

Formal Objections and Comments of Support to Traffic Regulation Order – Swale Amendment 23 2021

– ANNEX B

Response No.	Comments	Support	Object	Not specified
1	<p>Thank you for sending me a copy of the revised plans for the parking restrictions and parking bays in Abbey Street and Abbey Place, Faversham.</p> <p>I agree with the plan and the alterations and am delighted that the proposals will hopefully be passed and implemented.</p>	Support		
2	<p>Further to our earlier comments on the proposed parking changes in Abbey Street, and relating ONLY to the wide or southern end of the street</p> <p>1. We really do not think it is a good idea to put more yellow lines on the road. Marking the parking areas clearly - as happens at the moment - has not led to random parking outside the parking areas, ever. This is arguably one of the most beautiful streets in the country, and yellow lines are not popular. They are ugly. In this case they would add nothing except disfigurement. Has anyone consulted the SPAB or other Conservation Body about these proposals? There must surely be a better way.</p> <p>2. There is at present a stretch of road in front of the two vehicle-access points at our house (no **), and next door (no **). (Please note this does not have yellow lines yet no-one parks in it!) It is used every day, all the time, for short-term delivery stops, postal vans, increasingly for ambulances, and of course as a convenient passing place when oncoming traffic cannot get along the main part of the road. It also helps with visibility for pedestrians crossing the road, not least for those coming down the alley beside our house. In fact it is quite a busy pedestrian area, compared to the rest of this part of the street. Your proposal extends this by quite a lot, mostly in front of our house. Extending its use as a passing space will act against pedestrians, and will we think lead to increased speeding and aggression by drivers... more drivers will dash towards it, faster and faster.</p> <p>3. Moreover, those vehicles who want to get through waiting in this space will of course have their engines running, and you are just permitting more diesel fumes to be sent out, right in front of our</p>		Object	

	<p>house. We would prefer to see it left as it is. If it has to be extended it should be spread evenly between no 92 and no 94 and not created just in front of no 92.</p> <p>4. However, this is not really tackling the main problem - which is the speed which drivers think is ok. We think the whole street should be controlled as to speed ... by signage at the south end of the street, saying PEDESTRIAN ZONE or PLAY ZONE. Speed bumps are not suitable next to these medieval houses, but the whole street should be subject to a 5 or max 10 mph limit. That may sound extreme, but if priority were given to residents, pedestrians, children, pets etc, that would seriously modify the behaviour of the drivers.</p> <p>5. As far as we can see, having lived here for nearly ■ years, the problem is really the belligerence of the drivers, esp dropping their children off to school, or collecting them, and it's noticeably worse with all the new houses at the northern end of the street and the restaurants and shops now operating at Standard Quay. We think all these drivers - especially visitors - should be made aware of the very special and sensitive and fragile area they are coming into... There is nothing to show them that children or old people or dogs may be crossing the road, and with the silence of electric vehicles now this is an increasingly dangerous situation. So, we urge you to consider zoning the whole of the street and its off-shoots as Pedestrian Priority.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

3	<p>Re: your ref.: H4.1/TRO AM 23 Objection to Traffic Regulation Order – Swale Amendment 23</p> <p>In response to your letter of 15 February 2021, I am writing to strongly object to the above proposal to install double yellow lines in front of 63–64 and 65 Abbey Street.</p> <p>In our conversation this morning, you mentioned that the Council likes to take advice from local residents’ associations. I also wish to emphasise that I was never at any point consulted by the Abbey Street Residents’ Association about their suggestion, and in fact it was sent to the Council without any knowledge on my part. I would certainly never have given it any support.</p> <p>I completely agree that there is a serious issue about traffic on Abbey Street. From having once been a residential street, it is now a major access road, and the irreversible surge in traffic has been caused by the significant additional housing developments further down the road and the significant increase in commercial activity at Standard Quay. And for obvious reasons, there is no other point of access. The road is far too narrow to allow for the easy passage of cars, let alone all the vans and lorries. Therefore I do welcome the Council looking at ways of easing the flow of traffic, and reducing the frequent and recurring damage to parked cars (of which I myself have regularly been the victim). However, some more comprehensive plan is required. Some of the local residents consider that the only way to resolve the problem permanently,</p>		Object	
---	---	--	--------	--

rather than applying another short-term sticking-plaster solution that will in itself cause more problems, is to create a one-way system, incorporating Belvedere Road.

I object to this current proposal for the following reasons:

1. There will be a loss of three parking spaces in the immediate area, when there is an alternative solution that would achieve the same objective with the loss of only one parking space. This is to leave the parking outside 63–64 and 65 Abbey Street as it is, and on the other side of the road extend the existing double yellow lines to include the frontage of the electricity substation, between nos. 48 Abbey Street and 1 Lammas Gate. (This would have the additional benefit of allowing clear emergency access to the substation.)

The proposed compensating parking spaces on Abbey Place are at some considerable distance, and will be no help to the infirm, the elderly carrying heavy shopping, or parents carrying small children.

