

(1) Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Dolphin Road, Sittingbourne

1 Formal Objection & Comment

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 1)

I have just received your letter with the proposed plans for double yellow lines to be added to the north side of dolphin road.

I am a resident of Dolphin Road, and while I am in support of this proposal of adding yellow lines I would ask that the area of the road covered could be amended to stop at the opening of the parking/garages and not continue outside numbers 1-4 Dolphin Road.

It would cause great difficulty to the residents of Dolphin Road if we lost the ability to park outside our houses as everyone here owns two vehicles and the side parking only gives us enough space for one car each. This would also make it difficult for any people coming to visit to park near our houses. The area outside our houses is currently used 24/7 by the residents and from talking to my neighbour he would also be against double yellows outside the properties.

The cars that are currently parked further down the road are definitely a safety risk as it blocks visibility getting out of the side parking and also causes unnecessary traffic on the road so I am in support of that.

(2) Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines – Canute Road, Faversham

3 Formal Objections & 2 Indications of Support

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 2)

I don't support the extension of double yellow lines on Canute Road.

*As a resident on the street (** Canute Road) this will reduce our parking options especially when commuter numbers increase again as the road is used a lot by people catching trains to London for work as they can park freely.*

I would however like to see parking permits brought into the street.

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 3)

I would like to object to the Proposed Extension to the Double Yellow Lines either side of Harold Court. Over the years that the junction has been there it has never been problem so why has it become one now the number of cars that come in or out of the junction is very small. Also by extending the Double Yellow lines you would be taking away two parking spaces. Plus visitors to Harold Court have to park in Canute Road as parking is limited in Harold Court.

Third Formal Objection (TRO Objection 4)

In response to the consultation in respect of the captioned Amendment I should like to oppose the proposed change.

Extending the double yellow lines at the entrance to Harold Court will reduce the available parking by at least two and possibly three spaces: spaces which are frequently at a premium particularly in recent years as there are more families with two cars in this street. This proposal would exacerbate the existing problem.

I have gone into Harold Court at various times on various days in order to evaluate the exit into Canute Road. I have found that exiting to the south towards the London Road and to the north towards Athelstan Road with normal caution is not difficult and no more difficult than exiting Ethelbert Road to the south or north. Visibility is not seriously affected by parked vehicles except occasionally when there may be a large van in the immediate parking space.

I believe that more practical benefit would come from the current investment in an improved road surface, but throughout the whole length and width of Canute Road, complete with smooth traffic calming humps similar to those

in Whitstable Road, Faversham, which slow traffic down without causing danger, while controlling those who tend to use Canute Road as a rat run, often at excessive speed. A complete resurfacing would be much more effective and would last longer than the current policy of repairing pothole by pothole. Currently, there are numerous potholes of various dimensions in Canute Road, and quite large stones are thrown out as cars drive through them, causing damage to parked vehicles and potentially injuring pedestrians waiting to cross the road.

I do not believe that the extension of the double yellow lines would materially improve the situation for our neighbours in Harold Court, while it would reduce the amenity by losing parking spaces both for them and for those who live in Canute Road.

First Indication of Support (TRO Support 2)

I wish to add my support for the changes proposed for Canute Rd. we have restricted view on leaving Harold Court which is made worse by van parking near the junction. The proposed extension of double yellow lines should improve the situation. I have lived in Harold Court for over 22 years and it has steadily got more .

Second Indication of Support (TRO Support 3)

I have not been able to locate the above TRO on the swale.gov.uk. website but my wife and I both support the new proposal.

We live in Harold Court and very often it is nerve racking trying to pull out into Canute Road because of the vehicles parked so close to the junction.

Many of the vehicles parked are not owned by residents, some are commuter travellers as this road is the nearest to the station and permit free. Also the school run is a nightmare as yellow lines are just ignored and parking is dangerous at this time.

