

Subject:	OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES ORDER 2017
Date:	6 November 2017
Decision to be taken by:	Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets (in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing)
Report of:	Roger Walton, Director of Environment and Corporate Assets
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Nigel Collor, Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing
Decision Type:	Executive Non-Key Decision
Classification:	Unrestricted
Purpose of the report:	To give notice that the Council intends to confirm the Off-Street Parking Places Order 2017
Recommendation:	To confirm the Off-Street Parking Places Order 2017, having considered the objections received in response to the consultation process and not withdrawn.

1. Summary

- 1.1 The report seeks agreement to the implementation of the decisions taken by Cabinet on 3 April 2017 (Cabinet decision CAB 177) regarding off-street parking charges and associated matters.

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 Cabinet received a report at the meeting on 3 April 2017 setting out a series of proposals regarding on and off-street parking.

- 2.2 With regard to off-street parking it was agreed that:

- b) That parking charges continue to be frozen at their current levels, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, with the following minor exceptions:
- i. To agree to the proposed reduction in the maximum daily charge at those locations as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.
 - ii. To agree to the principle of the introduction of a charge of £7.50 for overnight parking by motorhomes on Dover seafront.
 - iii. To agree to replace the current linear parking charges for coaches at Castle Hill Car Park and Maison Dieu Car Park, Dover with a charge of £7.50 for up to 8 hrs
 - iv. To increase the charge for visitor permits to £2.
- c) That the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing, to make the necessary arrangements to introduce the above charges as soon as is practicable, and to make the necessary changes to the Council's On-Street and Off-Street Parking Orders.

2.3 Following on from the meeting a new Off-Street Parking Places Order has been prepared and a number of comments have been received as set out in Appendix A, along with the comments on the proposed action.

2.4 The Director of Environment and Corporate Assets has consulted with the Portfolio Holder for Access and Licensing and now proposes to confirm this Order which came into operation on 2 October 2017 and will be cited as the Dover District Council (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2017.

3. **Identification of Options**

3.1 Option 1: To confirm the Off-Street Parking Places Order 2017, having noted the comments received in response to the consultation process.

This is the preferred option as it will implement the decisions taken by Cabinet.

3.2 Option 2: To take no further action.

This option is not recommended for the reasons noted within the report.

4. **Resource Implications**

4.1 This was set out in the report to Cabinet on 3 April 2017.

5. **Corporate Implications**

5.1 Comment from the Section 151 Officer: None

5.2 Comment from the Solicitor to the Council: The Solicitor to the Council has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no further comments to make.

5.3 Comment from the Equalities Officer: None.

6. **Appendices**

Appendix A: Consultee Responses

7. **Background Papers**

None.

Contact Officer: Roger Walton, Director of Environment & Corporate Assets, Ext: 2420

Appendix A: Off-Street Parking Places Consultation (July-August 2017): Consultee Responses

Consultee		Consultation Response	Comment
1	Mr Le Vaillant	The proposals concerning the Deal & Walmer area make perfect sense and are certainly acceptable to us. I can't talk for Dover or other areas although they look similarly sensible. We would also strongly support proposals for a paid Residential Parking Scheme for the area in and around the Strand in Walmer. Seafront houses being developed into multi-use, bnb and holiday homes, and the Lighthouse are putting increasing strain on parking for residents.	Agree to review whether additional controls are required on the Strand, Walmer.
2	Mr R Mitchinson	<p>I have received your letter today thank you.</p> <p>I am a bit disappointed with the doubling of daily permit charges for our family and friends.</p> <p>Bearing in mind its us residents with our council tax and annual parking permits that pick up the costs for everyone else's free use of the parking bays, i am surprised that the council doesn't make plans to collect parking charges from businesses that use the bays but don't pay because they constantly move their vans and trucks from bay to bay to avoid paying any fees, as well as often coning-off sections of the parking bays to preserve their spaces for their return to their business activities.</p> <p>Another problem of these vans and trucks is that each time they move them there is often debris left in the road and parking bay from their unloading and loading of building and garden matter.</p> <p>It's a shame the council cannot find a way to get money out of these van based businesses, rather than pressing us residents again for more money, from our family and friends visits.</p>	Issue noted. Arrangements made to increase enforcement in the area concerned.
3	Mr R Sutherland	<p>It was previously accepted that people with a Deal Zone 2 Parking Permit could park not only in the three car parks stipulated, but also on residents' bays on Beach St north of the Royal Hotel. There is no mention of this in the document. Is this an oversight or a deliberate change?</p> <p>I only ask because, since the Union Rd car park is largely unusable on Saturdays owing to the market, the freedom to park on Beach St was fairly useful on Saturdays - as it was, I imagine, for residents of Beach St at all times. Can this be reinstated ?</p>	No action as no changes are proposed to Deal Zone 2.
4	Ms C Miller	Just wanted to clarify something in our lovely hometown of Deal. I've noticed that you can only park in town for two hours. The main car park is four hours. If we want visitors to come to our lovely town, where on earth are they meant to park for the	No action. Consultee advised that the car parks designated for long stay are at; Beach Street (Royal

