

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND CORPORATE ASSETS

DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 27 FEBRUARY 2014

## **PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME**

### **Recommendation**

*The Board is asked:*

- 1. To agree to recommend that Kent County Council makes a Traffic Regulation Order to implement the proposed on-street pay and display parking along York Street, Dover as detailed in this report.*

*And*

- 2. To decide whether, or not, to recommend to Kent County Council that the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme for Bridgeside and the proposed Pay and Display parking in Sondes Road, Deal, as detailed in this report should be implemented and if not, whether it wants either scheme withdrawn, or amended and re-advertised.*

Contact Officers: Gordon Measey                      Ext 2422  
                                 Christopher Allen                      Ext 2054

### **Reasons why a decision is required**

1. The Community Safety, CCTV and Parking Unit at District Council is responsible for the processing of waiting restrictions on behalf of Kent County Council. It is necessary for the Board to consider whether the proposals outlined in this report should be implemented, or otherwise.

### **Evaluation of options available to the Council**

2.
  - i) To agree to recommend that Kent County Council makes a Traffic Regulation Order to implement any or all of the proposals in this report  
  
and/or
  - ii) To amend any part of the proposals listed in this report and to re-advertise, where necessary  
  
and/or
  - iii) To withdraw any or all of the proposals listed in this report.

### **Introduction**

3. The Parking Services Section recently advertised 3 proposed changes to the parking restrictions in the District:

- Bridgeside Deal – proposed residents' parking scheme
- Sondes Road, Deal – proposed Pay & Display (P&D) on-street parking
- York Street, Dover – proposed Pay & Display (P&D) on-street parking

The closing date for the receipt of written objections was Monday 10 February 2014, at 12 noon. The written representations received will be available to the Board meeting on 27 February 2014 and can be viewed in advance by prior arrangement with the Highway and Parking Team Leader, Gordon Measey (ext 2422).

#### **A) Bridgeside - Proposed Residents' Parking Scheme**

- At its last meeting on 12 December 2013, a report was brought before the Board in response to a petition from residents in Bridgeside and part of London Road, Deal to introduce a residents' permit scheme in Bridgeside. The Council undertook its own consultation of these properties (including additional properties in Albert Road that backed onto Bridgeside) to see if there was sufficient support for such a scheme. Plans showing the extent of the proposed scheme and road restrictions are attached as **Appendices A1** and **A2** to this report.
- Members may recall that of the 64 properties within the proposed Zone P that responded to the original consultation:
  - 56 supported the proposal
  - 6 objected to the proposal
  - 1 would support the scheme only if Albert Road, Sutherland Road and Beechwood Avenue were included as these were the roads that the resident preferred to use for parking
  - 1 had no strong feelings either way
- In light of the amount of support indicated for the scheme from those that responded to the consultation, the Board resolved on 12 December 2013, that the scheme be formally advertised and in the event that no objections are received, that the scheme be recommended to be sealed by Kent County Council. Any objections received to the formal advertisement being referred back to a future meeting of the Board for further consideration prior to making any final recommendations.
- Those residents in the proposed Zone P who had been originally consulted were advised that they needn't respond to the formal advertisement as it would be assumed that their views would remain the same, unless they informed us otherwise. They were asked only to write in if their views had changed or if they wished to make additional comments. No one reported a change of view.
- Objections have since been received, in response to the formal advertisement, from residents in neighbouring roads who are chiefly concerned about the impact on the reduced parking opportunities for them if the proposed Bridgeside scheme is implemented. The objections are summarised in the table below:

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
Middle Deal Road resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I fully sympathise with residents but we already have exactly the same problems in Middle Deal Road and surrounding roads</li> <li>• all that will happen is parked cars will then clog up where we park and live</li> </ul>	

