

**13 INDICATIONS OF SUPPORT****Support 1**

*Parking for us is horrendous, sometimes we've been forced to park a street away which is not good enough when others not related to the road park here. I appreciate some households have more than one car but each household should have a space outside their property also for the safety of their vehicle. I strongly suggest this be made a priority. This is the reason why we should have permits. The benefits are that parking in the road is then for residents only. This displaces all the people who park their cars and then catch a train to work, or those that park and walk into town to work. They often don't leave until after most residents are trying to return home. It also stops those in the permit areas from parking in the non permit areas. It also displaces the residents in the areas that do have a permit but choose not to buy one and just park in the non permit area.*

*It also displaces and depending on your point of view makes parking fairer by limiting the number of cars each household can park. At one time there was a house in the permit area with 8 cars in the household. So those houses with more than two cars are not taking up quite so much road.*

*If you look back at the permit system it was partly to deal with all the London coach commuters and town workers parking in resident roads all day long. This is why the scheme really needs to be run till later in the day as it is in other towns. A later finish will help the scheme work better.*

*No one expects or thinks they will get a magic piece of paper that means they can park outside their own house. (There are a few who seem to think the piece of road outside their home is their own personal property but no scheme will help deal with them) I will be asking along with others in other roads that I know of for the scheme to be extended time wise. I know this does not help everybody especially Delph but no scheme can help everybody.*

**Support 2**

*I am so happy and pleased you are going ahead with this parking plan. We have been living a nightmare here. I drive around all day trying to park. I work from home a lot of the time and every day it's the same commuters going to the train station. And people leaving their work vans getting into their cars and going home. It's worse at the weekend with everyone going into town then picking cars up the next day when they sober up.*

**Support 3**

*We are writing in full support of the proposed extension to the residents parking scheme. Although we feel that the times do need to be amended on the standing traffic regulation order, we feel strongly that this will help immensely with the commuters and shoppers who use Park Road as a car park. Also people from the permit end who park their third/fourth vehicles outside our homes for weeks on end without moving them.*

**Support 4**

*Please record my total support for the proposed TRO changes. This is a sensible approach, taking into account the current patterns of parking.*

**Support 5**

*We live at \*\*\* Park Road and are supportive of the proposal to extend the Residents Parking Scheme in our area.*

**Support 6**

*I live on Ufton Lane. I am supportive of these proposals.*

**Support 7**

*We still would like this extension of permits to go ahead, the problem is still there absolutely fed up with inconsiderate people leaving their cars for weeks days at a time or they park so you cannot even open your boot of*

*your car just for the sake of free parking. The farm shop have the yellow lines but people park on them because there are stones all over them.*

### **Support 8**

*As a resident of Park Road (\*\*\*) , I would like to offer my unconditional support to the plan to extend the parking resident plans in the area, for the following reasons;*

*1 – Cars often block the road when they are dropping school children off, having officers in the area will promote safety.*

*2 – Whilst our family has 1 car there are at least two 3-person households that have 5 cars parked in the street.*

*3 – By offering resident parking in other streets in the locale, people are opportunistically leaving their cars in Park Road and Ufton Lane.*

*4 – A lot of sports / vintage / commercial vehicles are left in the street (I counted 6 in upper Park Road today). There is even a van stuffed full of toys which remains there for months on end.*

*5 – On Friday thru to Sunday it becomes almost impossible to park your car due to visitors – if there are a couple of parties expect to walk ¾ mile to be able to park your car.*

*6 – Reducing congestion, idling traffic and school runs will lead to improvements in air quality. I do hope you can understand my reasons for SUPPORTING the parking extension.*

### **Support 9**

*Hi I'm am writing to support the permit scheme, I live in a no permit part of park road and pay for a permit just to get parked . Looking out my window now and there is only 3 cars out there that belong to the residents, the rest are mainly people that live in the permit areas that are to tight to pay for a very well priced permit . The other cars are from quealy estate agents , people walking into town , and people that must commute and leave there cars all day or sometimes all week . I understand I'm not going to get parked outside my house all the time but getting parked near would be nice . So hopefully the decision will be the correct one.*

### **Support 10**

*I live at the top end of Park Road, Sittingbourne at \*\*\*. Just writing as regards H4.1/TRO AM 25, the proposed amendment to the parking scheme. I am in favour of extending the scheme to cover where I live, as I feel that it would make parking easier.*

### **Support 11**

*I live at the top end of Park Road, Sittingbourne at \*\*\*. Just writing as regards H4.1/TRO AM 25, the proposed amendment to the parking scheme. I am in favour of extending the scheme to cover where I live, as I feel that it would make parking easier.*

### **Support 12**

*I live in Ufton Lane and just wanted to confirm I am wholeheartedly in favour of the scheme however we do not understand why there is a proposed Residential parking bay between Homewood Avenue and number 157 . As this is a busy road all this would do is restrict the flow of traffic and cause congestion at that point which could potentially result in collisions. We think the double yellow lines should go all the way from 181 past 157 to Homewood Avenue.*