Consultee	Consultation Response	Comment	
	<p>day. They may want to spend a day here, on the beach, shopping and spending money in our shops. Surely visitors will be put off if they can't park for any significant time. Comments are greatly received.</p>	<p>Hotel), St. Georges and Union Road, which all allow parking for the whole day.</p>	
5	Ms S Sharp	<p>Yesterday I received three copies of your notification re: Off Street Parking Places. I believe my neighbour has already notified your office of the multiple communication. I notice from the letter that you are increasing the cost of visitor permits to £2. Whilst I have no problem with this I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the new style visitor permits are open to abuse, as we have already discovered in Clanwilliam Road. Because they are no longer scratch card style it is now possible to manipulate a hand written date and use the permit again.</p> <p>This has been occurring in the street for three weeks now by one individual. The traffic wardens have been made aware this is going on and have issued some parking fines but in the case of some numbering it can be hard to prove. For instance numbers 1 to 9 can easily be changed to 11 to 19. It also begs the question about how many visitor permits allowed to one household per year? The owner has two vehicles, has been using visitor permits in both and is a resident in the street but does not possess a parking permit!</p> <p>Also while changes are being made to the Off Street Parking Places can DDC please reconsider a change to the On Street Parking of '2hr no return within 1hr' parking time in Clanwilliam, Ranelagh and part of Victoria Road to bring it into line with the '1hr no return within 2hr' of Stanley, Soudes and Wellington Road. This would put an end to the confusion for motorists and bring about a fairer chance to local residents to park in the area. What seemed reasonable in 2000 no longer works for us with the increase of traffic and everyone looking for free parking! Our proximity to the town means we are the first 'port of call' for motorists but have the same free parking time as areas further from the shops but which are not so popular to them for obvious reasons.</p> <p>One other issue that would help resident parking is to do away with the double yellow lines that separate the two parking areas in Clanwilliam Road. All they do is make it possible for 'free parkers' to move their cars to the upper or lower area, thereby managing to park all day for free. This is sometimes achieved by two cars being</p>	<p>Apology given for multiple correspondence. Comments regarding visitor permit scheme and adjustments to length of stay restrictions noted for future action.</p>

Consultee	Consultation Response	Comment	
	<p>swopped over between places in one manoeuvre, usually by people working locally and in the know! The double yellow lines serve no purpose other than to make this possible whereas if abolished they would provide parking for two more cars.</p>		
6	Mr G Sullivan	<p>The whole DDC body is missing the point here: you should be encouraging visitors to use our local shops and businesses instead of levying these punitive car parking charges. What long term advantage will be gained from short term cash growth at the expense of increased closure of high street businesses?</p> <p>I despair. On we go with more and more our of town retail parks with their free parking, while you penalise customers using local small businesses. Petty and short sighted.</p>	<p>No action proposed. Noted that Council's parking strategy seeks to balance the needs of visitors, local businesses and residents alike, by ensuring that the limited parking capacity available provides some spaces within the town centre for both long and short stay. This is I accept a difficult balance, but without such controls, car parks would see little turnover of spaces with consequent impact on local businesses as customers avoid the area.</p>
7	Mr J Stevens	<p>I live in Hope Road Deal CT14 7DF and nearly every day of the week between 4-30 pm and 7-0 in the evening, we have cars parking outside our window, some of which sit there with their engines running and radio's on full blast. Saturday mornings are also a problem. This is because of people bringing their children to and from the Martial Arts Studio. My wife has spoken to Mark who runs the place and he has been helpful in sending out e-mails to the parents asking them not to do this but of course there are always the ones who are a law unto themselves. Because of the times of the classes the Traffic Wardens have usually finished for the day.</p> <p>This morning Thursday we had a large builders van parked outside our house for an hour and this caused an obstruction for other vehicles trying to get up and down the road. Can you tell me what is the point of double yellow lines when people do not take any notice of these? We very rarely see Traffic Wardens these days.</p> <p>I think this is very unfair when we as residents have to pay to park in our own road and not only that the fees are being raised for visitors parking!</p>	<p>Issue noted. Arrangements made to increase enforcement in the area concerned.</p>

