

Appendix 1: Milton Area – Parking Management Scheme – Details of the comments received

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| 1 | Resident – Park Terrace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very much in favour of the scheme | No Comment | Proceed with proposals |
| 2 | Resident – Avenue Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that issues may be partially resolved during the operational hours of the scheme but that it does little to improve parking outside of the hours. • Believes no pre-scheme surveys have been undertaken to assess levels of residents/non resident parking • Concern that no local exhibitions/consultations held | <p>A parking scheme can only address issues during the operational hours. Due to the proximity of the town centre, the scheme operational hours match the town centre controls currently in place.</p> <p>Outside of these hours the town centre is subject to free parking therefore these roads are unlikely to be used for free parking. The scheme is proposed to operate daily inclusive of weekends and any bank holidays. The proximity to the seafront requires controls to be operational during main visiting hours.</p> <p>There are parking pressures in the evenings which may be due to the numbers of residents' vehicles and the limited road space.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken prior to the design of the scheme to assess potential levels of resident and non resident parking in the area. This information led to an appropriate design with adequate parking bays allocated to residents. This methodology meets industry standards and is considered as a good practice.</p> <p>Two open sessions for residents were held on 15th and 18th June (an evening and a Saturday). These were held at the civic centre as a local venue was not available. The sessions were advertised in letters which were delivered to all properties and also on posters displayed in each street.</p> | Proceed with Proposals |
| 3 | Milton Conservation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces existing parking • Consider lowering the footway in Avenue | When formally designing parking, there is very often a reduction in the available spaces. This is | Proceed with proposals |

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------|
| | Society | <p>Terrace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the removal of chicanes in Park Road and Avenue Road and replace with speed humps to provide more parking • Concerned that visitor permits could be abused and sold to local commuters by residents • Appearance of lining in the conservation area | <p>due to requirements we must adhere to for safety and access reasons.</p> <p>The surveys undertaken show 12 residents parked in Avenue Terrace during the daytime, 13 bays are being provided (this is the maximum number of bays possible to provide). The costs for lowering the footway are beyond the available budgets at this time however the footway strength can be assessed to determine if this would be possible should there be need and if budgets are available. Members are advised that existing tree roots could be damaged during excavation and that the weight of vehicles could compact the roots leading to a weakening of the root system which of course is detrimental to the health of the tree.</p> <p>In Avenue Road there were 15 residents vehicles parked during the daytime and 21 bays have been provided. In Park Road, 17 vehicles were parked and 19 bays have been provided. The cost of the chicane removal and replacing with humps would not be possible within the existing budget and is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>This is a concern however the terms and conditions of visitor permits clearly state that the permits are not to be sold. Breaches of permit use may result in a refusal for additional permits. In the two existing schemes, this does not appear to have been an issue.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow for controlled parking systems to operate without the requisite lining. To be effective a scheme has to be</p> | |

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| | | | enforceable and that can only be achieved by having appropriate signs and lines. It needs to be noted that we make every effort to ensure these are kept to absolute minimum to meet the statutory requirements. | |
| 4 | Resident – scheme area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low response rate, should require more than 50% return. Concern that proposals will prevent people from shopping locally | The response rate was low however Members agreed to progress with the implementation of the proposals. While it is possible that drivers choose to park in the area while shopping. Residents have identified that long term parking is the issue therefore it is likely that the vehicles belong to local workers. | |
| 5 | Resident – Avenue Terrace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of parking bays • Will exacerbate parking issues locally • Low response rate to consultation, does not believe there is majority support for this scheme • Permit availability of up to 4 permits excessive should be limited to 2 | <p>The maximum number of bays available in this street is 13 without attempting to accommodate parking on the footway.</p> <p>It is possible that there may be some displacement of parking. This is a common issue and we monitor the situation closely and take appropriate action where needed to address this.</p> <p>While 59% of the responses indicated support for the scheme, it is acknowledged that the response rate of 16% is relatively low. The levels of vehicles parked did not indicate that the numbers of households with 4 vehicles is high. Availability of up to 4 permits is an option available to residents and is linked with an increased cost of the permits. Permit numbers could be restricted but based on the outcome of surveys, there does not appear to be justification for this.</p> | |
| 6 | Resident – St Vincents Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports scheme | No Comment | |
| 7 | Resident – Avenue Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme detrimental to area, lack of parking being provided , will interfere with deliveries | Delivery vehicles can park on single or double yellow lines while loading. | |
| 8 | Resident – Park | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to scheme | No comment | |