(3) Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Queens Road/Imperial Avenue, Minster-on-Sea

4 Formal Objections & 1 Indication of Support

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 5)

I am writing to object to the above

*If this proposal goes through it will cause more parking issues along Queens Rd and you'll then get cars/vans parking down and close to the junction on Imperial Ave so I don't agree. Could you please inform the residents of imperial Ave of this as all this is obviously their doing. Why is it necessary? Is it because they clearly cannot manoeuvre or judge pulling out of the junction? If this is the case do you not think it's time to hang up them keys and consider public transport. I live at ** Queens Rd and have for 15 years and I'm very sure it's not the parking that's a concern it's the speed in which cars travel along Queens Rd that's the issue. Get the speed cameras up there, make it a 20 mph zone but don't take away our parking. I work in and around Kent and come across some very challenging roads and junctions in residential areas far worse than at the end of Imperial Ave Minster. I've currently been working all through lockdown working in 7 to 8 properties a day doing essential work ***** risking my health my family's health so I have enough stress to deal with and I get this letter on my doorstep telling me that I may have trouble finding a parking space for my van near my house, well I tell you now if I do have trouble it will be parked down Imperial so please inform the complaining residents of this.*

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 6)

With reference to your letter dated 25th April 2021, Requesting me to give my opinion regarding the proposed double yellow lines Queens Road/imperial Avenue

Please note my objections as I see no reason for these lines to be inserted into our Road

Third Formal Objection (TRO Objection 7)

I would like to register my objection to the propose yellow line.

I have lived at the above adress for nearly 30 years and there has not been a problem with vehicles exiting imperial Ave to Queens road.

Ther has only been one accident years ago, which was caused by a speeding car a long Queens road.

The proposed yellow line will cause more of a parking problems, forcing vehicles to park down the entrance of Imperial Ave which is an unmade road which has a narrow entrance, and you don` t plan puting yellow lines in Imperial Ave. your yellow lines will force vehicles to park on Queens road opposite Imperial Ave, which some do already,(people who work at the coop shop) this makes traffic, have to pass on the wrong side of the road. so a good suggestion would be leave it as it is.

i would consider this a waste of council tax money, which would be best spent on stopping speeding traffic down Queens road by people that don` t live here.

if yellow line`s need to be done any where, it`s at the junction of Baldwin Road and Chapel Street, this is more of a major junction and if you live near here, you would now it can be a nightmare to exit, specially when the school run is on, there are always park cars parked on Chaple street right up to Baldwin road.

I would like to add that if the propose yellow lines are done at Imperial Ave/Queens road, and not Baldwin road/Chapel Street, i would be complaining and want to know why.

Fourth Formal Objection (TRO Objection 8)

In response to the consultation re the proposed double yellow lines, I do not believe that the said yellow lines will solve any issues. It is the speed of the traffic along Queens Rd which is the problem, my son lives on Queens Rd & driving off his drive with good sight from both directions is hampered due to vehicles going too fast.

It is my belief that speed restrictions would be of more benefit & provide a more effective outcome. I think this would be a better long term solution, & if the said yellow lines do not solve any issues, putting these down would be a waste of money.

At these times when we should be looking also at environmental issues, reducing speed would aid this too.

I am sure, in the councils wisdom, they will take into account long term efficacy of any proposed alterations, taking into consideration the opinions of the public, after all it is our money that you will be spending & our immediate locality which will be effected!

First Indication of Support (TRO Support 4)

I am writing to express my support for this proposal to go ahead.

In my opinion, and from observations of cars pulling out from Imperial Avenue on to Queens Road, the parking of cars on Queens Road either side of this junction does cause a significant risk of accident and potential injury. I know of at

least one accident that has occurred because of this and there have been a number of near-misses previously observed. It also doesn't help that cars using Queens Road do often exceed the speed limit.

When pulling out from Imperial Road it is impossible to see traffic coming from either side, especially when vans are parked on Queens Road, which they frequently are.

I do believe that this proposed change is important to ensure there are no accidents in the future and again I offer my support for this proposal.

(4) Proposed Reduction of Double Yellow Lines – St Georges Avenue, Sheerness

2 Formal Objections & 1 Indication of Support

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 9)

Please note my objection to the proposal of the removal of double yellow lines -

(1) On the south-eastern side (a) from the Junction with High Street to a point in line with the south-western building line of 26 St Georges Avenue; (b) from a point in line with the boundary of 32/34 St Georges Avenue to a point in line with the boundary of 40/42 St Georges Avenue.

My main objection relates to the start point of the removal (building line of 26 St Georges Avenue), could it not be moved to the building line of no.28.

The plan on the reverse of the notice does not take into account that no.29 has land next to the house that is used for off road parking. It can be difficult enough to get onto the road when the traffic is queuing from the High Street, but if vehicles are parked directly opposite it will be even more so.

I have attached two photos that I have taken from either side of the parking land, it is 16foot wide and is next to the driveway of no.21 next door.