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we already have an acute problem; the ever increasing residents in Church Path with one or more cars creating the biggest parking issues</li> <li>• If Middle Deal Road and adjacent ones were included in Zone P, would this mean only one permit per household (when many of us have two cars)?</li> <li>• Residents have petitioned for a trial one-way route along Middle Deal Road; would this enable some double yellow lines to be lifted, creating more parking?</li> <li>• Given the reported income generated from parking charges could the Council not purchase some land to provide parking to ease the issues for those with more than one car? There's a large dumping area along Church Path, the former garage site along Albert Road, or the former Deal Plant Hire site</li> <li>• a long term solution is required for all residents in the area, just restricting parking in Bridgeside will make things considerably worse</li> </ul>	
Church Path resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have lived in my property for over 29 years and over that time double yellow lines have been added to Albert Road. At that time this did not matter as Bridgeside was built. Since that time double yellow lines have been installed to the front of my property</li> <li>• there is nowhere nearby left to park legally; the nearest municipal car park is in West Street</li> <li>• the proposal offers permits to people living much closer to car parks, such as those in London Road and Albert Terrace who not only live nearer to Victoria Park, but live further away from Bridgeside than me</li> <li>• this is grossly unfair</li> </ul>	
Church Path resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Church Path has not got parking facilities nor vehicle access to the front of the properties</li> <li>• I always park in Bridgeside as its closer and safer than Middle Deal Road</li> <li>• I object to the scheme if I'm unable to park in Bridgeside</li> <li>• All the houses in Bridgeside, except with the possibility of one, have off street parking for several cars and are therefore unaffected by others parking in the street</li> </ul>	
Church path resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our only available parking is in Bridgeside</li> <li>• as there are no houses apart from the six at the bottom in Bridgeside it seems that you are trying to stop people parking there that use the station; this I'm totally in agreement with</li> <li>• we have nowhere to park and so hope would be included in the residents parking or have you some other plan for us?</li> <li>• I have a blue badge, will there be disabled bays in Bridgeside?</li> </ul>	
2 residents from Bridgeside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could consideration be given to foreshorten the double yellow lines in the turning area halfway along Bridgeside and allow a car's length space in front of the</li> </ul>	

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
(raising the same request)	twin garages? If not my neighbour or our visitors won't be able to use this space for parking. This has been done for the last 29 years with no issues. Generally this area is clear	
one of the above residents, additionally reports:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that sufficiently long dog bone markings be provided across vehicle accesses to allow ease of turning</li> <li>• that a vehicular passing place be provided on the north-bound side; without it drivers will continue to mount the drop crossing on the opposite side if they meet traffic coming the other way; perhaps a strategically place bollard will help with this?</li> <li>• If this, or another passing place near No.5 could be considered?</li> </ul>	
Matthews Close resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the proposal is approved, it will be necessary for people to find other parking areas</li> <li>• the situation is the same for residents in many areas in Deal</li> <li>• Residents in Bridgeside should not have special treatment</li> <li>• there is already a problem in Matthews Close, being used by residents from Middle Deal Road and Albert Road</li> <li>• Matthews Close is used by Company vans for overnight and weekend parking</li> <li>• if the proposal is approved it should be modified to include Middle Deal Road, Albert Road and Matthews Close</li> </ul>	
Dover resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all the Bridgeside houses were built with off road parking and may have garages; if they choose not to use them, why should others suffer?</li> <li>• there is not sufficient long-term parking in Deal town centre especially when the market takes over Union Road car park</li> <li>• I appreciate that it's not nice to be able to park outside one's property, but it's a price to be expected living close to the town centre</li> <li>• I hold a business parking permit and only park in Bridgeside on a Saturday because of the lack of long term parking; perhaps a compromise can be reached with the new restrictions only applying Monday to Friday?</li> </ul>	
2 residents from Matthews Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I oppose the proposed Zone P parking in Bridgeside</li> </ul>	<i>No further explanation given in letters</i>
Middle Deal Road resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we heartily agree with the letter published in the East Kent Mercury (30 January 2014 issue)</li> <li>• parking in Middle Deal Road is almost impossible at weekends and week days alike, particularly as there is little or no parking for residents of Church Path</li> <li>• granting resident parking will only exacerbate an already difficult situation</li> </ul>	<i>The letter published in the East Kent Mercury is attached as Appendix A3 to this report</i>