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| | Road | | | |
| 9 | Resident – Park Street | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the scheme. Requests any surplus funds be allocated to the provision of trees in the area | No comment | |
| 10 | Resident – Avenue Terrace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern and displeasure with regards to scheme • Concern that permit costs will increase each year • No guarantee of spaces • Consider possibility of Avenue Terrace being excluded from the scheme | <p>This is a budgetary decision for Members but our permit charges are very reasonable in comparison with other similar authorities.</p> <p>Unfortunately there is no guarantee of parking spaces being available although daytime pressures will be eased. This is the case even now as there is no guaranteed space for any one on the public highway.</p> <p>Avenue Terrace is on the western boundary of the scheme and this option would be viable however displaced parking likely to be an issue that we would likely be required to address at a later date when budgets may not be available. Hence it is not regarded as an efficient and cost effective approach.</p> | |
| 11 | Resident – Park Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current first come first served system works, scheme reduces parking provision – will create more problems | No comment | |
| 12 | Resident – scheme area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such a low response is not representative • Loss of spaces | <p>The response rate is low and may not be representative of all views however the decision to proceed with the formal consultation was agreed by Members.</p> <p>The loss of parking is an unfortunate side effect of formalising parking controls, while any loss of spaces is regrettable, we must ensure the parking layout does not affect safety, traffic flow or emergency access.</p> | |
| 13 | Resident – Park Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low response, why being progressed • Loss of available parking | The response rate is low and may not be representative of all views however the decision to | |

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not suitable for a conservation area as more frontages will be lost for parking | <p>proceed with the formal consultation was agreed by Members.</p> <p>The loss of parking is an unfortunate side effect of formalising parking controls, while any loss of spaces is regrettable, we must ensure the parking layout does not affect safety, traffic flow or emergency access.</p> <p>Conversion of front gardens for parking is subject to planning controls and neighbouring properties would have an opportunity for comment on any applications</p> | |
| 14 | Resident – Park Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low response, why being progressed Loss of available parking Not suitable for a conservation area as more frontages will be lost for parking | <p>The response rate is low and may not be representative of all views however the decision to proceed with the formal consultation was agreed by Members.</p> <p>The loss of parking is an unfortunate side effect of formalising parking controls, while any loss of spaces is regrettable, we must ensure the parking layout does not affect safety, traffic flow or emergency access.</p> <p>Conversion of front gardens for parking is subject to planning controls and neighbouring properties would have an opportunity for comment on any applications</p> | |
| 15 | Resident – Avenue Terrace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has little difficulty parking, neighbours generally considerate and park to maximise spaces. Reduction in spaces may mean parking in another road and having to walk home which could compromise safety. Concern over how visitors permit would work | <p>The loss of parking is an unfortunate side effect of formalising parking controls, while any loss of spaces is regrettable, we must ensure the parking layout does not affect safety, traffic flow or emergency access.</p> <p>Misunderstanding that visitor permits would have to be applied for in advance. Permits are</p> | |

| | Source | Details of Comment | Officer Comment | Recommendation |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|----------------|
| | | | purchased in books of 20 for use when required | |
| 16 | Resident – Avenue Terrace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased that majority of responses in favour, increasing problems accessing the street due to parked cars. Requests passing places provided in St Vincents Road | Only one section of St Vincent's Road is proposed to have two side parking therefore adequate passing places proposed. | |
| 17 | Resident – Hamlet Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One side parking in some roads reduces parking provision, considers inconsistent approach as two side parking in other PMS areas being provided. • Availability of 4 permits per household could result in some households not being able to purchase a permit • Surveys to ascertain levels of parking is flawed | <p>We must leave at least 3.3metres of available road width for traffic when designing new layouts. In some roads it is possible to provide 2 side parking and maintain this width however the smallest narrowing of a carriageway – even as little as 0.1 metre - will result in only 1 side parking being possible</p> <p>There is no overall limit on the total numbers of permits available however the purchase of a permit does not guarantee a parking space The precise numbers of vehicles belonging to residents is not possible to determine. We have no authority to take registration details and enquire as to the owners details.</p> <p>Surveys were undertaken prior to the design of the scheme to assess potential levels of resident and non resident parking in the area. This information helps enable an appropriate design with adequate parking bays allocated to residents. The methods we use are industry standard and considered good practice.</p> | |
| 18 | Business – London Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to parking meters being introduced in London Road • Parking problems due to bad planning policy • Reject the scheme due to consultants costs and charges to residents/traders | <p>There are no proposals to introduce pay and display parking at any location on London Road. No comment</p> <p>The scheme has been progressed using internal staff. Charges for the permits are applied as the scheme maintenance and enforcement is funded from permit sales.</p> | |