LOOKING FROM THE LEFT HAND SIDE OF THE DRIVEWAY ACROSS TO NO.26



LOOKING FROM THE RIGHT HAND SIDE OF THE DRIVEWAY ACROSS TO NO.28



*While I appreciate it will (hopefully) slow down the traffic along St Georges Avenue, which will prevent the vibration we feel in our house from Lorries, also when we have heavy rain it ponds outside no. ** (and across outside no.**), as there aren't any gully drains, the traffic drives through this and splashes this onto the front of the house.*

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 10)

I am writing in response to the letter I received on 25.08.21 about the proposed removal of the double yellow lines down my road St Georges Avenue. I have been a resident there for 12 years and I strongly object to the proposed plan to remove the yellow lines as I feel it will cause unnecessary traffic congestion on an already busy road which was proved a few years ago when the yellow lines were removed for some resurfacing work, cars were parked outside which narrowed the road and made it more dangerous as some people come down the road at speed. So I hope this is taken into consideration on the outcome of the decision that is made.

First Indication of Support (TRO Support 1)

Today, I received notification of the proposed removal of double yellow lines down St George's Avenue.

I wholeheartedly support this consultation for the following reasons:

- *It will act as a traffic calming measure for cars speeding down the road - daily!*
- *It will enable residents to park safely and near to their property (me included).*
- *Illegal parking will be reduced.*
- *Granville Road will be less congested due to residents of St George's Avenue parking there (me included).*

(5) Proposed Formalising of Disabled Persons' Parking Bay – 27 Colegates Close, Oare

2 Formal Objections

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 11)

Why are you moving the disabled parking space? I am a driver and disabled. I don't understand why one person is getting her way, the space is not needed. The parking is sparse as it is, you are going to make it a lot worse than it already is. Other disabled drivers and other residents will be badly affected. I don't know why it's needed. If the person concerned backed up in the right place everyone could park but no, she parked across the only footpath and blocked that.

And why did you make it longer and put it across the only footpath we have? If you move it it will be awful for the rest of us. Why has she got it anyway, she carries her own shopping and compost and lots of heavy things and her son is living there. Why is she more important than the rest of us? Very upset resident.

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 12)

I am writing to object to the proposed new disabled parking space in Colegates Close. Currently the disabled space is being used with no problem. The car is always parked right at the end of the space which has already been extended. Another vehicle which I believe belongs to her son parks in front of the car. There are very few spaces for all of the residents to park already, and moving this spot will make things more difficult for everyone else, while not actually making any difference for the person it is intended for.

I personally believe the disabled bay which is already there is absolutely fine. The car could park a lot further back but doesn't through choice. This can be seen by the build up of dirt in the road where it's not being used as it should be.

I can't stress enough the worry I feel about the problems this will cause for the other residents parking.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Queens Road/Princes Avenue, Minster-on-Sea

1 Formal Comment

*I have resided at ** Queens Road since August 2012 and welcome this opportunity to comment on the worsening situation on Queens Road on the following points;*

- 1. Increase in anti-social behaviour, verbal abuse and road rage incidents since the removal of street cameras which did have a deterrent purpose.*
- 2. Non compliance with existing road markings in front of the co-op foodstore and Vicarage Road and properties 6-14 on Queens Road.*
- 3. Speeding traffic the whole length of Queens Road.*

The overall picture is an obvious one, it is that the co-op needs a dedicated car parking facility to accommodate it's growing number of customers. This can only be achieved by relocation to a new site or the unlikely purchase and demolition of properties from 6-14 on Queens Road for that purpose. Otherwise, I can only comment that the proposal for double yellow lines may or may not improve the current situation and then only if accompanied by speed restrictions.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Queens Road/Kings Road, Minster-on-Sea

1 Formal Comment

Regarding the referenced application for proposed double yellow lines.

Firstly I am pleased to see this being actioned, however since the initial consultation this matter has deteriorated.

Would it be possible to include additional yellow lines on the other side of the street, namely covering 7, 9 and 11 Queens Road. These properties have dropped kerb access, which they utilise however consistently also parking on the road and adjusting off road parking as required. Somewhere near we also have KENT MOVERS that use the current spaces to be marked ie 1 and 2 Kings Rd. If these spaces are denied, I feel it will only be time before they use Kings unadopted road to park up in front of both 1 and 2 Kings which will further hinder access/line of sight for traffic using this junction. Thank you for considering the above points and providing any clarification on a successful resolution.