

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Attlee Way, Sittingbourne

1 Formal Objection & 4 Indications of Support

First Objection (TRO Objection 1)

I would like to object to this decision.

*My property is * Satis Avenue *** number 1, 3, 5 and 7 all have shared access driveways as stated on our title deeds on which we cannot park all of our vehicles on as we would block the access way. Therefore our only option is to park out the front of our property (which is then on Attlee way) because If we park on the road along Satis Avenue we would then make it difficult for residents to get onto driveways and round the bends on our road.*

Also, any visitors to our property also use the main road to park on when visiting.

As stated in the letter “following concerns from some residents that parked vehicles are obstructing the safe movement of vehicles and junction sight lines” - yet there has been no accidents on this road or from the junction since I have lived here the past 3 years. Especially given the speed that some drivers go up and down Attlee way.

*Our vehicles are parked on Satis Avenue outside our property which is number * Satis, we have never parked close to the junction for it to obstruct any drivers. As my partner is a civil engineer and works on the roads he knows what is a safe distance from the junction for people to see etc.*

If these yellow lines were to go ahead it would make it incredibly difficult for home owners and visitors to find somewhere to park along this road, especially given that KCC workers who visit the building at the bottom of Attlee Way and care home staff use Attlee Way during the day for their house visits which will limit our parking.

I find it very surprising that the yellow lines do not go more into Satis Avenue - more outside number 2 Satis Avenue as when people park outside this property we cannot get onto our driveway because of the turn we need to make, yet nothing has been done about this despite several complaints previously and this is the same for the entrance to our driveway on our side of the road.

If anything it would be more use for resident parking bays along Attlee way especially for us residents at 1,3,5,7 who have a shared access driveway and limited parking so we would still have somewhere to park if yellow lines were introduced.

First Indication of Support (TRO Support 1)

I am writing regarding an incident that occurred last week that could have potentially resulted in a serious road traffic accident.

I was walking my dog along Atlee Way last Friday evening at about 6pm. A woman was stationary in her car at the junction of Satis Avenue and Atlee Way. She pulled out, turning right towards Foxgrove. She was forced to suddenly stop as there was another vehicle coming down Atlee Way towards her. The other vehicle had pulled out of Foxgrove, and although not travelling excessively fast, was accelerating and both vehicles were forced to brake suddenly to avoid a collision. The lady in the car claimed she had not seen the man in the other vehicle because the line of sight was obscured by a white van and several other cars including an earth mover on a low loader vehicle, which were parked in Atlee Way on the approach to the junction with Satis Avenue.

I have lived in the area, in both Satis Avenue and now Foxgrove for about 30 years, and despite the traffic calming measures, the speed with which traffic travels along Atlee Way is horrendous. I have recently seen and heard other similar near misses due to the parking on Atlee Way. These parked vehicles prevent clear line of sight of oncoming traffic, and given the speed at which traffic often travels, a serious accident is very likely to happen.

*I do not know the occupants of number * and * Satis Avenue, who I believe are the owners of these vehicles, but I do know they have ample parking space on the driveway in front of their house, therefore do not need to park some or all of these vehicles on the main road.*

When these vehicles are parked in Atlee Way, traffic travelling in the direction from Foxgrove towards North Street is forced to go onto the other side of the road, into the path of oncoming traffic. It only needs one of these oncoming vehicles to be speeding, which they frequently are, and there will be a serious head on collision.

If direct action cannot be taken to remove these vehicles then I believe the council has a duty to local residents to put double yellow lines here, which would force the owners to find somewhere safer to park.

Second Indication of Support (and Request to Extend Proposals) (TRO Support 2)

We would like double yellow lines extended pass no1 [Satis Avenue], no18, no20 [Foxgrove] on Attlee way.

When the works van and digger are parked out on the main road at No., he is blocking the view from on coming traffic from North street, which makes it a blind spot. And waiting for a accident to happen.*

He does have his own drive way to park his van

We also sent in a petition of about 50 people wanting the double yellow lines.

We would be grateful if you would consider our request favourably and await your decision on this matter as soon as possible.

