

Parking and waiting restrictions

13 September 2018	Thanet Joint Transportation Board
Report Author	Uniformed Services Enforcement Manager
Portfolio Holder	Cllr Savage, Cabinet Member for Operational Services
Status	<i>For consideration</i>
Classification:	<i>Unrestricted</i>
Key Decision	<i>No</i>
Reasons for Key	<i>N/A</i>
Ward:	Across the District - Various

Executive Summary:

This report presents new parking and waiting restrictions that have been discussed with KCC.

Recommendation(s):

That advice is given on these proposals before going out for statutory consultation.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money	Any financial implications are detailed in the main body of the report.	
Legal	There are no legal implications arising from this report.	
Corporate	The proposals are intended to improve traffic flow, congestion and access issues, which include inconsiderate parking. This fits in with the councils Priorities and Values.	
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	
	Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.	
	Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.	
	Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,	
Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a		

	protected characteristic and people who do not share it	
	Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	
It is the author of the report's view that there are no direct Public Sector Equality Duty implications for this report, however the author will keep this under review		

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	✓
Promoting inward investment and job creation	
Supporting neighbourhoods	✓

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	✓
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Since 2005, the responsibility for parking matters in the Thanet District is split between Kent Highways and Transportation for requests relating to safety and Thanet District Council for amenity requests.
- 1.2 Making changes to Traffic Regulation Orders is a lengthy and costly process involving changes to legal documents and thorough public consultation. In order to optimise the handling of these changes, the requests are consolidated into a quarterly review. Objections that are received on traffic related matters during the public consultation will be brought back to the Joint Transportation Board for consideration and advice in a timely fashion.
- 1.3 The officers' recommendations as to whether each proposal should be implemented are based on the General Provision for Traffic Regulation in the Road the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Within the Act changes are considered to be justified:
- a) where a road safety hazard exists;
 - b) where traffic flow on main roads is impeded;
 - c) where access is seriously obstructed, particularly for emergency vehicles;
 - d) where damage to the highway or to buildings is caused by particular classes of vehicle;
 - e) where serious loss of amenity is caused.
- 1.4 Additionally, as a general rule, parking restrictions are not recommended in remote locations where there is little chance of enforcement. The opportunity has also been taken to review locations where parking restrictions can be removed.

2.0 Options available

- 2.1 Members of the Board can:

- 2.1.1 Support the officers' recommendations about whether to consult on each of the proposals,
- 2.1.2 Make a different recommendation about whether to consult on individual proposals,
- 2.1.3 Recommend amendments to any of the proposals to be advertised.

3.0 Next Steps

- 3.1 That the proposals as list in appendix 1 are advertised for public consultation and that any traffic related objections are reported back to a future meeting of the Board

Contact Officer:	Rebecca Glaiser, Uniformed Services Enforcement Manager
Reporting to:	Trevor Kennett, Head of Operational Services

Annex List

Appendix 1	List of proposals below
Appendix 2	Maps

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Matthew Sanham, Corporate Finance Manager
Legal	Colin Evans, Assistant Litigation Solicitor