

ANNEX C

** Lyndhurst Grove
Sittingbourne
Kent
ME10 1QH

15th April 2019.

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

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re Single Yellow Line in Lyndhurst Grove

I wish to oppose the latest scheme to add a single yellow line in Lyndhurst Grove because it is unnecessary and it will add further congestion to the cul-de-sac, making it dangerous during school time. The affects will be the same as the previous proposal as outlined in my previous letter, which I and many of my neighbours opposed and the scheme was abandoned.

Contrary to the 8am claim and request for the two and a half hour morning and two hour afternoon restriction. The school parents park in the affected area for approximately 20 minutes in the morning between 8.40 and 9am and then approximately 30 minutes between 3-3.30pm, which I can evidence if required. The short duration is thanks to the headteacher's decision to stagger the school start time to help alleviate congestion, which commenced this academic year and has been very successful.

With regards to the petition organiser's concerns. The binmen have accessed the road during school time, (most recently 5th April) and subsequently emergency vehicles could easily access the grove. The road space is larger than some of the newer estates and also older roads such as William Street. We do not have any residents using wheelchairs and as such have no concerns with regards to pavement access. As this is a "no through road" these points are unlikely to affect anyone else. Therefore I fail to understand the rationale behind the petition.

There are only four families walking down the road at this time of day, therefore it is difficult to understand how other residents are significantly impacted, particularly the petition organiser, whose address is Gore Court Road. The property's location and entrance on Gore Court Road mitigate bin collection, emergency vehicle and any future wheelchair access concerns. I also believe the property's high wall obscures the view of the road, which may explain the somewhat absurd proposed restriction times. The property's abundance of parking means that the owner will be unaffected by the proposed loss of these parking spaces, that will be applicable throughout the year for quite an extensive daily duration.

With regards to the petition itself. I have been informed that one of the signatures on the petition was only obtained upon the petitioner's second request, as the person initially refused to sign. Another person withdrew their support citing they felt "ambushed". Unfortunately knocking doors does place people under pressure and does not allow time to fully consider the matter. It is peculiar that some people who opposed the previous petition have signed this; given the effects are not dissimilar. Many residents and their visitors park in these spaces for a far greater duration, overnight and over the weekend. The fact that they do not rush to move their cars when another space becomes available, proves they are unconcerned about the actual issues raised in the petition. It is unreasonable and a contradiction for residents and their visitors to park there, (albeit out of necessity owing to the shortage of spaces. as stated in my previous letter) and support an attempt to restrict anyone else doing so for a far shorter time period.

Given most residents have lived in Lyndhurst Grove for over 10 years, if there were major concerns, we would have contacted the council directly ourselves by now.

I am concerned that if this scheme proceeds it will have **several detrimental effects**.

1. The scheme will not stop cars parking in the road, simply move the vehicles adding further congestion to the cul-de-sac. Parents will abandon their cars in the middle of the Grove; obstruct access ways and driveways, thus blocking resident's cars and access for emergency vehicles/the dustcart, because they have nowhere else to park as the school has no onsite parking and all neighbouring roads are congested. We have seen this recently on one particular day, when residents from a neighbouring road used these spaces, presumably due to roadworks, as I have not seen the road this chaotic for many years. It was very difficult to find a gap in-between the parked cars to cross the road safely, particularly with small children. The increased risk of danger is by far more of an issue than "the view from a window".
2. Removing spaces will increase the competition for parking and therefore the duration of the school run will simply increase, which will mitigate the success of the stagger start.
3. The restrictions are in the same place as the previous abandoned petition and as such one of the proposed restricted spaces in particular is in constant use by residents.
4. The restrictions are too lengthy and shouldn't apply throughout the year. We do have several teachers living in the road and this Easter holiday has already seen these spaces used throughout the day.
5. We have several people who park in Lyndhurst Grove from neighbouring roads who do not work normal hours, who will start parking in the cul-de-sac to avoid the restrictions, which will add to the congestion.
6. As car ownership is set to increase, why would anybody want to decrease/restrict available parking spaces? (I.e. create an issue, where there is not one?)
7. In the future, parking availability could have a negative impact on our house prices / ability to sell.

To summarise, a single yellow line will not stop parents parking in the road, they will just add to the congestion in the cul-de-sac. This will block driveways, access ways, and resident's cars and moreover **make it dangerous for the families walking to school**.

As The Oaks has existed for 50 years, residents knew they were moving into the closest road next to a primary school with no onsite parent parking, and subsequently they should tolerate parents briefly parking in the road. I fail to see this issue warrants the council's intervention and use of resources. Please could you abandon this scheme?

Yours truly,