### **Support 13**

*Just to let you know I am in full approval of the Scheme. It is just the Hours that I think need to alter ie:- 0800 – till 2000hrs or later.*

## **41 FORMAL OBJECTIONS**

### **Objection 1**

*I am writing for the 3rd time regarding Permit Parking at the top end of Park Road. The reason for my objection are still the same as it was the last two times. The problem of lack of parking spaces at top of Park Road is from 4pm with school mums, the vets and the pub. During the day its not a problem. For an example, someone arrived for a drink at the pub say 4pm, they can stay parked for 2hrs, that brings it to 6pm, from 6pm the 2hr parking restrictions stop so the car doesn't have to move till 8am the next day. So where can paying for Parking permits benefit us? The people visiting the vets in the late afternoon/evening session sit in their cars awaiting results ect and that is about the time Park Road residence come home from work so again there are no spaces. There is no justification for there to be Parking Permits unless its just a Money Making scheme by the Council.*

### **Objection 2**

*I would like to object to the proposed order to extend parking in Park Road and Ufton Lane, Sittingbourne. A full review of parking in these roads needs to take place, rather than just extend the existing problems. There isn't a parking problem at the top end of the road.*

### **Objection 3**

*Here we go again...*

*Please excuse the above flipant comment, it is the result of being fobbed off and ignored for many years.*

*I would like to formally object to the proposed extension to the existing res parking scheme for the following reasons.*

*Parking at the top of Park Road is not an issue. I can see no other motivation for this other than the council clearly wanting more revenue. If this is being requested by residents in the proposed extension then, I would be interested to see the requests at a planning meeting.*

*Because to my knowledge, nobody is asking for this.... please correct me if I am wrong. What people are asking for, and have been for some time is a full review of the residents parking scheme.*

*Also it would massively impact the small businesses in the area as people will most likely only have 2 hours.*

*Once it is implemented, it won't go away or be reviewed and the cost will increase as time goes by.*

*The council will also keep removing parking spaces for garage access and new properties that are squeezed in. Obviously these are looked at separately, but represent a reduction in residents bays available to all.*

*I have campaigned for a review of timings for years, others have taken the time and effort to raise at least one petition in regard to this. The reply to my comments was that it was too expensive to alter the traffic order. Then almost immediately SBC proposed altering the traffic order to extend the existing scheme. So if they can extend the scheme already in place... why would it not be fair to consult all residents in the scheme area and review at the same time. I believe that this is fair and measured. And would avoid additional costs of a review at a later date. This scheme was introduced many years again and the times have not changed, yet vehicle ownership has.*

*The scheme allows parking with two different restrictions. The original area up to the Park Tavern is 9am- 6pm with one hour parking by non permit holders. Meaning you can park all night from 5pm. From the Park Tavern up, you have 2 hours for non permit holders. Meaning you can park from all night 4pm. During the hours of operation, the parking even near town is not normally a problem. After 4pm parking in the area is almost impossible at the town end of the scheme with lessening affect as you move up Park Road (where the extension is suggested).*

*This area of town is the most likely to not have off street parking and residents face the extra cost and restrictions. As a 'Residents Parking Scheme' should it not serve the residents. The times are not standard, they vary across Swale. In fact the suggestion to alter the timings was made by a Parking Warden who suggested 'contact the council, and get it extended as it doesn't work'. And this has been going on for over 6 years.*

*I asked on numerous occasions for details of the person in Swale council and get fobbed off contractors in Maidstone.... These contractors are responsible for enforcing the scheme not the policy, the policy rests with SBC.*

*Obviously, if people feel residing in the extension feel they need it, fine that is their choice. But in fairness, no alterations should be made to the scheme without full consultation, in the light that there have been petitions and numerous complaints and suggestions from various residents. And as they directly stated 'cost of altering the traffic order' was the barrier to a review, I believe it is an absolute abuse of power by SBC to conduct this alteration of the traffic order without consulting the residents in the existing area.*

*On this basis the permission should not be granted.*

*Please also take into account previous communications:*

*TS/CZL/01*

*TRO AM14*

*In relation to parking in the area.*

*Please send details of the full planning meeting which I intend to attend in person.*

