

**Comments Received – December 2010**

**Comment 1**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Sent:** 08 January 2011 23:39

**To:** Mike Knowles

**Subject:** RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME: CANUTE ROAD TO THE MALL FAVERSHAM

Good Day, Mike,

Thank you for your circular notice of 30 Dec 2010. I can't pretend that I, and several of my immediate neighbours, are not disappointed by the omission of Canute Road from the scheme – again. That's democracy for you. We're obviously destined to suffer the commuters, the white van operators and residents parking 4 or more cars per household, a pity.

I must express my gratitude to you for keeping us up to date with Council decisions and for explaining them in the context of our area. That you always respond to emails is also appreciated.

**Comment 2**

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Sent:** 12 January 2011 17:05

**To:** Mike Knowles

**Subject:** Re: Parking scheme between Canute Road and The Mall, Faversham

Many thanks for your response Mike, especially from your feedback table. I note with interest that in the absence of the petition there was a slight bias in favour for parking restrictions. I cannot comment on the validity or reliability of the petition itself not having been asked by the self appointed organiser of it nor seeing the way in which the petition question was phrased, although anecdotal evidence from discussion with other residents suggests it was less than scientifically rigorous, with no option to vote in favour of the scheme - it would have been nice to know the size of the pool the 44 objections were drawn from and how many refused to sign it I feel! I also understand the £40 fee had rather more to do with the strength of feeling than logistical considerations, and at no point was an option presented for the scheme that the council have now proposed.

I have no real preference for or against a parking scheme, but strongly feel that if a scheme is implemented it should be comprehensive and not the intermediate measure currently proposed for the reasons outlined previously. If this feedback and my previous comment make it to the next JTB meeting along with other residents feedback then that would be good.

With kind regards,

**Comment 3**

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*  
**Sent:** 07 January 2011 13:00  
**To:** Mike Knowles  
**Cc:** Cllr Cindy Davis; staintonjamesa@parliament.uk  
**Subject:** Edith road - residents parking extension. H4.1/MJK

Dear Mike,

I refer to your letter of 30th December (received this morning) and that of 11th October.

Given that in your letter of 11th October, the Edith Road residents' petition result is reported of 3 for and 10 compared to the proposal versus the flawed SBC feedback survey of 13 for and 1 against (which completely ignored the abstentions - i.e. those happy with the status quo) and also reference the even more significant difference in the Belmont Road results, the JTB decision to proceed as reported in the 30th December is clearly questionable under the principles of elected democracy.

Will you please therefore in the first instance provide a copy of the full minute of the joint transportation board meeting for the benefit of Edith Road residents. I will be happy to distribute it on your behalf.

Your sincerely,

#### Comment 4

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*  
**Sent:** 19 January 2011 14:22  
**To:** Mike Knowles  
**Subject:** RE: Kingsnorth Road residents' parking scheme  
Dear Mike

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Kingsnorth Road parking scheme. As you can imagine, I and many of my neighbours are very disappointed that the scheme will not be extended to Kingsnorth Road. It is deeply unfair that a late petition, the authenticity of which is questionable, has prevented a popular scheme from going ahead. As I am sure you are aware, the extension of resident's parking to Belmont and Edith will undoubtedly lead to more parking problems for residents of Kingsnorth and Canute. It will now be even harder for us to park near to our houses, to access our properties safely with our children, to easily unload shopping and other belongings.

Given that the objections largely stem from the top of Kingsnorth Road, I wonder if you would consider residents' parking for the bottom of the road, from Atheistan to Belmont?

Either way, I urge you to consult residents again, to ensure that an accurate and reliable response to your proposals is obtained, without undue pressure and without bias. Alternatively, perhaps a parking survey could be undertaken, whereby non-residents' cars are identified, so that we can see the exact nature of the problem at different times of the day.

I would be very grateful if you could put this view across to the JTB when you next meet.

Many thanks,

## Comment 5

-----Original Message-----

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Sent:** 08 January 2011 21:06

**To:** Mike Knowles

**Subject:** Proposed extensions to Canute Road Residents' Parking Scheme

Dear Mike

Very disappointed news in your letter dated 30th December 2010 which arrived on 6th January.

Democracy at its worst. Having consulted the residents in your original survey an appeal after the deadline seems to have had more sway over the Canute Road Residents from a non resident who lives in Kingsnorth Road who I gather has three cars!

In my opinion the proposals in your letter will only exacerbate the parking problems in Canute Road as parking by commuters and others, including a car business, will be at a premium. Canute Road as you know is also a direct route for parents dropping off children going to the Abbey School.

What recommendations did the Joint Transportation Board make to monitor the situation?

A very disappointed resident.

## Comment 6

**From:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Sent:** 12 January 2011 16:32

**To:** Mike Knowles

**Subject:** Re: URGENT Your ref: H4.1/MJK Parking scheme Kingsnorth Rd

**Importance:** High

Dear Mike

Thank you for your swift reply and informing me of the feedback for of the consultation. I will be putting forward an objection in due course.

According to your analysis it is plain and clear to see that there is an obvious divide in opinions in Kingsnorth Road (as I suggested earlier) and as it is a long road I would suggest that there are alternative measures that could be put in place.

Why not echo the parking restrictions in Athelston Road and only have the parking restrictions in the lower half of the road - if the upper half of the road are objecting, let them have their 'free parking' and experience how life is for the rest of us at the bottom of the road who cannot park our cars due to commuters, employees of Faversham, the 'second cars' from Athelstan and the visitors - not to mention the Jewson workers who will park up there as Edith Road are on board with the scheme! I would be extremely interested to see how they would cope and how quickly their objections are retracted!

Could this idea be suggested and subsequently implemented? There is no denying this is a long road with a clear divide of opinions and so therefore surely we can compromise?

Kind regards,