

ANNEX D

Park Road – Objection Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1	<p>I am writing in response to the correspondence received this morning regarding the extension to the resident's parking scheme in Park Road and once again wish to lodge my very strong objections.</p> <p>I reside directly opposite the junction with Ufton Lane and we are the last house to benefit from on-street parking before the double yellow lines begin. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>The time of operation 8am- 6pm is unnecessary. For most of the day, say from 9 am until 3.15pm, the road is quite empty. My wife is in and out of the house all day, every day, using her car and never has had any problem in finding a space, normally right outside our property.</p> <p>The 3 schools nearby (Minterne, The Oaks & St Peter's) all use the top of Park Road for parking during the school run period. Whilst this can cause congestion (we simply avoid returning or leaving the house during these times), the cumulative pressure that this will put on other roads, especially nearer the schools will be a serious hazard. Any restriction at the top end of Park Road would be a reckless decision, causing serious safety concerns. I have no doubt that your proposal will go ahead, but I wish to record my concerns here and request that this situation is monitored very closely.</p> <p>The landlords at the Gore Court Arms public house set a wonderful example of respectful behaviour for the neighbourhood. Vehicles parked in the area are usually for short stays and any restriction would mean that either their clientele will park in other roads, increasing pressure in those areas or in fact, will visit other establishments. Not a helpful move in the current climate, I am sure.</p> <p>The 3 properties to the south of us currently do not have on-street parking outside and I presume at the moment they park in other roads or indeed further down Park Road. In the light of the purchase of 2 permits per household, I would suggest that they may feel more of an understandable right to park as close to their properties as possible: thus causing further unnecessary tension in the area</p> <p>The most difficult time to park at the top of Park Road is AFTER 6pm. It would seem that your current proposal will do nothing to alleviate this situation. Other local councils have introduced more suitable time zones, dependent on need. This may be something that you might like to research and consider before merely extending the current area as a matter of expediency.</p> <p>Finally, I note that this proposal has been raised as the result of a petition. I therefore must inform you that when we were canvassed in this respect, the gentleman concerned was very biased in his spiel on our doorstep and had we not already had such discussions as a family, it would have been far easier to have signed the petition, so that we could continue with our evening meal. I therefore have to question how many other residents may have felt the same?</p>

<p>2</p>	<p>I am replying to yet another letter sent to me regarding your proposal for the south end of Park Road and Ufton lane. If you could refer to my last two replies for my input , you will see my reasons against the proposal. Just in case you don't refer to them I will explain again.</p> <p>At the top end of Park Road you state " The scheme should improve parking during the daytime". " and "To use parking facilities in the town centre "</p> <p>Well, the parking in the town centre is an absolute shambles and the top end of Park Road during the day time there is NOT a problem with parking. As I stated before IF you drove to Park Road to see for yourselves you wouldn't have to take my word it.</p> <p>It is late afternoons, early evenings that is the time that's the problem with parking here. Are you going to apply No Parking at any time for non permit holders OR is it only from 8am - 6pm and also give them time limits that they can park for an hour or two during the daytime ?.</p> <p>If it's the latter then we are back to square one as at 4pm or 5pm anyone will be able to park here who are visiting the Vets or The Gore Court Arms Public house and stay till late even until 8am the next day if they wish (that has happened due a drink driving)</p> <p>So residents coming home from work in the evening will still not get a space .</p> <p>As I said in my last response about this IF you must implement Parking Permits then have No Parking for Non Permit Holders between approximately 4pm - 7pm .</p> <p>I have spoken to many of my neighbours who feel exactly the same as I do and also you say there was an informal consultation undertaken with residence. How come many of us in Park Road was not informed about it ? .</p> <p>I would have liked to be given the opportunity to have my say as I'm sure my neighbours would have.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>I am emailing following a letter I received regarding the Parking Scheme.</p> <p>I live in Park Road, my husband drives and finds it impossible to park, however we do not feel the parking scheme will help him. Having lived here for 13 years and walking up and down the road (especially as a walker) at different times of day I do not notice a big difference from one end (where the scheme is in operation) to the other, there may be a few extra spaces during the day compared to south end but at night both are equally packed out with cars. If my husband finishes early he can get parked but as soon as it hits 5.30 there are no spaces, the scheme finishes at 6pm so this will not help, unless the scheme went on later hours then perhaps it would solve it but 6om is when the trouble starts. I would not be happy paying for my husband not to park. The resident north end are not happy with the scheme.</p>

