

**OBJECTION 1**

**ANNEX B**

HIGHSTED ROAD  
SITTINGBOURNE  
KENT  
ME10

30<sup>th</sup> January 2016  
Swale Borough Council  
Swale House  
East Street  
SITT  
KENT  
ME10 3H7

For the attention of The Engineering Team  
Leisure & Technical Services

Dear Sir

AMENDMENT 17 ORDER 2016 GRAYSHOTT CLOSE

I have just read your Notice regarding parking restrictions being extended in Grayshott Close I dont have any issues around extending the restrictions but I dont understand why you are confining it to Grayshott Close. The whole area needs to be reviewed. Highsted Road is a major access road into Sittingbourne and yet nothing is done. There is no pavement at the junction of Highsted Road and Brenchley Road and because of this school children and mums have to walk in the road.

The parking is unbelievable because of the two schools and the doctors and the hospital and there are times when residents are unable to get on or off their drives because of inconsiderate drivers its about time something is done about it because if they build the 540 houses in Swanstree Avenue it will make matters even worse.

Please dont say the congestion reduces traffic speed, because it doesnt and there needs to be three accidents before you do anything.

Farm Crescent  
Sittingbourne  
Kent  
ME10

8<sup>th</sup> February 2016

Engineering Team  
Leisure and Technical Services  
Council Offices  
Swale House  
East Street  
Sittingbourne  
Kent, ME10 3HT

Dear Sir

**Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places (Amendment No. 17) Order 2016**

I take this opportunity of objecting to the advertised order parts (c) and (d) where the Order refers to parking restrictions in Grayshott Close and Highsted Road.

My grounds for objection are based on the fact that I have serious reservations about this parking proposal and the potential for just pushing the problem "up the road" and creating parking and safety issues that do not currently exist.

I share the frustration with many of the homeowners in close proximity to the school and hospital. Indeed I often hear of problems with homeowners who cannot get out of their driveways due to visitors parking opposite or across their driveway. Should the refuse lorry or an emergency vehicle need to travel up / down Highsted Road everything stops!

I am somewhat surprised that any proposals do not extend to other streets in the area where residents may need to use Highsted Rd. The parking is used, as you know, to top up operational parking for the hospital and school where the sites themselves do not have available land to achieve their desired capacity in spaces for customers. We already have a sub standard junction at Farm

Crescent / Highsted Road. Additional trip generation from parking and poor visibility, could further compromise safety at this location. Parking on the bend just east of Farm Crescent now appears to be preferred by some motorists who just abandon their cars anywhere.

I would urge you to examine an overview of hospital / school parking with a view to considering a strategy that will not simply push the problem up the road.

I trust you will look at and review any measures for consideration to the benefit of all of us around the Highsted Rd area who need to move toward / from Bell Road.

I do hope we can all find a way forward that offers reasonable solution or compromise for us all.

Many thanks

### OBJECTION 3

ANNEX B

Engineering Team, Leisure & Technical Services,  
Council Offices,  
Swale House,  
East Street,  
Sittingbourne, Kent,  
ME10 3HT

Dear Sir,

I have the following comment on the proposal to enhance the yellow lines in Grayshott Close.

There is a serious problem of parking in both Grayshott Close and Highsted Road. This results mainly from vehicles of people attending the local schools and the Memorial Hospital. It is often very difficult to travel along the north end of Highsted Road, because cars are parked on both sides of the road, leaving a single narrow lane in the middle of the road, not sufficient for the two way traffic which uses the road. If there is a large vehicle, such as a waste disposal vehicle, it is gridlock.

If parking shifts from Grayshott close, then it will move into Highsted Road. The only way that extra parking can be accommodated is for it to move further along the road, round the bend by the entrance to Farm Crescent, and beyond.

The entrance to Farm Crescent is a dangerous one. When approaching from the South to turn into Farm Crescent, it is difficult to be sure that there is nothing coming towards you round the bend. Many times I have been turning right and have had to make an emergency stop.

If parking develops on that bend, or closer to Farm Crescent, then the area will become a death trap. If parking is further restricted in Grayshott Close, then it needs to be done in conjunction with new parking restrictions on the bend in Highsted Road and at the junction with Farm Crescent.

Beyond the Farm Crescent entrance, there is no footpath along Highsted Road. If there is parking along that stretch, then the busy pedestrian traffic there will be put at risk.

Any additional parking restrictions in Grayshott Close must be done in conjunction with new restrictions in the areas I have outlined.

