

Proposed Formalising or Removal of Disabled Persons' Parking Bays

Summary of Formal Objections and SBC Responses

Formal Objections

Objection 1 – Bay Outside 8 Bredhurst Close, Sheerness

“The only objection I have is the bay isn't situated as to where your consultation states. It is the frontage full frontage of number 6.

The road which has been damaged by people conversing the highway into the field.”

Response: Bay has been removed from this Traffic Regulation Order and will be included in a future Order with the revised location description as “Across the frontage of 6 Bredhurst Close, Sheerness”.

Objection 2 – Bay Outside 42 Hythe Road, Sittingbourne

“I wish to contest the formalisation of the disabled bay that is located on hythe road outside number 42 as currently it is a public bay and it is also used by myself as I hold a valid blue badge and also have difficulty walking long distances as I live **** at number **. Another solution to this issue would be to have an additional bay put in opposite or make the existing one a double bay.”

Response: Officers explained that the disabled bay would still be available for use by any blue badge holder, and following this the objection was withdrawn (as detailed below)

“I would like to withdraw my previous email in regards to hythe road (42). Would it be possible to get it in writing that the disabled bays are for any blue badge holder to use. Thank you for all your help”

Objection 3 – Bay Outside 8 Barrow Grove, Sittingbourne (Proposed Bay Removal)

Confirmation was received that the disabled persons' parking bay outside 8 Barrow Grove, Sittingbourne, was still in use and as such the proposed removal of the bay has been deleted from the Traffic Order.

Response: Proposed removal of bay has now been deleted from Traffic Regulation Order.

Objection 4 – Bay Outside 14 South Avenue, Sittingbourne

“I am writing to voice my strong objection to the plan of installing an extra disabled bay outside 14 South Ave, Sittingbourne. I think that this plan is unwarranted, unjust and harmful to the local residents who already face a shortage of parking spaces in the area.

You may already know that there is an existing disabled bay outside 12 South Ave, which is very near to 14 South Ave. This bay is hardly used by the resident of ** South Ave and who doesn't have a permanent vehicle parked there. Therefore, it is illogical to create another disabled bay outside 14 South Ave, which would effectively take away two parking spaces from the rest of the street.

Therefore, I urge you to rethink the plan and to look for alternative solutions that would not negatively affect the parking situation for the local residents. For example, you could propose that the residents of 12 and 14 South Ave share the existing disabled bay. This means that the residents have to depend on the scarce on-street parking, which is often inadequate to meet the demand, especially during peak hours and weekends.

Additionally, I would like to point out that the residents of East Street, where I live, also use parking in South Ave, as there are double yellow lines. They also tend to use Gaze Hill, but off-street parking is also extremely limited there, as there are dropped kerbs. Chiltern Ave and Orchard Place. Again all extremely limited parking options. This means that the plan of adding another disabled bay in South Ave would also affect the residents of East Street, Gaze Hill, Orchard Place and Chiltern Ave who would have to compete for even fewer parking spaces.

Furthermore, I would like to suggest that the area outside of number 12 and 14 South Ave could be better utilised to accommodate more parking spaces. The walkway / pavement is oversized for its purpose and could be redesigned to make more efficient use of the space. This would not only increase the parking capacity, but also improve the appearance and safety of the street.

Moreover, I would like to ask if the council has taken into account the proposed impact of visitor parking once the Wheatsheaf Pub development has been redeveloped into flats, shops or community centre. I assume that the Wheatsheaf Pub in our area is also undergoing a similar transformation, which would likely attract more visitors and increase the demand for parking. What is the council doing to ensure that the local residents who are struggling to park their cars are not further disadvantaged by this development?

Finally, I would like to inquire about the council's parking strategy for our local area, taking into consideration that there are areas that are not properly utilised. According to the Green Grid Strategy and the Open Spaces and Play Area Strategy adopted by the council, the public realm should be designed to maximise the potential multi-functional benefits of green spaces and open spaces, and to enhance the quality of life and wellbeing of the residents. How is the council planning to improve the public realm and make it more compatible with the parking needs and preferences of the local community?

If the plan does go ahead, I would like to know what actions the council is taking to mitigate the impact of the loss of parking spaces for the local families who do not have driveways or garages to park their cars on. How will you ensure that the parking enforcement is fair and consistent, and that the disabled bays are not misused by non-disabled drivers? Or that resident's will have to park further away from their homes?

I hope that you will take my objections into account and that you will consult with the local community before making a final decision. I look forward to hearing from you soon."

Response

Many thanks for your email. Just to clarify, there is no intention of installing another disabled bay at this location. It is our intention to formalise the existing bay. This means the bay is currently advisory but we are proposing to make it enforceable backed by a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The only difference on site would be a sign sited in the footway once the TRO has gone through and not another bay. Do you still object to the formalisation of this bay or would you like the objection retracted?

"I am correct by stating that there will be 2 no. disabled parking bays at this location once the TRO is enforced? Or is this one being remove?"

Response

2 x disabled bays will remain, one outside 6 South Avenue which will be advisory and one outside 12/14 South Ave which will be enforceable.

“What is the council doing about the lack of parking? Why can't 6 and 14 share a disabled bay?”

Response

Can you please confirm whether you would like your objection to formalise the bay outside 14 South Avenue to stand or be retracted as the closing date is this Friday.