Third Indication of Support (TRO Support 3)

I am aware that double yellow lines are being considered for Attlee Way in Sittingbourne, and therefore felt it important to stress my views as a resident of this area for 33 years, whose property backs on to Attlee way. Over the years the traffic on this road has become both heavier and faster and with parking also becoming more regular at certain points it now, in my view, has become quite dangerous. This is primarily on the slight bend in the road as you head down from Foxgrove towards North Street. Some days there can be numerous cars and several commercial vehicles with trailers parked, meaning that two way traffic cannot pass and it relies on vehicles giving way to one another. Unfortunately with visibility being hindered due to the slight bend and the drivers speed and often attitude, this results in cars breaking suddenly, which I can often hear from my property.

It is because I fear there will be a collision sometime soon, that I would like to give my support to double yellow lines on this road.

Fourth Indication of Support (TRO Support 6)

A neighbour has mentioned that Swale Council have at last decided to place Yellow lines around the corner of Satis Avenue and Attlee Way, Sittingbourne. Thank-you for this, as I have had a few near misses with cars coming down Attlee way quite fast and then over taking parked vehicles and forcing me to brake hard in my works van to avoid collision.

However, the plan I have been shown still allows the vehicles to park close to the corner of Satis Avenue. All the lines that are planned, all stop exactly where all the parked vehicles park. Therefore changing nothing.

Would it be possible to have the Double Yellow lines extended to the entrance of Foxgrove. Its only another 90 ft (approximately) but would help with the traffic and reduce the chance of an accident. I have spoken to the ladies that live in the properties where lines would be placed and they have welcomed the extension to the lines.

Apparently, a number of residents have also said that it would help.

The traffic calming area just below Satis Avenue reduces the speed and therefore works as planned. But its the stretch of road between Foxgrove and Satis Avenue (Foxgrove side of Attlee Way) that is causing the problems.

It also doesn't help that works vehicles are parked there at the weekends and evenings, making the road narrower for vehicles to pass.

I hope that you can see this is in the best interest of the neighbourhood and local residents..... for the sake of another 15 minutes worktime and a tin of paint.

Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines – Dark Hill, Faversham

2 Indications of Support

First Indication of Support & Request to Extend (TRO Support 4)

Further to your letter of 26th May (Ref H4.1/TRO AM 24) I write to express agreement to the proposed extension to existing lining.

Also, I propose the extension is made slightly longer than shown on the chart that accompanied your letter. Monks Alley is a busy pedestrian route. There is a high footfall crossing West Street at that point and a dropped kerb has been provided, presumably with that heavy pedestrian traffic in mind. Cars parked immediately by the alley (which would still happen under the current plan) block pedestrian sight-lines and desire-lines and make crossing the road more hazardous than would otherwise be the case.

A small further extension of, say, three (3) metres in addition to that proposed would aid pedestrians while retaining desirable on-street parking for some 3/4 cars between Monks Alley and Stonebridge Way. A chart indicating the point is attached

Second Indication of Support & Request to Extend (TRO Support 5)

*Further to your letter of 26 May (Ref H4.1/TRO AM 24), I'd like to thank you for opening the formal consultation about extending the yellow lines further **, as requested by ourselves in our previous correspondence.*

*As proposed by our neighbour, *****, a small further extension across the foot of Monks Alley would be desirable from our perspective, in terms of sight-lines when entering and exiting our drive, and pedestrians frequently use this spot to cross the road.*

From my husband and my perspective, we continue to be quite happy for the Royal Mail and other delivery companies to use the layby area outside our fence when delivering to houses in our vicinity.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Clarence Row, Sheerness

3 Formal Objections

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 2)

*I would like to object to the planned proposal to extend double yellow lines across property's 1-7 Clarence Row. My reason for objections are as follows, I personally am a elderly disabled motor vehicle driver and use the parking every single day, I live in ***** and have done for over 50 years and I have parked my vehicle in Clarence Row for that time and there has always been an acceptance as there is double yellow lines all around my property.*

There are a very limited amount of safe car parking in this area and There isn't a system in which local property owners like myself can benefit from in any way shape or form. In some cases similar to this there is a permit system awarded or a designated disability system.