4	<p>I am emailing you regarding the parking situation on park road.</p> <p>I have lived here for over 10 years and do not experience any issues with parking during the day. The main issue is at night. I do not feel that having parking permits will help with the parking situation. I also have spoken to many residents on park road and most have also voiced the same as me. I also feel that permit parking will affect the local pet shop and vets. We are meant to be supporting local shops. Therefore, I feel that we are entitled to see the precious petition regarding the results. Ince again I will say that I do not wish to have permit parking.</p>
5	<p>I have just had sight of a letter regarding the proposed extension to the residents parking area on Park Road and Unity Street.</p> <p>To say I'm am somewhat vexed is an understatement. I have made several approaches to SBC regarding the existing residents' area no longer being fit for purpose.</p> <p>I have received responses stating that I need to arrange petitions and 'it will cost too much to review'.</p> <p>The most recent of these was in the latter part of last year. I had to chase the response more than once!</p> <p>The main issue as to why SBC do not feel they have a responsibility to review the scheme to ensure it is fit for purpose is that they would need to review the parking order incurring a financial cost. Which you now appear to be doing in respect of an extension. Would it not of cost the same to review the whole scheme?</p> <p>If these schemes are as they are sold to residents to gain support 'residents parking schemes' and not a revenue generation scheme, then there simply must be the onus on the authority to review periodically and when any changes are proposed.</p> <p>The letter details an 'extension to the existing scheme' if this is the case I question why persons residing in the existing area are not being sent these letters for consultation as well as those in the proposed extension. The existing area is used by persons not resident in the waiting time from 1hr or 2hrs respectively before the restrictions end, at 1800hrs this is simply not late enough. Residents returning from work in their vehicles including large vans (who cannot apply for permits) then take up spaces for which residents have permits, who then cannot park within a reasonable walk from their property.</p> <p>Put simply, the waiting time should be standardised across the area and the times of operation should be significantly extended, in my opinion at least 2000 if not 2200hrs.</p>

	<p>I wish to be made aware of any public meetings in relation to this matter.</p>
6	<p>Further to the proposed residents parking scheme in Park Road, I can confirm that most of the local residents are against this scheme as it stands.</p> <p>To ask homeowners to pay to park in their own road is totally unfair, especially as the restrictions are lifted in the evening when the demand for homeowners to park near their own property is at its highest.</p> <p>Also, how do you propose how the Fern Cottage Veterinary Surgery (233-235 Park Road) can continue to operate their business with the restrictions in place?</p> <p>This scheme hasn't been requested by the residents and is a just another money making revenue for SBC.</p>
7	<p>Further to the more recent letter regarding the proposed changes to the parking permit scheme along the top end of Park Road and Ufton Lane, and as stated in my original response below, we are still not happy with the extension of permits that is outlined. Our reasons are below.</p> <p>Although the current scheme prevents people from parking for extended periods during the day at the lower end and free parking at the upper end of the road, this is not and has never been where the issues lie; problems occur after 4pm (2 hours before the 6pm end time) and when homeowners return from work after 5pm. Parking is for the most-part easy in the hours up to then and we currently usually get parked close to our house. After these hours parking can be problematic on occasions, but the scheme proposed will not address this. Even with 24-hour permit enforcement, issues will still be prevalent due to the number of cars per house (and I don't believe that SBC are open to extending the current working hours anyway due to 'cost constraints' and being too expensive to review). However, an extension to the hours proposed will have some positive effect in preventing non-residents from parking on the road and then commuting or using the spaces as opposed to parking in a town-centre car park.</p> <p>With the permit area and heavy amount of yellow lines, we will also loose a space directly across our shared drive and up onto Ufton Lane, which will impact on the number of cars that can park and further increase competition for spaces.</p> <p>Further to this the Vets and Gore Court Arms pub also add to the issue of not being able to always park in the evening but as these visits are usually short anyway the introduction of permits will not alleviate this as visitors are unlikely to stay beyond the 2 hour init currently set.</p> <p>The use of permits and visitor permits also puts people off from visiting and produces an additional expense to homeowners who will have to purchase these on top of the permit to park their own car. As someone who has a parent abroad who visits for 1-2</p>