Yours faithfully,

Eastchurch  
Isle of Sheppey  
Kent

To the Engineering Team,

I have just noticed a sign on the lamp post requesting any objections for any further restrictions to parking or added bays down Church Road. As a resident of the above address, I would like to point out the following –

- We already have two disability parking bays, one of which is very oversized
- The bays are used by those who are supposed to benefit it, by parking two cars in one bay, covering the fire hydrant.
- The bays are abused by the said recipients, by overlapping at each end of the bay when they park two cars, ensuring the whole front of their house is kept to their selves.
- The recipients of the one bay has 3 vehicles that utilise that one parking space.
- The gentlemen resident has become confrontational, and threatening to take legal action at various times.
- The path in Church Road only runs the recipients side of the road.
- The bins are on our frontage.
- Dismounting from vehicles into the main road.
- On our stretch of road, there are 11 viable parking spaces, with 8 houses.
- Four cars used by number 30 alone.
- Walks his dog for long distances.
- I also have a disability.

I object on the following grounds to anymore disability spaces or restrictions thereof.

- One evening the fire brigade had to knock at No.30 as one of their cars was covering the fire hydrant, thus leading to a severe breach of H&S to the residents. This will be documented by the Fire Brigade as it caused disruption and stress to us neighbours.
- The residents park without due care and attention to any emergency services and their duty to protect life or as a civil neighbour,
- The residents of No.30, I only know the man's first name as 'Bobby'. becomes abusive and threatening

The council when I questioned them about the parking space originally, stated that if there was nowhere else to park, as a resident of Church Road, I could park in that disabled space. This should have been made clear to the recipient to avoid confrontation and misunderstanding, of which I clarified to him.

- They rotate parking, two main cars and also two other cars within the one space. So that his argument, of nobody should park within the disabled bay, which should only apply to the badge holder, he does not uphold himself.
- We have only one pedestrian path on the recipient's side of the road to utilise, to ensure safe dismounting from our vehicles.

## OBJECTION 4

ANNEX B

do my visitors and so cannot safely dismount as we have no path unless we dismount the vehicle onto the main road. Again, causing a breach to our/their safety.

- 
- I have witnessed 4 vehicles used and parked by No.30. Three of them are more frequent and park there daily. We have 8 houses and only 11 viable spaces, at least 3 if not 4 vehicles utilised by No.30. How can you justify two spaces used by four vehicles at one small bungalow, supposedly resided in by two people to take priority over others?
- I have witnessed both residents, walking their dog for long periods of time and also long distances. I ask you to consider for this reason alone, the justification of them, 1 having a blue badge and 2, having to park directly outside their house.
- . I am in fact disabled myself, but because I haven't applied for a blue badge, does not make me any less deserving. I wonder if the validity of the blue badge, has been reviewed for the recipient and if not, would request it to be so. Forthwith. I was advised by the recipient to apply for a badge, but choose not to use every tool available to take advantage of systems in place.

I would like to invite you to visit me, so you can see for yourselves the already restricted parking and encumbrances we have to endure daily.

Regards,

## OBJECTION 5

ANNEX B

Eastchurch  
Isle of Sheppey  
Kent

29/01/16

To the Engineering Team,

I have just noticed a sign on the lamp post requesting any objections for any further restrictions to parking or added bays down Church Road. As a resident of the above address, I would like to point out the following –

I object on the following grounds to anymore disability spaces or restrictions thereof in my stretch of road.

- The residents at no 30 park without due care and attention to any emergency services and their duty to protect life, covering the fire hydrant.
- The council when I questioned them about the parking space originally, stated that if there was nowhere else to park, as a resident of Church Road, I could park in that disabled space. This should have been made clear to the recipient to avoid confrontation and misunderstanding.
- We have only one pedestrian path on the recipient's side of the road to utilise, to ensure safe dismounting from our vehicles. I so cannot safely dismount as we have no path unless we dismount the vehicle onto the main road. Causing a breach to our/their safety.
- 
- We have 9 houses and only 12 viable spaces, at least 3 if not 4 vehicles are utilised by No.30. How can you justify two spaces used by four vehicles at one small bungalow, supposedly resided in by two people to take priority over others?
- I have witnessed both residents, walking their dog for long periods of time and for long distances. I cannot for this reason see how you can justify any further restrictions and cannot see how you can allow further concessions.
- We were of the understanding when the last disabled space was put in of which there are already two, that the road could not sustain any further spaces or further restriction that would cause unreasonable hardship for other residents some of whom are elderly, disabled or have young children.

## OBJECTION 5

ANNEX B

I would like to invite you to visit me, specifically after 5pm to see for yourself how difficult it already is to park so you can see for yourselves the already restricted parking and encumbrances we have to endure daily.