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
Middle Deal Road resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in discussions last year with our local councillor concerning parking/traffic issues in Middle Deal Road we were categorically assured by him that resident parking would not be granted to the residents of Bridgeside because this would result in the residents of Albert Road and Middle Deal Road coming under even more pressure for parking outside their homes as commuters try to find free parking close to the Deal Station</li> <li>• we already have cars from Church Path and Southwall Road parking in the limited parking currently available to the Albert Road/Middle Deal Road residents and to limit this further is not an option</li> <li>• Despite objections from our local KCC councillors who are pressing KCC to make Middle Deal Road a one way street you seem hell bent on making life more difficult than necessary</li> <li>• when does Middle Deal Road get the option for residents' parking?</li> </ul>	
Albert Road resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are double yellow lines where I live and I have no option but to park my car in Bridgeside</li> <li>• I would like you to consider extending the zone to include the odd numbered properties on our side of the road</li> <li>• Nearly all the properties along Bridgeside have off-street parking. We do not</li> </ul>	
Church Path resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I live about 20 metres outside the proposed Zone P area. The entrance to my flat is in Albert Road. There is very limited parking 100 metres before my flat and 100 metres after my flat</li> <li>• the only place I can park is in Bridgeside</li> <li>• I'm not allowed to receive a permit for this road and there will be nowhere close to my flat that I can park</li> <li>• in principle I don't object to Bridgeside being permitted, but request that the area be extended to cover properties such as mine</li> </ul>	
Albert Road resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm not adverse to a residents' parking scheme, but the proposed restriction will do nothing to support the residents in Bridgeside and massively impact the homeowners in Albert Road</li> <li>• the stretch adjacent to my property amounts to 20 houses with 5 road side spaces and one off-road resident's space</li> <li>• by contrast almost all the properties in Bridgeside have off road and/or garage parking; there are 23 houses in Bridgeside with 32 off road/garage spaces, this does not include the maisonettes on the corner of BS/AR where there are a further 4 garage and 4 off-street parking spaces; The Sanctuary Housing blocks has 22 parking spaces but the resident units in this block is not calculated</li> <li>• the on-street parking capacity in Bridgeside is circa 42</li> </ul>	

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
	<p>spaces; if the proposal is approved what are the options for Albert Road residents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the existing Zone H parking the other side of the level crossing leaves practically no option for suitable parking</li> <li>• proposal not needed for residents of Bridgeside</li> <li>• discriminates against properties in Albert Road, surrounding roads and Church Path</li> <li>• Zone P location is not suitable in current location; widening Zone H should be considered</li> </ul>	
Matthews Close resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal will put extra pressure on surrounding roads</li> <li>• we have the same problems with people not living here parking their cars whilst they go off to work and some leave them when they've finished work</li> <li>• cars park on the bends with no regards to safety and don't consider the residents that live these surrounding roads</li> <li>• the proposal will just move the problem into someone else's street/road/estate</li> <li>• we think that the Council needs to undertake a proper consultation with local residents as parking seems to be a big issue</li> </ul>	
Church Path resident	<i>Listed comments attached as Appendix A4 to this report</i>	see Appendix A4
Deal Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deal Town Council's recommends that whilst it supports the proposed resident parking scheme, that KCC Highways should consider a more comprehensive scheme for Bridgeside due to the impact on Albert Road and Middle Deal Road</li> </ul>	*Late objection

9. The person that organised the original petition requesting the residents' parking in Bridgeside for the London Road and Bridgeside residents has written a letter and asked it to be drawn to the attention of the Board. It is attached as **Appendix A5** to this report.
10. Whilst the proposal has the support of the majority of those included with the proposed Zone P area, there are objections from residents outside the zone who are concerned about the impact on parking for them.
11. The Board has a difficult decision in deciding if and how to proceed with the scheme. If the scheme is implemented as proposed it could be in place by April this year. This could be followed up by offering to extend the scheme to the neighbouring roads. However there would be about a 6-month period when parking will get worse for the neighbouring roads before they'd have an opportunity to be issued with permits covering Bridgeside and any newly extended area. Alternatively, Members may wish to consider withdrawing the current proposal and consulting over a wider area to see if a revised scheme covering Bridgeside and the neighbouring roads could be considered together. This would remove the interim parking problems for the neighbouring roads but would mean that a scheme wouldn't be in place for about another 6 months.