	<p>weeks at a time and uses a hire car for such trips, it will be an added cost that we do not wish to incur.</p> <p>This comes across largely as a money-making scheme by SBC that will not benefit the residents of the affected area in any way. Residents that currently live in the permit area are not happy with the current scheme (and have contacted SBC on numerous occasions to highlight the issues) and it is not fit for purpose - even with parking restrictions, residents still struggle to park in the evenings, when they need too.</p> <p>We would also still not be happy with 2 permits per house/2 cars per permit if this is still planned.</p> <p>In summary, we are against the proposal as it stands and do not wish for the extension to proceed in this format.</p>
8	<p>Once again, I have to respond with our objections to the latest proposal to extend controlled parking to the south end of Park Road. As you'll see from earlier correspondence left appended below (all still relevant, so please note), this is clearly something that SBC doesn't appear to wish to let go of, despite repeated such 'surveys' and the objections levied against the scheme (the last being Aug 2019).</p> <p>Therefore, please register this as my new, reiterated and strong objection to this proposal.</p> <p>The grounds are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unnecessary. There are no issues with daytime (week day or weekend) parking in the top section of Park Road, as the photos taken by myself on a random day off on 24/10/19 at 11.21am demonstrated. (Any 'issues' generally occur outside of the scheme's operational hours on residents' return home - but generally everyone tend to get a space, even if they need to forego the luxury of parking directly outside their own home). 2. In 2009, objections to the first proposal of the scheme extension were submitted to SBC in the form of a petition representing a significant no. of residents of Park Road and Ufton Lane, which then (as now, I suspect) far outweighed calls in favour of it (a leading one at the time was from a council official seeking a guaranteed daytime parking place outside his own house!). This was covered by the Sittingbourne KM, and I attended the council chamber vote on the matter. <p>Casual polling amongst all of our immediate neighbours in Q4 2019 and into 2020 still reveals no-one who is in favour. To this end - and as I have stressed previously - a properly democratic process is needed here, with a 100% poll of residents and publication of the results necessary in order to settle this matter for good.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Cost - why should residents (especially the elderly or families with young children) be forced to pay to park in their own

neighbourhood (?) when the scheme is i. demonstrably unjustified ii. Of SBC's own making (in that controlled schemes tend to push any issues into a neighbouring area (and, in this area, with three schools on our doorstep (The Oaks Infants, Minterne Junior, St. Peter's), generating potentially new safety concerns); iii. Offers absolutely no advantages to residents.

It is hard to overlook the idea, as has been stated previously, that its intention is less to keep residents happy than to generate revenue.

So, once again, *please* refrain from continually issuing letters such as the once recently received (datemarked Dec 13), where the onus is on the objectors to continually gather the energy and time to repeat their objections.

Instead:

- *Please* show us a fair, fully democratic and process that truly represents the majority preference of the residents of the southern sections of Park Road and Ufton Lane.
- *Publish* the results of this survey for all to scrutinise (please do not leave this matter merely to a vote of councillors (as in 2009), many of whom did not even reside in the borough).
- Prove to us that this has finally been dealt with equitably and with the interests of the residents genuinely in mind rather than as another means of raising capital.
- Please then do not re-visit this matter for at least 5 years.

9

I would to express our deep disgust, anger and disappointment at the decision to extend parking bays to the top of Park Road and Ufton Lane. You asked for our opinions and worries, and we feel these have been ignored. Our family has lived in Park road for over 44 years and have never had any issues parking. We are a family of disabled members, young mother and honest workers. We have paid our road tax and to be asked to pay an extra £45 per vehicle a year for the freedom we already have seems preposterous. We have 6 members who need vehicles to get to work which, includes getting to a hospital for work every day. Without the ability to park near home, this will cause trouble getting to work. Why live in Sittingbourne if we can't park outside our own houses? In addition, will disabled members of the road have to fight for disabled bays? The problems with your plans mean that other roads will be congested which, will have a knock-on effect for rush hour. The local schools will suffer as more cars will be forced towards Minterne and the Oaks infant school, which could result in injuries or worse. We already have a family member in a care home due to reckless driving around these areas so, when will it end?