#### **Objection 4**

*I am writing to express my objection to the proposition of imposing parking permits to the top end of park road/ ufton lane. I run a small salon based at the above address, where there is only myself and one other person who work here. So, with only a few clients being in the salon at one time my customers that do park in park road for short periods of time has a minimal effect on the local residents. There is usually plenty of space for everyone during our trading hours. I am sure you can appreciate that the past year has been very difficult for many businesses, especially those in the hair and beauty industry. Having deciding to open a new business in March 2020 to then be told that the country was entering into a national lockdown was a huge blow both financially and emotionally, no one expected it to last as long as in did. We were very happy to be able to finally open up in July 2020 and have had amazing support from the residents in park road. Everyone has been thrilled with the way the salon looks and have enjoyed the services we are able to offer. However this was short lived as not only was we shut down in November but again in December. Having reopened again on 12th April business has been going really well, and customers are once again able to enjoy being pampered. To hear of this proposition is just another blow to my business which I am hoping you will be able to empathise. I feel that the implementation of parking permits would have a huge negative impact on my business; the fact I was able to offer free parking close by to my customers was actually one of the reasons I chose to open up in this location. Although we do have a number of local customers who are able to walk to the salon as live close by I also have a number of customers who travel by car so need to park close. For some of those clients it's a matter of being necessary to park close by for mobility reasons. I appreciate that customers can park for 2 hours without permits but some of the services I provide can take longer and just not feasible to expect customers to have to move their car mid way through a treatment. Not only because on the inconvenience to the customers but also into my time. The nearest car park is some walk away which would take some time for a customer to walk to the salon. Yes I could buy books of visitors permits but that comes at further cost and also I have a lot of customers..... if I am limited to how many I can buy it's not fair to say some can have one and some can't so not an option I can consider. I hope you will take into account the reasons for my opposition and consider them when making the decision to implement or not.*

#### **Objection 5**

*In connection with your recent letter, which once again proposes and extension to residents' parking at the top of Park Road, my response is no different to that below which I previously submitted in early 2020. So, PLEASE, No thank you very much. I do not want to be charged to park in the road in which I live. I pay my council tax. I pay my road tax. I even pay the council to empty my brown bin every two weeks. I absolutely do not agree with being held to ransom by the council when it can decide at any time to increase the cost of this scheme, having already risen by 50% since it's inception. I absolutely do not agree with paying £45 to park in the road that I live in. In the 15 years that I have lived in this property [\*\*\* Park Road] I have never had a problem in parking. How many houses in Park Road,*

probably most paying for 2 permits ...what a fabulous income! I have seen only some of the bays re-painted once and I would assume that the traffic wardens cost is self funding from all the tickets issued. Wonderful! So, who does this benefit. All I see it as, is a money making scheme for SBC. If you want to create an income, put parking meters in and charge non-residents to park in the bays for no longer than 3 hours????? And give the poor bloody residents two free parking permits per year. You will still make money on fines too???? I absolutely feel that this proposed scheme is totally immoral and unethical. I no longer wish to keep being bullied in having to pay to park outside in the road in which my house resides. Seriously, why are we being penalised just because of the location of our houses. When I moved here there was no bay parking .....never had trouble parking. The parking got a little worse when SBC put in Bay parking lower down in Park road as clearly residents don't agree with it and don't want to pay so park up the top ....YET, after you created this problem I still DO NOT have any problem in parking my cars in the vicinity of my house at the top of Park Road, apart from when I come home late after a cricket match which is always after 6pm ...which the scheme doesn't accommodate. PLEASE STOP this nonsense. And surely the wonderful new, expensive to park in, Spring Lane Parking should alleviate any parking problems in town!????

### **Objection 6**

\*\*\*\*\*of \*\* Ufton Lane , can see no advantage of the suggested scheme as, since the addition of double yellow lines at the corner of Ufton Lane towards the Gore Court Arms, parking on Ufton Lane is less congested than previously. We are happy with the status quo. Please let us know if there is any further way of contributing to the consultation.

### **Objection 7**

I am writing yet again in response to your proposed extension to Residents Parking Scheme - Park Road and Ufton Lane. I do not consider this to be in the best interest because it does not cover evenings and weekends when we find it very difficult to park. It is also inconvenient if we need work to be carried out over a longer period of time than 2 hours! We can usually find a place to park during daytime therefore we would be paying for something we can already do! If the scheme was for 24 hours a day it would be more acceptable to us. The scheme does not guarantee that we will be able to park near our home or find a parking space, we could find ourselves still looking for somewhere else to park and paying for it! This could also cause parking problems in other areas not covered by parking permits. It would appear to me that the Council benefit most from this money making scheme! I hope you will consider the points made seriously.

### **Objection 8**

I'm emailing to express my dismay at the proposed plans to further restrict parking in Park Road/Ufton Lane. As a resident of Roonagh Court, I can tell you that the school run parking here and in Gore Court Road/Bradley Drive, Lyndhurst Grove is already abysmally dangerous. To restrict the proposed roads even further will only add to the pressure on our residential streets, all of which have 3 primary schools within a close proximity. I urge you to think about the follow on effects these restrictions could have.

### **Objection 9**

Yet again I would like to make it clear that all residents of \*\*\* Park Road are not happy with the proposed parking scheme extension, unless the times are changed as its totally pointless otherwise. If the times are left the same it is clear it is nothing more than a money spin

### **Objection 10**

With regards to the parking permit extension proposal. We wish to confirm that we are totally opposed to this proposal, which offers only negatives to the residents and businesses within this road. We've lived here since 2006, and see no need for this scheme, other than being a revenue generator.

