

Parking & Waiting Review – Thanet Various

| | |
|---|--|
| Joint Transportation Board Meeting | Thursday 15th September 2022 |
| Report Author | Abigail Young (Parking Policy Officer) |
| Portfolio Holder | Cllr David Saunders (Cabinet Member for Finance) |
| Status | For Recommendation |
| Classification: | Unrestricted |
| Key Decision | No |
| Previously Considered by | Not Applicable |
| Ward: | Across the District - Various |

Executive Summary:

To report upon the requests to install Parking & No Waiting Restrictions in various locations across Thanet.

This report has 1 appendix.

Appendix 1 - Presents a number of new proposals for restrictions across Thanet in map format.

Recommendation(s):

Appendix 1

That subject to the views of this Board the recommendations shown in appendix 1 are approved and that the proposals which require statutory consultation are advertised, and that any traffic-related objections are reported back to a future meeting of the Board.

Corporate Implications

Financial and Value for Money

Parking and waiting restrictions are funded, managed, and enforced by the Thanet District Council using the decriminalisation budget. No additional staffing resources are proposed, as the majority of the controls should be self-enforcing and are covered within our existing patrols. As a result, there are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Legal

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Corporate

The proposals are intended to improve access, sightlines, and the free flow of traffic. This is applicable not only to residential traffic but also to emergency service vehicles and Stagecoach buses. If controls are not introduced, having identified a problem and proposed a solution and if an incident were to occur, it is possible that Members could be challenged for a failure to discharge their duty of care. This fits in with the council's core business priorities.

Equality 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, sex, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.

This report relates to the following aim of the equality duty: -

- *To advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it*

Proposal for the introduction of no waiting restrictions in the following locations:

- The Vale, Broadstairs
- Ayton Road, Hibernia Street, Tothill Street, Ramsgate
- Harold Road, Herbert Place, Glebe Road/ Glebe Gardens, Margate
- Old Boundary Road, Westgate

This proposal will improve sightlines for drivers and pedestrians, improve access for emergency service vehicles, improve traffic flow on the above roads and support Thanet residents.

Proposal for the extension of addresses in Permit Zone W in the following locations:

- Herbert Place, Margate

If any changes are made to the current legislation, parking areas, or representations are received with relevance to the Public Sector Equality Duty we will review our impact assessment. Officers will review consultation feedback for any comments relevant to the Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty.

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

This report relates to the following corporate priorities: -

- *Environment*
- *Communities*

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Since 2005 the responsibility for parking matters in the Thanet District has been split between Kent Highways and Transportation for requests relating to safety and Thanet District for amenity requests. Requests that both councils have received over the past six months have been investigated and those that are considered to be viable are shown with recommendations in appendix 1.
- 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 usually consolidated into a quarterly review. Objections that are received on traffic related matters during the public consultation will be brought back to the Board later in the year for a decision about whether to implement the proposed changes.
- 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.
- 1.5 This report is proposing multiple restrictions on waiting in Thanet. These locations are listed in appendix 1.

These proposals will improve sightlines for drivers and pedestrians, improve access for emergency service vehicles, improve traffic flow on the above roads and support Thanet residents.

These proposals come as a result of requests from residents and/ or councillors in the localities.

2.0 Options

- 2.1 Members of the Board can:
- 2.2 Support the officers' recommendations about whether to consult on each of the proposals,
- 2.3 Make a different recommendation about whether to consult on individual proposals,
- 2.4 Recommend amendments to any of the proposals to be advertised.

3.0 Next Steps

- 3.1 That the proposals as listed 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: Abigail Young, Parking Policy Officer
Reporting to: Penny Button, Director of Neighbourhoods

Annex List

Annex 1: List of sites and site plans of proposed restrictions on parking and waiting in map format.

Background Papers

Not Applicable

Corporate Consultation

Finance: Matthew Sanham, Corporate Finance Manager

Legal: Jennifer Phillips Principal Litigation Solicitor

**THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECORD OF DECISION OF CABINET / INDIVIDUAL CABINET
MEMBER**

(Delete the inapplicable)

Name of Cabinet Member:

Relevant Portfolio:

Date of Decision:

Subject:

Key Decision: Yes/No

In the Forward Plan: Yes/No

Brief summary of matter:

(Enter text here)

Decision made:

(Enter text here)

Reasons for decision:

(Enter text here)

Alternatives considered and why rejected:

(Enter text here)

Details of any conflict of interest declared by any executive Member who has been consulted and of any dispensation granted by the Standards Committee:

(Enter text here)

Author and date of officer report:

(Enter text here)

Background papers:

(Enter text here)

Statement if decision is an urgent one and therefore not subject to call-in:

(Enter text here)

Signature:

(Only needed if an individual Cabinet Member Decision - Delete when completing template)