As a family who supports our local council and our MP's why should we have to endure, more hassle everyday trying to get to work and trying to come home to park after a long day. Our local business' will suffer due to parking being forced into their private parking. Mothers will struggle trying to park and disabled people will have more struggles trying to ensure they can get a bay.

I would like to feel our concerns will be listened to and the cons to these bays will outweigh the "pros" that we can not understand. Thus please hear our issues and consider the negative impact you will place on our area.

Regarding the extension of the parking Scheme
To the top of Park road and upper lane
The Question I ask is WHY. I took a photo
on the 20th SEPT of the top of Park road
(enclosed) at midday showing plenty of spaces
I put the photo on the Homeward Ward forum.
on the 20th sept many comments have been made
on the 9th & 20th sept. one comment made
several times is it doesn't guarantee you
a parking space. Cllr quoted
Dec 18th in the Sittingbourne News regarding
Council tax We are reluctant to load any extra
costs on people. So why are we being made
to pay for a unguaranteed parking permit.

Back in the Summer a Survey was carried
out I asked 4 neighbours ONE was on holiday
ONE VOTED for. Two against. Has there been a
result published?

Further to your letter dated 13th December 2019 I absolutely disagree with the idea of extending the existing residents' parking scheme into the southern end of Park Road.

It states that the scheme would improve parking for residents during the daytime. I live at [redacted] Park Road and can state that there is no problem parking in the daytime.

Your letter fails to mention the cost to the residents. We have 2 cars so we would have to pay a substantial amount for something that we don't feel we need. It also becomes awkward when visitors come to stay.

The only time we have difficulty parking is the evening but this scheme will not help with this problem.

I object strongly to pay for parking my car outside my house when I have no problem parking for free now. It feels like this is a 'money making scheme' for Swale Borough Council.

I know that there are many residents on Park Road that share my view [redacted]

So I do hope you will not take our money.

Park Road – Support Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1	<p>Have just received the proposed extension plans for the residents parking on park road and we are completely in agreement that these plans are needed here. I have 3 children and one on the way and I look after my nephews and friends kids regularly. Sometimes I have to park a considerable distance from our home which can be incredibly difficult with lots of children and shopping etc. So many cars park here at 8/9am, walk to the high street for work and don't return until 5/6pm. The parking here should be prioritised for the residents and the permit extension is the only way possible. My partner also has to wheel water barrels to his van daily, if he's parked 400yards away this becomes quite a chore back and forth. We cannot wait until there are permits here!!</p>
2	<p>We agree with the proposed plans. We would like them to move forward as soon as possible.</p>
3	<p>We are responding to the recent request for comments regarding the above proposal. We fully support the extension which will address some the issues with non-resident parking.</p>
4	<p>We at Park Road, Sittingbourne are very happy to ahead with the parking permits. Also, with the structure advised.</p>
5	<p>I write in relation to the proposed extension to the Park Road/Ufton Lane Residents' Parking Scheme. I am in favour of the scheme to prevent non-residents parking for weeks on end in Park Road but have a few comments about the finer details. During which hours will the restrictions operate? It is not during the day-time that residents have problems parking, it is after 5.30pm when we return from work. Could the restrictions therefore be in place until 7pm? Will there be any restrictions on the size of vehicle that can park? There are many larger transits/flatbed trucks that park on Park Road taking up a lot of space, particularly on a Friday afternoon when their occupants are in the Gore Court Arms! Your letter does not state how much residents will have to pay for the pleasure to park outside their own houses, a cost that will not be well received if we still can't find a space during the early evening. How many cars will be included on each permit and will we receive visitor's permits included in the price?</p>
6	<p>We agree with the proposal for Parking Scheme in the marked area. However knowing about issues with the existing Scheme at the lower part of our road, we would like to have parking time increased. Most of the residents/occupiers getting home from work</p>