12. If the Board is to consider extending the scheme to cover Middle Deal Road, Members are asked to give guidance as to which roads they'd like including and KCC Highways is requested to indicate if any sections of yellow lines in Middle Deal Road can be removed and if any unrestricted sections of road require new yellow lines.
13. Subject to the consideration of the objections received, the Board is asked to decide whether, or not, to recommend to Kent County Council that the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme for Bridgeside detailed in this report should be implemented as proposed and if not, whether the scheme should be withdrawn, or amended and re-advertised.

### **B) Sondes Road Deal, Proposed On-street Pay and Display (P&D) Parking**

14. At its meeting on 4 February 2013 the Cabinet agreed that formal procedures be commenced for consultation on the introduction of Pay and Display parking in York Street, Dover and Sondes Road, Deal at a charging level in line with on-street parking in the district. Section B) of this report deals the Sondes Road proposal.
15. Currently all the available parking in Sondes Road (approximately 21 car spaces) is subject to limited waiting, operating a maximum stay period of 1 hour during the period from 8.30am – 5.30pm, Mon – Sat. The same spaces can currently be used by Zone H resident permit holders without time limit.
16. Under the proposal the 6-space block on the northern side of the road (at the eastern end) of Sondes Road will be changed to Pay and Display parking. This detail is shown on the plan attached to this report as **Appendix B**. The effect of the charging will be that the spaces will become more available to visitors wanting to park close to the near-by seafront amenities, and able to pay for this convenience. There will, of course, be a daytime loss of 6 spaces for Zone H permit holders and others seeking free parking.
17. 10 objections to the proposal were received and are summarised in the table below. Two of these were received after the 10 February 2014 deadline but have been included to allow the Board an opportunity to consider them.

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the grounds of reasoning to provide additional parking for visitors to the seafront and local amenities is unjust</li> <li>• any local person wanting to visit their home town is already heavily restricted on free parking and would therefore shop elsewhere</li> <li>• there is already enough car parking in the area which visitors outside of the town can pay to use</li> <li>• what we don't have is enough motorcycle bays in the town (South Street is a good example) and how does this support local businesses?</li> </ul>	
Dover resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• charging for 2 hours to park in an existing 1-hour limited space will not provide additional parking for seafront and nearby amenities. On the contrary it will allow parking for longer times, effectively reducing the number of spaces available</li> </ul>	
Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deal is losing more and more of its free parking to pay and display parking</li> </ul>	

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increases in charging is going to make more people worse of than they are already</li> <li>• this would affect tourism as well</li> <li>• I think P&amp;D along the town's seafront should be abolished</li> <li>• the cost of P&amp;D is preventing tourists and locals from spending the day at the seaside</li> <li>• the more tourists that come to Deal with no time limits on parking along the Seafront will encourage them to spend money in the town</li> </ul>	
Resident and Local Cllr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are already few enough parking places for residents in Victoria Road and neighbouring roads</li> <li>• it's difficult enough finding a parking space close to one's house and often we're forced to park on Marine Drive or The Strand</li> <li>• having paid for a resident's permit the least that should be provided is a parking space near to where one resides</li> <li>• the proposal will not result in a single extra parking space</li> <li>• perhaps a better idea would be to make the whole of Victoria one-way enabling parking on both sides – it's already one-way along 3 sections over a distance of a few hundred metres (and not all in the same direction). This causes confusion, near-miss accidents and cars parked the wrong way in the one-way sections</li> </ul>	
4 residents (raising the same objections)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is already a very severe shortage of residents' parking in the area</li> <li>• the parking problem is exaggerated by the Council's decision to permit the development of 9 flats at the top of Sondes Road with the provision of additional parking</li> <li>• the proposal is blatantly dishonest; it will not provide additional parking as all existing parking is already available to visitors; it's purely revenue generating at the expense of residents</li> <li>• the existing shortage of parking spaces already causes huge problems for residents trying to get shopping, visitors, small children etc to their properties</li> </ul>	
one of the 4 above residents additionally states:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• my husband and I are in our 80's and although not car owners are dependant on others and family providing us with shopping and services</li> <li>• the limitations on parking cause us many difficulties already and this proposal will exaggerate these</li> </ul>	
Resident and Guest House owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they will have a detrimental impact on my and other local businesses</li> <li>• there is already a shortage of parking for residents who pay for permits and the removal of 6-spaces will exacerbate this situation</li> <li>• the 6-spaces are close to my property and under the current restrictions my guests can park from 4.30pm until 9.30am; the proposals to change the time of the</li> </ul>	*Late objection