### **Objection 11**

I am a resident of Park Road and am writing to you to formally object to the planned parking permits to be put in place at the top end of Park Road. I for one, wouldn't be able to afford a permit for a start. Secondly I do not think this will help with the parking situation at all. I have access around Brambledown Farm Shop to the rear of my

*property and I fear all this would cause is congestion and dangerous parking around there for farm shop customers and vet customers. This is going to cause chaos and I am concerned for the safety of my children when walking around that area. We live at \*\*\* park road so right next to this access. Parking permits will cause more hassle and dangerous parking than ever before.*

### **Objection 12**

*I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permits in Park Road. All of my neighbours and I did a petition last time you were going to do this, saying that we didn't want this to happen! None of us want this as there isn't any problems parking along the top end!! We personally think that you are only doing this to get more revenue!!!! So we all absolutely oppose this little venture of yours*

### **Objection 13**

*I would like to lodge my concern and advise I am against the scheme. Living on Bradley Drive we already are subjected to traffic issues at school times with disrespectful parking and traffic jams. I've even had to instal a white bar to deter people from parking across my drive way. We are also subjected to cars parking here when the Appleyard have their football games on and events. Which then people leave litter in the street. Taking any parking away from these roads clearly leaves no where for people to park or go. The council offers no plan for this. Why on earth don't the council get a drop off zone at Minterne School is ridiculous and shows a real lack of wisdom in this council. The Appleyard also clearly needs to take more cars off the road and onto their grounds.*

### **Objection 14**

*I would like to register my objection to proposals to extend double yellow lines in Ufton Lane and introduce further parking permits in Park Road. I believe it will do no more than move parked cars and commercial vehicles to my road, Bradley Drive Sittingbourne. The road is already plagued with parked cars during peak periods especially school drop offs and collections. Please think again*

### **Objection 15**

*I am objecting to the Proposal for new double line joining the existing one from the top of Ufton Lane all the way to Homewood Ave and installing parking permits all along Park Road from Valenciennes to the top. 1)As the closest road we will undoubtedly see an increase in Parked vehicles in Lyndhurst Grove.*

*2)Almost 50% of people opposed the Scheme therefore some of the residents will refuse to purchase the permits and park here.*

*3)We will have the impact of the displaced vehicles whose owners exceed the amount of permits they can purchase, Pub Patrons, school parents and the visitors to the households who will need permits. The increased traffic could cause safety issues. Our own parking spaces in the Grove will be reduced, then where do you suggest we and our visitors should park?*

### **Objection 16**

*I am writing to object to the proposed charging of parking at the top end of Park Road like everybody else in the country it has been hard due to the epidemic so the council decides to put more hardship for a few more for what nothing we don't gain anything from this and nor has anybody who already pay for a permit*

### **Objection 17**

*As I have already Registered my Opposition to this parking scheme at the top end of Park Road, (email on the 5/2/2020) how many times do we need to say NO please do not do this as it is not Solving the problem just moving it on. I wonder if you have worked out how much money it will make you in Park Road alone? I am sure you have!!*

### **Objection 18**

*As a resident of Roonagh Court, I must object to the proposal to add new double yellow lines to Ufton Lane and additional parking permits for the south end of Park Road. We already have too many non-residents parking in*

*Roonagh Court, especially during the school runs, and this proposal will make it far worse. If it does go ahead, can you at least make parking in Roonagh Court for Roonagh Court residents only and/or mark it as a private road*

### **Objection 19**

*I'd like to express my disapproval of the proposed parking permits on park road unless the times are revised. If the timings aren't changed, then it just proves that it's a money maker, and not to actually help control the parking situation. If the times change to something far more reasonable then I will be fully in support.*

### **Objection 20**

*As a resident of Lyndhurst Grove, Sittingbourne, I strongly object to the new proposals for put double yellow lines from the top of Ufton Lane to the junction of Homewood Avenue along with the other local parking proposals in this vicinity as this will have a knock-on effect to Lyndhurst Grove.*

### **Objection 21**

*I OBJECT to the proposed extension to the residents parking scheme in Park Road. I live at the top end of Park Road. The only times when parking is difficult is the evenings eg after 4pm. The scheme will allow cars to park without a residents permit from 4pm onwards. This will mean there is no change in my ability to find a parking space in the evening so it is of no help to residents like me. It can be difficult to find a parking space in the evenings & it will continue to be difficult to find a parking space in the evenings. The only difference is if I had to buy a permit I would be paying £45 for the privilege. This proposal is a money making scheme which does not benefit us, the residents. I strongly OBJECT to the proposal of the extension of the parking permit scheme in Park Road.*

### **Objection 22**

*With reference to your public notice for parking and waiting restrictions for Park Road and Ufton Lane, please accept this correspondence as an official objection to the above order. Reasons:*

- 1. Three vehicle family limited to registering only two cars.*
- 2. Current parking restrictions for residents unfair, too costly for parking near your home.*
- 3. Not enough consideration/thought/space within parking bays for light commercial vehicles.*
- 4. This pushes resident's vehicles up Park Road or into surrounding roads.*
- 5. Unfair situation from my own experience attempting to find a parking space (non permit).*
- 6. Having to park third vehicle on Saturdays due to the parking restrictions nearest Gore Court Road on occasions Capel Road and further afield.*
- 7. Escalated problem for working at home or booked personal holidays.*
- 8. Experienced vandalism on a brand new car worth £32k (I might have heard the persons responsible for jumping on the roof if the vehicle was parked near my home).*
- 9. Stop developers buying houses in Park Road or surrounding roads so they can convert into flats.*
- 10. Re-assess the positioning of particular parking bays as these contribute to a dangerous road junction re- Homewood Avenue and Ufton Lane.*