Consultee	Consultation Response	Comment	
	<p>I have previously been in touch with parking services before but have had no response. I would be grateful if you could look into this matter as you will appreciate it is very frustrating when you cannot communicate with anybody.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p>		
8	Mr P Jull	<p>Clause 7 appears to be incomplete. There is no regulation requiring the badge holder to alight from the vehicle. As written an able bodied person could abuse the scheme by leaving the badge holder in the vehicle while going about their own business. Surely this is not an intention of the regulations.</p> <p>Use of Disabled Persons Bay</p> <p>(a) The vehicle is displaying a valid Disabled Persons Badge and the disabled persons clock is set at the time of arrival, and</p> <p>(b) The vehicle is carrying a registered disabled person at the time the vehicle enters and leaves the Parking Bay and that person (whether the Driver or a passenger) is the person to whom the badge was issued;</p>	<p>This is covered by the Blue badge regulations which are very clear that the badge should not be used to allow non-disabled people to take advantage of the benefits while the badge holder sits in the car.</p>
9	Ms C Haynes	<p>I have just received my parking permit renewal, which I happily pay for although the cost has gone up by 30% to £90 since 2008. You will then perhaps sympathise with me when I am frequently unable to park in Delf Street partly due to the fact that private hire cars from Delf Cars park in the very limited spaces available. Three spaces were taken the other day, one of them for the entire day.</p> <p>I'm aware the permits do not guarantee a space but they are Residents Permits. They also park on the double yellow lines outside their office or indeed anywhere they feel like it in the vicinity constantly. When they moved offices to the old Barclays Bank they were more considerate but that did not last very long.</p> <p>I would be very grateful if you would give this matter some consideration. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.</p>	<p>Issue noted. Arrangements made to increase enforcement in the area concerned.</p>
10	Ms P Graeme (Deal Parking Permit)	<p>I have received a letter confirming the proposals being made to off street parking (your ref RJW/SCY).</p>	<p>No action proposed, noting that charge has not been increased for</p>

Consultee		Consultation Response	Comment
	Holder)	I strongly object to the proposed increase to visitor permits - which represent a 100% increase from £1 to £2. This is an unreasonable increase and cannot be justified.	many years and councillors in reviewing charges considered the proposed charge of £2/ day to still be quite modest noting that the charge in Canterbury for example is £4/ day.
11	Ms A Bone (Deal Parking Permit Holder)	I have received a letter confirming the proposals being made to off street parking (your ref RJW/SCY). I strongly object to the proposed increase to visitor permits - which represent a 100% increase from £1 to £2. This is an unreasonable increase and cannot be justified.	No action proposed, noting that charge has not been increased for many years and councillors in reviewing charges considered the proposed charge of £2/ day to still be quite modest noting that the charge in Canterbury for example is £4/ day.
12	Kim Murphy	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest proposal in relation to off street parking.</p> <p>Comments as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add an additional pay and display car park at Walmer and Deal Castles & Loos: There is absolutely no reason or logic to introduce parking charges at these locations (aside from a cash cow). The ground isn't made-up or maintained. A large proportion of those parking are enjoying the beach walk. I am sure you would wish to encourage residents & visitors walking improving their general health & wellbeing. Whilst you might say that the £2 charge is low, we cannot be fooled, we know jolly well it's the thin end of the wedge. • Increase the charge for visitor permits to £2 per permit. Resident and business permits remain unaffected: This is just a ruse to claw in further income and totally unnecessary. I can't see any justification • Kearsney abbey: I am unable to see the proposals for Kearsney abbey although it appears in the map section. 	<p>With regard to the specific points made;</p> <p>Walmer Castle/ Deal Castle The car parks at both Deal and Walmer Castles are owned by English Heritage (EH) and the decision to introduce charging is theirs and theirs alone. The Council has agreed with EH to undertake the management of the two sites on their behalf with the income collected being passed to EH who will be implementing a refund scheme for their customers.</p> <p>Visitor Permits Your comments regarding the increase in the charge for visitor</p>