OBJECTOR	COMMENTS	NOTE
	<p>new restriction from 9am – 6pm will reduce the free period and could put off customers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the proposal is likely to be implemented, could the times be changed to retain the existing 4.30pm – 9.30am free parking period?</li> <li>• whilst I understand the purpose of the proposal is to increase the opportunity for visitor parking, the existing scheme allows non-residents to park in the area for a limited time, so I cannot understand what the benefits for introducing P&amp;D in the 6-spaces will be?</li> </ul>	
Deal Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deal Town Council's recommendation is that a more comprehensive scheme should be considered for Sondes Road as this will impact on surrounding roads</li> </ul>	*Late objection

18. Subject to the consideration of the received objections, the Board is asked to decide whether it agrees that Kent County Council be recommended to implement the proposal detailed in this report and as shown in Appendix B.

### **C) York Street, Dover – Proposed On-Street Pay and Display (P&D) Parking**

19. The proposal to introduce pay and display parking in York Street is the second of the two schemes detailed in Paragraph 7 to this report. The proposal is shown in the plan attached to this report as **Appendix C**.
20. There was one objection received to the advertised proposal which is summarised below:

*The proposals for York Street will cause obstruction to the traffic flow. The fact that there have been double yellow lines on both the carriageways since the road has been built indicates that it was considered that parking would cause an obstruction; if that has been the case all these years, how is this different now? I feel that this proposal is likely to cause accidents with cars stopping to reverse into spaces and pulling out in to fast-moving traffic.*

The following paragraph picks up on the points raised in the objection.

21. York Street was widened and dualled back in 1971. To maximise traffic flow parking was prohibited along its entire length. At the time it was intended that the A20 which ran from the Eastern Docks along York Street and Folkestone Road would all be gradually widened, when opportunity allowed, to accommodate the ever-increasing port traffic. The only sections dualled before 1993 were Townwall Street and York Street. In 1977 the new A2 route to the Eastern Docks via Jubilee Way was completed which reduced traffic using York Street. Traffic flow was further reduced in 1993 when the new A20 dual carriageway from Courtwood to the Eastern Docks was completed. Since that time it's been recognised that the south-bound carriageway of York Street could accommodate single lane traffic. It is this that has afforded an opportunity to provide additional on-street parking if one of the lanes were to be removed. The narrowing down of this carriageway from 2 lanes to 1 will make this similar to Folkestone Road where on-street parking operates.
22. Neither the Traffic Police nor KCC Highways object to the proposal, though the scheme will be subject to them approving the necessary traffic management

requirements (road markings and signing) to narrow the carriageway from two lanes down to one, before the scheme could proceed.

23. Subject to the consideration of the objection received, The Board is asked to agree that the Kent County Council implements the proposal detailed in this report and as shown in Appendix C.

#### Background Papers

Parking Services Files.

#### Consultation Statement

The Portfolio Holder for Access and Property Management has been consulted on the proposals outlined in this report and as part of the statutory process formal advertisements were undertaken for the proposals through which objections were invited.

#### Impact on Corporate Objectives

The proposed changes to the waiting restrictions outlined in this report will foster improved opportunity and access.

#### Attachments

- Appendix A1 Plan showing extent of proposed Zone P residents' parking scheme.
- Appendix A2 Plan showing extent of the Zone P yellow lining and parking places
- Appendix A3 Letter published in East Kent Mercury (30 January 2014)
- Appendix A4 Additional written objection
- Appendix A5 Letter from representative of Bridgeside/London Road
- Appendix B Plan showing the Proposed P&D parking in Sondes Road, Deal
- Appendix C Plan showing the proposed P&D parking in York Street, Dover

ROGER WALTON

Director of Environment and Corporate Assets

The officer to whom reference should be made concerning inspection of the background papers is the Highways and Parking Team Leader, Dover District Council, White Cliffs Business Park, Dover, Kent CT16 3PJ. Telephone: (01304) 821199, Extension 2422