### **Objection 23**

*Will make no easier for residents to park outside their property. Total waste of time and expense.*

### **Objection 24**

*I would like this to be taken as an objection to the scheme as I cannot see any way for us to be able to keep our vehicles in Park Rd. We would have to find alternative parking for one of our vehicles as we do not have a garage or any off-road parking available to us - this is the same for many in this part of the road. Any alternative place we*

choose to park would only be moving the problem from here to another road outside of the scheme. Allowing residents to purchase as many permits as the household needs would help reduce the need to find alternative parking and stop the problem creeping into other areas. Can you please tell me how many permits are available for each house? We have 3 cars, mine, my wife's and my son's, all are in regular use and although we would like to get rid of one they are essential to us. I do understand that parking in Park Road is difficult at all times, but the majority of problems are caused by those in the existing permit area parking their work vans and cars this end of the road to avoid permits. There is also the issue of those from other parts of town using this end of the road to avoid parking charges in town for both shopping trips and leaving cars here whilst at work. Does the council have any plans to make low cost - or better still no cost - daily parking available?

### **Objection 25**

I am writing to inform you of my objection to the proposed extension of the residents' parking scheme. Having spoken to neighbours at the top end of Park Road everybody is opposed to the extension and a full consultation should take place. The operating times of the scheme are ridiculous, they should be extended to 10 pm with only 1 hour waiting time, otherwise people can still park at 4pm for the whole evening without a permit! There doesn't appear to be a limit on the size of vehicle that can park in the scheme which will not stop the builders vans/flatbed lorries parking outside the pubs in the early evening. I myself work in London and am rarely home before 6pm, so this scheme will have no benefit to me. If anyone should be paying to park in Park Road it should be non-residents via parking metres

### **Objection 26**

I would like to lodge my objection and opposition to the new parking proposal for Ufton Lane and Park Road. With double yellow lines along Ufton Lane it will make parking very difficult and inconvenient, parking in a residence parking bay that we will have pay for is also reason for objection.

### **Objection 27**

I understand your latest proposals for restricting parking in and around the school area of Ufton Lane are about to be submitted to council for approval.

I would like, once again, to voice my concerns, not about your proposals themselves, which are understandable, but about your inability to look at the bigger picture and the inevitable knock on effect to surrounding areas and adjacent road, such as ours, Roonagh Court.

I have lived in Roonagh Court for over 40 years and until your recent proposals I have had not to previously object to your proposal to the parking restrictions in Park Road, which without doubt have subsequently impacted on the residents of our road. Since then, we have seen a significant increase in the number of Park Road residents, not prepared to pay for a parking permit (not our problem) that are now parking in our road. Our road is constantly double parked making it a danger for council services - our dustbin collection, and access to services such as Fire and Ambulance. Add to this the additional danger of the school run, twice daily when many parents park across our gates and garages, albeit but inconsiderate times of the day. Would they be happy if you cannot get to your drives or garages as a result.

You may well see the immediate Ufton Lane school run problem with this approach.

**BUT** - Your next urgent proposal, after this one, is surely now and always will be how can you solve the parking in Roonagh Court and surrounding area. You cannot keep driving the problem further and further out of area. Woodstock Road and Gore Court Road residents certainly won't tolerate parking outside their properties. So, as part of your solution, you need to find a proper longer term answer to this problem.

I have not, as yet touched on the safety aspects of your proposal, which I voiced concerns about in 2020.

Previously I made the point about your earlier proposal, that your proposals are likely to increase the road safety pressure on the area around the Oaks School, Bradley Drive and Roonagh Court. This area is already heavily



*congested at key school times, coupled with poor visibility when exiting Roonagh Court, which is used by parents dropping off/ collecting their children.*

*Parent attitude to parking around this junction consistently borders on the inconsiderate and adds significantly to the dangers of causing a serious accident. Extending the double yellow lines by a few feet, is really not the answer.*

*There is also a wider issue here. Despite previous representations, UK Paper continues to fail in its play. It continues to accept it has any responsibility for maintaining the level of its hedging and ivy growth, which is a major factor to the lack of visibility when exiting Roonagh Court.*

*By rough calculation the visibility point of traffic coming from Bell Road at 30mph barely gives them legal braking time and distance to avoid a collision with any exiting vehicle from Roonagh Court. I also have to say that some are in excess of this legal speed restriction, which significantly adds to the potential dangers. Perhaps either a Police speed monitoring program or, like other areas, a 20mph restriction needs to be implemented. The fact there are a number of vehicles parked outside the school entrance limits the driver's options to avoid a collision.*