	<p>after 1800. And it's difficult to park as non residents/occupiers already parked their cars. Ideally no parking permit time should be extant to at least 1900. Being close to the High Street and pubs, often we have people parking our end and walking for a night out, leaving their vehicles until next day morning. And you don't really want to deal with this issue at the end of working week.</p>
7	<p>I would like to confirm I agree with the proposed extension for Park Rd and Ufton Lane.</p> <p>The only thing is that the disabled bays outside 180 and 176 are no longer disabled bays. The signs have been taken down, but the road markings are still there. I was told these would wear off.</p>
8	<p>I would like to add some comments to the proposed scheme referenced above, I have attached a scan of the proposal marked up with numbers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the proposal for adding double yellow lines here, there are dropped kerbs here with entrances to either parking spaces or garages, would prefer if these were white lined to allow for loading & unloading of a private vehicle, or left as is as there dropped kerbs here, I don't see these as a problem. 2. these spaces cause a single track chicane, causing traffic problems at busy times, and obscure the view turning right out of homewood avenue, it makes more sense to allow the traffic to flow more freely with all the parking on one side of the road. 3. this area has become a parking area for vans, cars and other commercial vehicles, I suspect with the introduction of residents parking which I fully support, will become even more rammed with vehicles, and would suggest that if parking here cannot be prevented it is included in the residents parking proposal. 4. I would like to see the proposed residents parking scheme to be in operation 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, as commercial vehicles and vans are routinely left at the top of park road all weekend without any thought for residents who live here.
9	<p>I previously voted yes for the extension, however, I feel the proposal of double yellow lines at the very top of the road near the pub and into Ufton Lane is unnecessary. For me personally, as long as the extension includes my house number, I am for the parking permit area being somewhat extended.</p> <p>At present, the permit area ends with my next door neighbour which causes me many issues. I am surrounded by permit bays which I can only park in for up to 2 hours, and my guests can only park in for 2 hours. The rear access to my home is in Ufton Lane and there are no free parking spaces without having to walk up the road where the residents whose homes back onto this part of Ufton Lane already park. The parking availability outside the front of my home is regularly taken up with commuters or other</p>

residents who are also not entitled to purchase a permit. Although, at the moment I have a car parked outside my house with a permit on it as, I assume, this is the closest they could park to their home at 7am. However, by 9am there will be plenty of spaces within the permit zone but not having a permit for my car means that I cannot use these spaces for longer than 2 hours. On top of that, I have been advised that I am not entitled to purchase the books of daily permits. This caused many issues recently as I had a baby in November and anyone wanting to visit was restricted to 2 hours as there were very few spaces in the non permit area.

I understand that many of the residents are against the proposed extension and I appreciate their reasons why. I am in agreement to the extension in part so that I have a bit more choice of where to park my car, or at least be able to buy the daily permits for visitors.

Ufton Lane – Support Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1	<p data-bbox="465 339 2024 403">My family live on Ufton Lane and I would like to give our feedback on these proposals. Overall, we are supportive of the proposals, but would suggest the following adaptations:</p> <ol data-bbox="517 448 2024 691" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="517 448 2024 547">1. Removal of the proposed parking bay on the south west of Ufton Lane near the junction with Homewood Avenue. This is currently an awkward bottleneck on the road that could be eliminated by these changes. It's also currently a visibility issue when pulling out of Homeward Avenue and turning right.<li data-bbox="517 555 2024 619">2. Addition of some flexible parking such as short-term bays for the vets at 235 Park Road. People should be able to legally park outside this business.<li data-bbox="517 627 2024 691">3. Although the Gore Court Arms has parking, we often see people parking around the top end of Ufton Lane to use the pub. If needed, it would acceptable to allow some flexibility evening and weekend parking around there too for that.
2	<p data-bbox="465 738 2024 834">In response to the informal consultation of residents regarding the extension of residents' parking in Ufton Lane and Park Road, I would like to say that I am very happy with the proposals as shown on the plan that was circulated and I appreciate the effort to retain as much of the existing parking space as possible.</p> <p data-bbox="465 882 2024 978">I would only say that I am aware that some residents on the eastern side of Ufton Lane would probably prefer not to have yellow lines across their drives because they are used to allowing visitors to park across their drives. If they were given the option of having dog bones instead this might avoid having to deal with objections when the TROs are advertised.</p>
3	<p data-bbox="465 1031 2024 1094">I support the extension of the current residents' parking scheme to the top of Ufton lane, should the scheme be extended in Park road.</p> <p data-bbox="465 1102 2024 1166">At the moment we are unable to park in the road due to the amount of Van's and commuters that park here, we park in front of our drive.</p> <p data-bbox="465 1174 2024 1238">Would we still be able to park in front of our drives? Especially on Sundays when the work vans will return so we are unable to park in the road.</p>

4

We wholeheartedly agree with the proposed extension & for us the double yellow lines from 179 to 157 Upton Lane is a superb idea, enabling residents to be able to drive off onto their drives with a clear line of sight. This is a very busy road and has become dangerous because cars park on this side of the road.