Consultee	Consultation Response	Comment	
	<p>I expect charges are involved so you can anticipate my thoughts.</p> <p>I think its all punitive, unjust & totally unnecessary. You might say that the charges are nominal but once it's in there is no going back.</p> <p>Yes, you can dress it up in whatever speak you like but it's the truth, the motorist gets clobbered again.</p> <p>It's so important to encourage visitors to the area, so many tourist locations are spoilt by greedy charges & awkward time parking restrictions.</p> <p>Don't let Deal etc be one of them.</p> <p>The one good thing is the pre-parking ticket, I hope that this is very well publicised & not buried in the council website.</p>	<p>permits are noted. This charge has not been increased for many years and councillors in reviewing charges considered the proposed charge of £2/ day to still be quite modest noting that the charge in Canterbury for example is £4/ day.</p> <p>Kearsney Abbey</p> <p>The changes in the new order at Kearsney Abbey involve amendments to the map alone and do not include introducing charges.</p>	
13	Ms S Shaughnessy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These permits are issued for the benefit of residents who already pay for a resident's permit, the cost of which has gone up significantly over the last few years. Why should residents be penalised once more? 2. The increase in permit costs has been successfully challenged in other parts of the country where it has been proven that the money raised does not go fully towards road upkeep as it should. 3. Residents are only able to buy a limited number of permits per year giving no opportunity to buy extra and postpone paying any increase for as long as possible. I have just noticed on your website that the maximum has been increased to 40 but I don't remember being informed of this when I renewed my permit this year. Are you going to give people the option to buy more if the price doubles in September? 	<p>No action proposed as this charge has not been increased for many years and councillors in reviewing charges considered the proposed charge of £2/ day to still be quite modest noting that the charge in Canterbury for example is £4/ day.</p> <p>As regards the number of visitor permits, which can be purchased the comment is noted although we clearly need to avoid a situation developing where residents can't park due to the number of visitors.</p>
14	Mr JL Davies	<p>I have two points I'd like to cover regarding the same location, Walmer Castle.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With reference to the car parking charges outlined in the East Kent Mercury, the plan for Walmer castle of 8 hours for £2 seems a little strange. <p>I, and a lot of other locals use this car park when we walk our dogs – since 1977 in fact. Apart from the state of it (a lot of potholes joined by gravel and dirt) have you thought of the consequences when local people will park on the road instead. Being a former Police Officer, I'm very aware of the public's</p>	<p>The car park at Walmer Castle is owned by English Heritage (EH) and the decision to introduce charging is theirs and theirs alone. The Council has agreed with EH to undertake the management of the two sites on their behalf with the</p>

Consultee	Consultation Response	Comment
	<p>attitude – at a very dangerous double bend.</p> <p>2. Finding two Bayliss coaches parked immediately outside the castle and causing a traffic hazard, I visited their depot and told them how dangerous it was. They said they'd tell all their drivers to desist. Why the entrance to the above car park was never modified to accommodate coaches escapes me. Foreign coaches often end up stranded in Kingsdown looking for a place to park. Perhaps a couple of marked parking bays specifically for coaches in Granville Road next to the field would be a great low cost solution?</p> <p>Would you help me understand the rationale of the car-parking charges and let me know what alternative parking arrangements for locals you have in mind.</p>	<p>income collected being passed to EH who will be implementing a refund scheme for their customers. The suggestion regarding coach bays will be reviewed.</p>