*This is a difficult junction for any driver and requires a driver to assess traffic approaching from Bell Road/ Bradley Drive and Park Road before exiting. I have previously raised these concerns with our local councilor but this met with crashing silence, Why represent these people if concerns fall on deaf ears. Perhaps they don't want to hear something that is not in their agenda.*

*In summation, I would respectfully ask you to then address the issues that concern us as part of your overall parking strategy for this whole area. This started off as a proposal to address the Park Road parking problem and I am aware that our local councillor lives in this road. But why should surrounding areas suffer because Park Road residents want pay for a parking permit. Perhaps you should address the cost of permits as an alternative solution.*

*I totally accept a permit does not guarantee a parking space otherwise I would suggest it as an alternative solution for Roonagh Court.*

*If our local council actually listens to its residents genuine concerns, then if nothing more, I would also like some reassurance as part of your final decision, there is no undue lobbying to allow your local councillor to park outside his house at our expense.*

### **Objection 28**

*Once again, I have to respond with our objections to the latest proposal to extend controlled parking to the south end of Park Road and Ufton Lane.*

*As this is the fourth time the proposal has been raised and challenged since first mooted in 2009 (the others made in Aug 2019 and Jan 2020), this is clearly something that SBC doesn't appear to wish to let this go. Therefore, please register this as my new, reiterated and strong objection to this proposal.*

*The grounds, once again, are as follows:*

*1. It is unnecessary. There are demonstrably no issues with daytime (week day or weekend) parking in the top section of Park Road. (Any - minor - 'issues' 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. This was covered by the Sittingbourne KM, and I attended the council chamber vote on the matter.*

*Casual polling amongst all of our immediate neighbours in Q4 2019, early in 2020 and presently reveal few in favour of the scheme, for reasons stated.*

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 indeed still hard to overlook the idea, as raised again this time, that that its intention is less to keep residents happy than to generate revenue.

So, once again, please close this matter once and for all and cancel this and any future plans for this unwanted scheme.

Thank you. I look forward to your response.

### **Objection 29**

Once again I would like to object to the above scheme.

I live in the closest road to both schemes and the displaced vehicles caused by the schemes will be then parked where I live, taking up the few spaces we have available. These schemes do not solve issues, just move them and as such should be banned. During school time, the subsequent increased traffic in the neighbouring roads will undoubtedly be dangerous to the young children walking to school and crossing in between the parked cars. Not to mention deterring cars from parking at the top of Ufton Lane, will clear the road for cars to speed down it, particularly from the Gore Court Road junction, which will be very dangerous both to motorists and pedestrians who rarely glance back to check the road is clear when crossing. It would be negligent of the council to implement this scheme and after causing its first inevitable serious accident, it would need to be reversed.

### **Objection 30**

I wish to **object AGAIN** to the scheme proposed for Park Road and Ufton Lane. I can only assume that the constant surveys are an attempt by Cllr Clark to exhaust residents into submission. I would hope that all the previous opposing comments are being taken into account, given it is the same proposal.

### **Safety – Increased Risk of Accidents**

Despite being raised in the resident responses, the **safety of the young children** attending the three primary schools located nearby have been ignored in this decision. The displaced vehicles resulting from this scheme will add to the school traffic in the neighbouring roads. There has already been two near misses that the Headteacher has raised concerns over and therefore this will **just add risk of there being a serious accident**. The schools have no onsite parking; therefore, parents will inevitably have to abandon vehicles where they can. **Surely the safety of our children must take priority.**

The cars that park at the top of Ufton Lane, narrow the road and effectively slow the traffic. Without them, cars will speed around the corner from Gore Court Road. **This will be dangerous for children, motorists and pedestrians,** given most forget to look back down the road before crossing. Most properties in Ufton Lane have driveways, therefore parking is not an issue, it is simply a case that they are trying to reduce the cars parked in their road. In any case, Ufton Lane is only being included to support the Park Road scheme.

### **Displaced Vehicles Crowding Neighbouring Roads**

The proposal covers a huge area and those residents who oppose and exceed the number of vehicles allowed in the scheme will naturally park in the neighbouring roads. As the closest road and as the Engineers have already

highlighted, this will cause Lyndhurst Grove significant obstruction issues as it is such a small cul-de-sac. Cllr Clark's argument for proposing the scheme is to alleviate issues caused by displaced vehicles from other neighbouring schemes. This proves that **these schemes are ineffective, because they do not resolve parking issues, they simply move it**. If this is implemented, Lyndhurst Grove will then be overflowing, and then will another scheme be required? Where will it end?

### **Dwindling Support for the Scheme**

The Ufton Lane scheme is subject to the Park Road scheme proceeding. The Engineer's informal Park Road consultation had only a two-vote majority in support, however in the second consultation, **55% of residents opposed the scheme**. Support drastically dwindled further after it was explained to residents how permits work. **The most recent survey resulted in only one vote supporting the scheme and 16 opposing** (Engineer's totals missed one comment carrying two votes) out of 94 properties, (point 3.5 Swale JTB Agenda Item 7 March 2021). In the Borough Wide Parking Review, there was 100% opposition to the schemes. (All figures taken from Annex D). All of which questions why this scheme is proceeding, particularly when two JTB members used the democratic argument to overturn the Engineer's original recommendation to reject the scheme.

