

ANNEX B

FORMAL OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

LOCATION/RESTRICTION	OBJECTION	COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATION
52 Watson's Hill, Sittingbourne – Disabled Persons' Parking Bay	Applicant is not disabled and walks easily. The person does not drive the vehicle. Strongly object to white lines outside our property.	The applicant has submitted the appropriate medical evidence and stated they drive on their application. Due to various comments from residents, we have written a letter to the applicant asking for a photocopy of driving licence and insurance documents to prove they meet the current criteria. The lines will be installed outside the applicants property, although, due to bay size some lining may encroach on neighbours frontage. The bay should remain at this time.
Extension of Current Sittingbourne Residents' Parking Scheme Area	1. The implementation of the scheme will have a "knock on" effect making parking in surrounding area's worse. Town workers and commuters are parking on the outskirts of the scheme making parking difficult for residents and dangerous for pedestrians. The Council are not providing sufficient parking within the town centre. Valenciennes Road area should be part of the scheme regardless of residents' comments.	1. There will be a review in the form of a consultation with residents once the scheme has had time to settle to see what affect the new proposals have had. There are 7 public car parks within the near vicinity of the town centre; we cannot force commuters or town workers to park there. Implementation of the scheme without the majority of residents support is not good practice and will have a negative effect on public's perception of the Council. The scheme should be implemented and a review to follow.

	<p>2. Have never had a problem with parking in this area. We have 3 cars in our household, if you are only issuing 2 permits per household, where is the other one going to park? The scheme will just push the parking problem to the neighbouring areas.</p>	<p>2. The consultation results show that a majority of residents are in favour of the scheme, therefore, confirming there is an existing parking problem. Each household is allowed a maximum of 2 permits; this can be transferable between 2 vehicles as long as the vehicle registration number is on the permit. The third vehicle can park within the scheme area without a permit for up to 2 hours. There will be a review in the form of a consultation with residents once the scheme has had time to settle, this will give us an idea what effect the new proposals have had. The scheme should be implemented and a review to follow.</p>
	<p>3. We are a Dental Practice in London Road just outside the proposed scheme area. If the scheme is implemented we will not be legible for parking permits and will cause major problems for us parking. We have 4 full time staff, a dental hygienist and 10 registered ancillary staff. We haven't the room to create off-street parking so our staff currently park in Burley Road, which has plenty of parking spaces during the day. We would like to apply for permits so we can enable to function as a business. The disadvantages of the scheme far outweigh any marginal advantages.</p>	<p>3. Having spoken to the Head of Amenities it was decided that this location not be issued with parking permits at this time. The proposed scheme should improve parking for residents, by encouraging non-resident vehicle users to use public transport or car parks. The maximum of two permits per household can currently be issued; this would not cover all staff that the objector has stated. If further requests are received for permits in London Road then a review maybe carried out and the results submitted to the JTB. There are 7 public car parks within close proximity of the town centre, Cockleshell Walk being approximately a</p>

		<p>5-minute walk from the Dental Practice. The scheme should be implemented and a review to follow.</p>
	<p>4. Lived in Connaught Road 30 years and never had a problem parking until the scheme nearby was implemented. It is a money making scheme for the Council. As far as I can tell very few people would be happy with the scheme. The results of the consultations should be made public for all to view.</p>	<p>4. The consultation results show that a majority of residents are in favour of the scheme, therefore, confirming there is an existing parking problem. The scheme is non-profit making and self-funding. The results of the consultations were submitted to the JTB, the reports can be viewed through the Swale Borough Council website or a hard copy can be sent to any member of the public that requests one. The scheme should be implemented and a review to follow.</p>
<p>35 Goodnestone Road, Sittingbourne – Disabled Persons' Parking Bay</p>	<p>1. The applicant is not disabled and has been seen carrying shopping up the road. Only walks with a limp when people see her.</p> <p>2. Applicant is not disabled enough to warrant this bay. She has been seen running up the road after her child and mowing the lawn. I am more disabled, but my application was turned down. Permit parking should be introduced so one car per household could park. People in this road have two or more cars and cause parking problems; bays would encourage sensible parking. If this disabled bay is allowed I will contact my MP in regards to me getting a bay, I am far more disabled.</p>	<p>1. The applicant has submitted the appropriate medical evidence. The bay should remain.</p> <p>2. The applicant has submitted the appropriate medical evidence. Residents parking permits are only generally issued when there is a parking problem created by non-residents. If residents are only allowed to park one vehicle in the road then the surplus vehicles will park in surrounding roads moving the problem. I cannot comment on your previous disabled bay application, but every application has to meet the K.C.C criteria. The bay should remain.</p>