I would also like to put to you that the tenants in Clarence Row also don't own there property and while I am understanding to there current plight I do not agree that home owners like myself are going to be penalised in the long term as the tenants will probably move on.

In summary I would like to object on these grounds and as this property has been in my family for over 100 years I feel that if I didn't voice my opinion then I wouldn't be doing how I feel. I am very open to a discussion on the matter and would strongly suggest that you give the home owners a chance in either a permit system or a disabled system.

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 8)

My first comment is that I was not aware of an informal consultation having taken place. My knowledge of the above proposal came by word of mouth from irate neighbours in Beach Street horrified at the proposal.

Here I must state that as a resident in Clarence Row for 27 years I strongly object to the proposed yellow lines.

I have not been informally consulted but initiated conversations with a Councillor, and 2 Council staff. Upon stating my objections, I was told that they would not be upholding the application and it was very unlikely to happen.

I am surprised that only 1 objection was recorded because I know that many phone calls and at least one letter of objection were put forward by residents of Beach Street who will be severely affected should this proposal be enacted.

Before I list my objections, made on behalf of myself and the wider element of this small community of Clarence Row, Beach Street and Beach Terrace, I believe you should be made aware that as I write the road outside * Clarence Row is illegally blocked by a cone, as it permanently is. For a year now, new residents (tenants) have been acting illegally and initially blocking the entire Row with a line of dustbins with written notices on stating it was private property. It is not. This was followed by illegal blocking of the road by dustbins left in the road outside the individual houses, Council and police intervention has been ignored and it is only recently that dustbins have been removed.

I list my and others objections below :

Parking in the area is severely limited already. Residents in Beach Street and Beach Terrace have double yellow lines and their only option is to park either in Clarence Row or in the part of Beach Street leading to the beach which has single yellow lines and prohibited parking for a large part of the year. The only other option being to park in the Beach Street Car Park, costly, risking vandalism to their cars and dangerous to have to walk unlit areas to get home.

How do disabled residents cope with this.

With no possibility of disabled bays in Beach Street this can be seen as disability discrimination should this proposal go ahead.

The parking problem would also apply to visitors to homes in Clarence Row. I strongly objection to my granddaughter having to shepherd her very children to my home in such dangerous

Once the disabled community become aware of double yellow lines in Clarence Row they will most definately be parking here. It is very convenient for this end of the High Street. The tenants in question will not have achieved their aims.

The residents making these demands are tenants mostly of recent occupancy. I am very aware of the itinerate nature of these tenancies, What happens if future tenants have cars? presumably the properties become less viable re lack of parking.

Whilst being aware of concerns from the applicants over emergency services, during my years here I have seen many ambulances service the Row with no problem likewise the few times the fire brigade has been called.

Concerns over the pavement being blocked by cars parking with wheels on the pavement is an annoying issue but one that should be dealt with as illegal parking. As a disabled person I have negotiated the pavement visiting many properties in the row over the years, with the only problem being the dustbins left permanently on the pavement. I

have also witnessed many, many families being able to negotiate pushchairs and children out of and into Clarence Row houses safely.

If we choose to live in a holiday area surely we should expect parking problems, we own no part of the road.

I believe I am the only car owner in Clarence Row and park off road, however when there are no parking spaces, because of a dropped kerb I am frequently blocked from exiting or entering my home and have to contact the police to get the car removed. This problem will escalate sharply should the proposal go ahead.

Whilst appreciating the complaints of a very small number of tenants has caused the Council considerable headaches, the interests of the wider community need to be enacted and not by informal consultation.

Apologies for this lengthy email but this is a matter of major concern for the community and not for just 3 careless residents in the Row.

Third Formal Objection (TRO Objection 9)

I am writing to object to lines, it is very difficult for those that live here to park here.

1. There are bollards near No.1 Clarence Row which stop you parking further up the road (not shown on map on back of letter).
2. No.* Clarence Row have cones in the road to stop anyone parking outside house so she can understandably get her child out.
3. Visitors to the beach and green also use this road so they don't have to pay parking. I often see people get out to walk their dogs or take family to the beach or sand pit.
4. The local workers also use to park I have seen delivery drivers from nearby restaurants using this road to the detriment of the residents.
5. Those in Beach Street also park here.