### **Alternative Solutions**

Park Road residents knew they were purchasing a property with only one parking space in front of their house therefore they have to take accountability; parking efficiently and renting spaces from the public house are possible solutions. Due to COVID, there are currently no commuters parking in the road (not that I ever seen any fellow commuters parking there whilst travelling myself!) Perhaps the council could review it's no parking signs in the wasteground and **if the neighbouring schemes are the cause of the problem, they need to be reviewed**. Perhaps the lower end of Park Road could use some of the many empty spaces in the underused neighbouring town car park, which would relieve some of the pressure further up. These are actual solutions that do not risk lives or negatively impact the local community.

### **Objection 31**

I am lodging a concern re yellow lines and parking permits in Park Road. We live in Roonagh Court and have nowhere else to park, if the yellow lines and parking permits go ahead it will create even more problems for us, we already have some houses in Park Road parking in our road, one small terraced house has three cars and a van parking in Roonagh Court pushing our residents out, these proposed parking restrictions will make our little road even more congested.

### **Objection 32**

With regards to the proposal to add more yellow lines from the top of Ufton Lane to Homewood Avenue and installing parking permits all along Park Road, we would strongly object to this happening! We live in Lyndhurst Grove and this would dramatically impact on us. We already have to contend with the vans of some customers of the Gore court pub parking huge vans on the entrance to the Grove and this would undoubtedly be made worse by this proposal as every customer that currently parks in Ufton lane would use the Grove to park in as it's so close! It's basically an accident waiting to happen as most of the customers after work seem to drive work vans and they park both sides of the entrance to the Grove as it is! Also the residents of park Road who refuse to buy permits or have more than 2 cars would again use the Grove as a car park which some already do when they can't park there and we barely have enough parking spaces for the residents of the Grove as it is. We already have to contend with parents of the Oaks school children just dumping their cars in the middle of the Grove at school time when they are in a hurry!! This proposal would basically turn the Grove into a massive carpark for Park Road residents and customers of the Gore Court Pub and when cars park both sides of the entrance you cannot see to get in it out and cannot use the path to walk on as it's blocked by cars. By agreeing to this proposal you are basically going to make the lives of every resident in Lyndhurst Grove an absolute misery and it would cause huge arguments with the people that would use the Grove as a car park and stop the actual residents of the Grove being able to park here

### **Objection 33**

*I have seen a copy of the parking proposals concerning the above roads. I am aware that in these circumstances NIMBY kicks in. I presume parking permits for now the whole of Park Road is a money making exercise. But it will push resident parking nearer the Infant school. I am not sure what the justification is for yellow lines down Ufton Lane. That too will impact on the schools. My worry is the safety of the children. Three primary schools in very close proximity are always going to create a traffic problem especially as the children come from a wide catchment area. I feel these proposals will just add to this. I live in Bradley Drive, so I see daily the school run problems. I am not complaining about this, parents have to park somewhere. But by squeezing the availability of parking you are worsening an already fraught situation.*

### **Objection 34**

*We object on the basis that this will result in increased, possibly unsafe, parking in Lyndhurst Grove creating congestion, inconvenience and possibly safety risk.*

### **Objection 35**

*Regarding your proposal to add double yellow lines from the top of Ufton lane all the way to Homewood Avenue and parking permits. I am strongly against this proposal, as a resident of Lyndhurst Grove, it is already a struggle to park outside my own house as people from Park Road, schools and people going to the pub already park outside. With this new proposal it'll bring in more people needing to park and as the closet road, it will undoubtedly make our parking issue worse. This will obviously cause more unneeded hassle and conflict as like I said, we already cannot park outside our one*

### **Objection 36**

*I am strongly against the proposal for double yellow lines from Ufton Lane to Homewood avenue. Also installing parking permits all along park road operating mon-sat. The impact to Lyndhurst grove where I live is bad enough with all the cars from the grove let alone residents from park road that dump there cars here because of the overcrowding. Where do you think people of Ufton lane and park road will park. With the proposed parking permits all along park road that will be limited to be purchased by residents so we will have pub patrons, more school parents and visitors to families to these households that will need parking, so the nearest small car park is Lyndhurst grove! We have 16 houses here and about 1-2 cars per household on average as most family members use cars for work where do you expect all these other cars to park and us residents? We have enough problems from the Oaks and minterne school and this is only an hour or so a day mon to fri in school term. So I strongly disagree to the proposals. I really hope you take our thoughts into consideration*

### **Objection 37**

*I wish to lodge my objection to the proposal to have parking permits from the top of Upton Lane to Homewood Ave and installing permits all along park road. This will have a massive impact in my road (Bradley Drive) and the surrounding Roads which are already very congested with the number of schools close by. Residents who refuse the permits will also park here as some already currently do. It will be complete mayhem as it is every morning and afternoon school times now but this will increase to 24 hours every day. I have people parking over my drive blocking access and many park on the pavement blocking the disabled access.*

