone;

2.8 In addition to the above costs, additional site costs such as traffic management, restricted hours charges etc. will need to be added and will be calculated based on site requirements.

2.9 With regard to physical traffic calming measures, these are often introduced as part of a 20mph zone scheme, typical costs of the various options available are as follows:

- Blacktop speed hump from £1,300 each. Preformed bolt-down humps may be a cheaper option if the existing carriageway surface is suitable to accept them.
- Pre-cast concrete speed cushions from £7,000 per pair. Preformed bolt-down cushions may be a cheaper option if the existing carriageway surface is suitable to accept them.
- Carriageway speed limit roundel £150 per pair.
- Road narrowing from £1,350 each.

- Chicane from £2,700 each.
- 2.10 It is unlikely that KCC would pay for the costs of any of this as there is no crash history in this history, which is the primary basis used by KCC to determine the allocation of scarce resources, and it is understood that they will only maintain the regulatory/safety elements of this installation with the scheme promoter being expected to secure funding for maintenance of the other elements when required.
- 2.11 The installation of physical measures such as these may of course potentially reduce the amount of on-street parking available.
- 2.12 Finally it is understood that there are no plans to introduce further 20mph zones anywhere else in the District at present.

3. **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Copy of petition as presented in September.

4. **Background Papers**

None.

Contact Officer: Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets

**Supporting narrative describing petition results**

**Petition for proposed speed restriction provisions to be installed on Beaconsfield Avenue**

We have received a resounding positive response and feedback from our petition. To summarise on the results received; -

**Signatures Received to date**

- 118no received in total. Of which; -
  - 65no are direct residents in either Beaconsfield Road or Avenue
  - 40no are local Dover residents
  - 13no are resident visitors to the area, assumed family and friends

**As a percentage Return (by Household)**

- An average of 52% of all house households situated on Beaconsfield Avenue and Road have signed the petition
- 78% of all households in Beaconsfield Avenue (29no / 37no)
- 25% of all households in Beaconsfield Road (9no / 36no)

**Households absent and negative feedback received**

- 48% of Households were absent, could not be reached and did not return the petition
- Only 3& (2no) of Households declined to sign the petition. Their reasons to decline was not disclosed

**How the petition was conducted; -**

- The Petition as exemplified in Appendix A was issued by post only.
- Issue of the petition was selective to Beaconsfield Avenue and Road Households only.
- Each household was invited to sign and return the petition document to our home address.
- The petition was posted around the 1<sup>st</sup> week in July and a request was made to return signed petitions no later than the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2017.



- On or around the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2017 we visited households and collected completed documents which had not yet been returned.

#### Comments returned by Residents

Upon receipt of the returned posted documents we note a large number of comments had been placed on the petition front page returned by residents. These comments include; -

- “One Way to stop continuous Road rage and broken wing mirrors” from 15 Beaconsfield Avenue.
- “Would it be better to make the road one way” from 5 Beaconsfield Avenue
- “Thank you so much for organising this petition – some cars drive dangerously fast day and night along this road – it is so scary” from 33 Beaconsfield Avenue

#### Further results to be confirmed

Whilst we report the above results it is important to note that we are still receiving more signatures from households which were previously absent or uncontactable and therefore anticipate the results may be further improved. This we believe is due to the holiday period.

Petition to request Speed restriction provisions on  
Beaconsfield Avenue / Road and the surrounding area

Name	Address	Signature			
					