I would be in favour if the occupiers of these 7 houses were given/road made residential parking only.

Proposed Removal of Single Yellow Line – St Catherine's Drive, Faversham

5 Formal Objections

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 3)

I am writing regarding the proposed changes to the yellow line opposite our house at No ** St Catherine's Drive. Though I understand the reason for removing this line for the benefit of residents at the southern end of the road I am concerned that this space will soon be known by commuters who could well begin to use this space not wanting to pay for parking charges at the railway station car park. It is hard enough getting in and out of our drive with the present occupants of this space. It doesn't need to be exacerbated by inviting others to park there as well.

I would therefore ask that the yellow line remain.

Thank you for understanding.

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 4)

I oppose the proposed removal of the yellow road marking as it will encourage free parking by commuters to London.

Third Formal Objection (TRO Objection 5)

Firstly I must express my surprise at being able to comment on the proposed work in St Catherine's Drive as I received an e-mail dated 9th June from Counsellor Eddie Thomas implying that this work had already been approved and stating that the work was due to start imminently. However, the purpose of this letter is to state that my wife and I strongly object to the proposed removal of a section/ of yellow line on the following grounds:-

- 1) The current arrangements have worked perfectly for many years to keep St Catherine's Drive free of commuters and longer term rail absentees using the street as a free station car park. (my own pre-covid business travel indicates an early Monday morning to late Friday evening absence is not unusual)*
- 2) On a normal working week day the only vehicle using the proposed line free is a white van which has usually departed by 9 am. I have been led to understand, but cannot confirm, that the van belongs to the applicant*
- 3) Under these circumstances line free zone will act as a magnet for commuters and longer term rail travellers. With the first London train departing at 04:58 this will at best be an all day irritant and in the dark winter months a safety hazard.*

Fourth Formal Objection (TRO Objection 6)

The current simple Traffic Regulation Order has been in use for many years and applied to all citizens including residents of this road. This order restricts waiting between 10am and 11am each day from Monday to Friday. This restriction prevents the highway being used for long stay parking by commuters and others, some of whom would not come back for a week or more.

In speaking to the other residents of this road, the consensus of opinion is undoubtedly to the effect that our present order should stay, exactly as it is. Indeed, one or two of them through that the proposer, especially if it were a newcomer, had got a mighty cheek! A resident living at the north end, near the Church, even wondered if that person, in due course, might want the whole order expunged!

*I do not know who the proposer is but suspect that it is the man who, **** months ago, took up occupancy of No. **. [sensitive information revoked to reserve anonymity].*

He appears to be the keeper of two vehicles [sensitive information revoked to reserve anonymity] when not in use are kept on the highway. It is therefore an offence for a keeper to use the highway for this purpose – unnecessary obstruction as per the Road Vehicles (construction and use) Regulations and as verified by the Case Stated from Lord Justice Goddard in the 1960's. He stated that this is unreasonable use of the Queens Highway by a keeper.

*I have spoken to Cllr ****, who was of little help as he was unable to recall the name of the person who requested the removal of the line between 2-8.*

For myself, I do NOT want the line to be removed. I DO want the current Traffic Order to remain.

Fifth Formal Objection (TRO Objection 7)

I would like to make the following comments about the amendment:

- 1. Narrowness of the road makes it difficult for reversing in or out of driveways, with particular reference to nos 13 and 15. The current amendments in Dark Hill are an example of extending restrictions for this difficulty, rather than reducing them. (I have known of 3 collisions due to this difficulty with other driveways in St Catherines.)*
- 2. The shared driveway between nos 8 and 10 as used by nos 2-20 and maybe others, is quite busy and needs clear sight-lines. It is used also by reversing delivery vehicles and has included Refuse Collection vehicles, though some drivers find it necessary to reverse down the major length of St Catherines.*
- 3. The properties from 2 upwards do have access to other off-street parking, albeit to the rear of the properties, as was appropriate when built.*