2. From past experience on Abbey Street, drivers regularly mount the pavement where there are double yellow lines. This is why the three bollards became essential outside nos. 2, 3 and 4 Lammas Gate, because there were near-misses with the residents and other pedestrians (and this was when there was less traffic). Cars mounted the pavement at that point even when there were already pedestrians there. That pavement is 2.1 metres wide. The pavement outside 63–64 and 65 Abbey Street is considerably narrower than that one (at its narrowest it is less than a metre, only 80 centimetres) and therefore it is inevitable that some protection will be required for pedestrians, as this will now become another danger spot. This will entail additional expense for the Council; or the possibility of the Council being involved in litigation and compensation if a pedestrian is injured. Arguably, the proposal also puts the frontage of 63–64 at greater risk of being hit by passing traffic.

3. The removal of parking places outside would result in a serious financial impact on the value of the property. This opinion is

	<p>supported by the advice of both a local estate agent and a highly experienced chartered surveyor. Whilst it may not be an absolute right to park outside one's home (and certainly not guaranteed on Abbey Street, where the parking is so pressured), completely removing the existing benefit of the possibility of parking outside one's home is another matter altogether. I am investigating with my solicitor whether there would be the potential to bring a case for compensation against the Council.</p> <p>4. Finally, as happens now with the other areas of double yellow lines, the space outside 63–64 and 65 Abbey Street will in practice be used as temporary parking by delivery vans, thereby negating any theoretical positive impact on traffic flow. The delivery drivers do not obey the parking restrictions, and the restrictions are not enforced in a way to deter such behaviour. They also leave their engines running. Therefore there will be a significant detrimental impact on my home, especially in terms of pollution.</p> <p>I hope very much that the Council committee will take my objection seriously. This is a matter of grave concern to me.</p>			
4	<p>I refer to the above TRO and in particular to paragraph 1C relating to the Eastern Side of Abbey Street where it suggests the removal of existing parking bays in favour of double yellow lines outside/adjacent to 64 & 65 Abbey Street.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that in fact a better solution, in terms of traffic movement and allowing the passing of vehicles in a narrow gap, is to actually make these changes on the western side of the street, i.e. directly opposite the proposed changes on the eastern side of the street, such that you remove a parking bay adjacent to the end of the current yellow lines and effectively continue the yellow lines to a point parallel with the boundary of 48 Abbey St. where it meets the Lammas Gate building.</p> <p>I understand the owner of [REDACTED] has already suggested these changes but feels you may have misunderstood his comments by proposing the changes to the eastern side of the road directly outside</p>		Object	

	<p>64 & 65 Abbey St. instead of on the western side of the road such as I am now suggesting.</p> <p>As local residents, and regular users of this stretch of Abbey Street, we wholeheartedly agree that some changes are required to improve traffic flow in the area, but feel that changes to the western edge of the road will have a better impact than on the proposed eastern side of the road.</p>			
5	<p>As resident of [REDACTED], I wish to object to the unsightly double yellow lines being proposed.</p> <p>There has long been a pull in for traffic by the drive ways of Nos. 92 to 94, and this has worked well.</p> <p>Any extension of parking restrictions will just reduce available space (already at a premium) and tend to speed up the traffic (in spite of the 20mph limit) as drivers try to get through without stopping.</p> <p>With more and more home deliveries, the yellow lines will just be ignored, or the road will be blocked.</p> <p>Please leave it as it is.</p>		Object	
6	<p>I support the proposals as described in your letter of 15 February, ref. H4.1/TRO AM 23.</p>	Support		
7	<p>Further to this application to make double yellow lines adjacent to 101 Abbey Street, I wish to protest this proposal. I live at [REDACTED] and as someone who is nearly [REDACTED] years old having single yellow line helps my [REDACTED] parking when she visits me on a [REDACTED] or late on a weekday evening. Anything that reduces parking, for no apparent reason, could have a negative impact on my visitors and me.</p> <p>I hope this decision can be reconsidered as I really don't understand the problem you're trying to solve.</p>		Object	
8	<p>Re: Proposed Parking Restrictions and Parking Bay Alterations - Abbey Street and Abbey Place, Faversham Your Ref: H4.1/TRO AM 23</p> <p>We are writing to confirm that we are in favour of these plans for new double yellow lines and altered parking bays. Although these won't completely solve the dire traffic situation in Abbey Street, they will go a long way to improving things.</p>	Support		
9	<p>To confirm I am in support of the changes to the parking on Abbey street Faversham.</p>	Support		
10	<p>Further to your letter and enclosure of 15 February 2021, my objections to these proposals remain the same as those detailed in my email of 18 October 2020, see below.</p>		Object	

	<p>Traffic in Abbey Street has become intolerable, due in part to all the new properties which have been built around Standard Quay. Unfortunately, these proposals will not deal with the issue and will, in fact, cause additional problems due to the loss of too many existing parking spaces at the top end of Abbey Street nearest the town centre.</p> <p>Restricting parking to residents only, and to one vehicle per household, would help to alleviate the traffic problems faced by those living in the street. At that point, consideration could then be given to these proposals.</p>			
11	In response to your letter dated 15/2/21, I am writing to inform that I am favour of the proposals which will assist the traffic flow in Abbey Street and the surrounding neighbourhood.	Support		
12	To confirm I am in support of the changes to the parking on Abbey street Faversham.	Support		

Results Total

Support	Object	Not Specified
6	6	0