### **Objection 38**

*I am writing to object to the proposed extension to the residents' parking scheme in Park Road and Ufton Lane. I live in one of the closest roads to the proposed area and I am concerned about the impact that it will have with increased parked vehicles in my road, especially around school dropping off and picking up times. Already cars are parking here for the school but with a lot of pedestrians crossing the road from the end of the footpath that comes past the cemetery to the Albany park and towards the town, an increase in traffic and parked cars could potentially cause a safety issue. Additionally, with the public house, the Gore Court Arms, now open again, there will be excess cars to the size of their car park which will again leave the patrons of the pub parking in nearby roads. There is already an issue with glass bottles and glasses being left in the immediate vicinity of the pub but this rubbish would be likely to*

*spread further afield if the customers are having to walk further to their vehicles. I hope that you will take my concerns into consideration when making a decision about this proposal.*

### **Objection 39**

*Referring to your letter dated 12 May 2021, we noted that the Council has agreed to extend the scheme contrary to objections made. There would seem therefore little to be gained by reiterating 'in-principle' objections to the scheme itself.*

*This decision having been taken, our concerns relating to the proposed Order itself are:*

- 1. The waiting time without a permit is too long (given 2 below) and should be reduced to 1 hour.*
- 2. As the extended scheme will be at the periphery of the original schemes and will represent a very large zone overall, we are very doubtful as to whether the Council will provide resources adequate enough to enforce the scheme. By making a charge to residents, it creates expectations as to an adequate system of enforcement. We suspect that a non-permit driver will stand a good chance in this location of extending their 2 hour allowance without adequate resourcing and patrolling by wardens.*
- 3. It seems likely that the Council will be petitioned in future by residents in West Ridge when non permit holders seek to park there for extended periods; such is the effect of these schemes.*
- 4. The Zone including Ufton Lane is far too large and should be sub-divided, otherwise cars, especially those that are not the main vehicle of the household, will potentially be left considerable distances away to the inconvenience of residents elsewhere.*

*We would be grateful if you would draw these matters to the attention of the Committee.*

### **Objection 40**

*We wish to comment on the proposed amendment to parking restrictions in Park Road and Ufton Lane, Sittingbourne, as we are very concerned about the potential negative impact on residents of Roonagh Court and other surrounding roads (Lyndhurst Grove and Bradley Drive in particular). We note the council's own advice to its members states: the extension of the Residents' Parking Scheme should minimise longer term parking in the area by non-residents and increase the likelihood of residents being able to park within a reasonable distance to their properties. This is a laudable aim. However: There is a risk that increasing the Scheme area will result in displacement of parked vehicles into adjoining roads which could have a negative effect on other residents. This is our concern. Roonagh Court is a narrow service road designed to allow vehicular access to the rear of 24 detached properties built 50 years ago and one Victorian cottage. It is not a full-width road and residents are forced to park on the pavements to leave an access lane down the middle. Two cars parked directly opposite each other on the carriageway would block the road. There are times when emergency vehicles would have extreme difficulty in gaining access due to an influx of parked cars that are nothing to do with the residents - such times include sporting and entertainment events at the adjacent sports ground and in the mornings and evening of school days when the road is used as a pick-up and drop-off zone by parents. This problem is exacerbated by staff from the Gore Court Road primary school site who park their cars every day at the entrance to the road which creates a dangerous hazard for drivers turning into the blind corner into Roonagh Court from the direction of Park Road. School traffic also parks directly opposite the entrance to Roonagh Court in Gore Court Road creating a further hazard for residents trying to leave the road at peak times. Roonagh Court is used as an access road for staff parking in the rear garden of the Park Road Fern Cottage veterinary practice, a use for which it was never intended, and also by Park Road residents whose gardens back on to Roonagh Court. Several Park Road residents already use Roonagh Court as their personal overnight parking area which has led to ill-feeling on the occasions when non-residents block access to driveways, garages or entrance gates. If you own a property here your only vehicular access and parking opportunity is at the rear of your house in Roonagh Court, No-one here has a front driveway. The Law of Unintended Consequences dictates that in solving one parking issue the council creates an identical issue for people living in the adjacent roads. We therefore object to the amendment.*

### **Objection 41**

*Please tell us you are not serious about parking proposals in Park Road/Ufton Lane!! This is already an accident waiting to happen with serious congestion already especially at school time drop offs. I know for a fact the teachers*

*and headmistress have already raised concerns over safety for young children. The parking in Lyndhurst Grove is already horrendous. Please think again for safety's sake. What is happening to Sittingbourne when residents have no say at all.*

### **1 COMMENT**

*Having no objections of extending the residents parking scheme along Park Road, my only concern is that the access road side of 181 will be more congested with parking of those who will refuse to pay for the permits, although there are signs along access road telling people not to park there at any time, people continue to do so, would there be a way to enforce people not to park there when the scheme comes into effect.*