We do though totally disagree with proposed parking bays just down from 157 Upton Lane. Cars exiting Homewood & travelling

towards Westridge do not have clear view of cars travelling down Upton Lane from Westridge/Park Road. This is a very busy junction & parked cars there impede the view to oncoming traffic.

Ufton Lane – Objection Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1	As residents at Ufton Lane, we are happy with the current arrangement and do not support the introduction of a resident's parking scheme. Since the introduction of the new double yellow lines at the corner of Ufton Lane, starting at number 88, we have seen a decrease in the number of work vehicles using this end of the Lane and do not see an advantage in introducing parking bays as you suggest.

Unknown Location – Support & Objection Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1 Support	Replying to the recent letter proposed extension park road. We agree with these changes being made and hope they are soon. Thank you
2 Support	<p>I refer to your consultation letter dated 13 December 2019.</p> <p>Whilst we remain opposed to residents' only schemes, their very flaws have led us to the conclusion that an extension of the scheme into Ufton Lane is now an inevitable necessity.</p> <p>Your justification for the scheme does not though understand the nature of the problems such schemes cause. It is self-evident that given that the parking problems in non-scheme areas are caused by residents within scheme areas seeking to avoid the annual charge for an additional car or commercial vehicle (even currently a London Taxi!), they will hardly be encouraged to use the <i>'parking facilities available in the town centre'</i> as suggested by your letter. Most problems in fact occur outside of the scheme core hours with there generally being adequate parking during the day.</p> <p>This is therefore a self-justifying and perpetuating process and because of it, we therefore feel that we must now reluctantly support the introduction of the scheme into Ufton Lane as a means to try and address the problems.</p> <p>In giving this support, we would ask you to give consideration separately to both the views of residents in Ufton Lane and Park Road. This is because if residents in Park Road are opposed or indifferent, Ufton Lane will continue to be subject to difficulties and in such a situation it should be subject to its own scheme.</p>

Scheme Layout General Comments

Email/Letter No.	Comments
1	<p>I was interested to see on the map that accompanied the letter referenced above still has a 'disabled' bay in place outside my house. In fact the map shows two disabled bays, but referring to communication with SBC over 18 months ago the Disabled Bay parking restriction sign was removed from the wall outside my house at the end of April 2018 and one is not visible in the vicinity of the bay outside 178 Park Road either so should one or both still be classed as such? Please see email thread below.</p>
2	<p>Regarding the proposed parking scheme in Ufton Lane. We reside in Ufton Lane and have a dropped kerb that allows 3 cars to be parked off road. We frequently have elderly friends and family visit. The dropped kerb allows them to park on the road in front of our cars. Should the proposed double yellow line be placed adjacent to our dropped kerb it would prevent any person parking adjacent to our property. Would you please consider NOT placing double yellow lines outside our property?</p>
3	<p>I understand that this is the address that we are to email with any views on the proposed extension to the parking permit zone on park road and Ufton Lane. We live in Belmont road and would welcome additional parking restrictions. However, may we draw to your attention the fact that parking on the whole would be much better if people actually parked properly. You'll see attached some pictures of people who feel that they are driving perhaps a bus?! These people who park their one car in spaces big enough for two are perhaps some of the reason that we cannot park near our homes? Could we therefore urge that the money being spent into looking at extending the restrictions is also used to paint in parking bays...this may solve some of the issue and also make our £45 a year actually seem worth it?</p>
4	<p>Can someone please provide the times of the parking schemes (e.g mon - fri 8-6?). Additionally, I noticed the proposal includes additional double yellow lines, removing all visitor parking from Ufton Lane to Homewood Ave. Who has requested this and what is their rationale? Thanks for your response and the information. I am putting together a letter regarding both proposals and will send it in due course.</p>
5	<p>I live at Park Road and would it be possible to have a single white line put on the road by my drop kerb can you inform me by e-mail with a answer</p>