

**From:** Planning Comments  
**Sent:** 7 Jun 2016 13:49:40 +0100  
**To:** Scanning Team  
**Subject:** FW: Planning application 16/503409/FULL

> From: Dorothy Greenhill REDACTED  
> Sent: 04 June 2016 18:58  
> To: Planning Comments  
> Subject: Planning application 16/503409/FULL

>  
> Dear Sir/Madam

>  
> I write formally to object to the above planning application to relocate Sittingbourne market in Sittingbourne High Street. My reasons are:

>  
> 1) It cannot be justified to close the relevant part of the High Street on Mondays-Fridays inclusive purely to accommodate what is a remnant of a market. The proposed relocation would not necessarily attract more stall holders nor revitalise the market. There has been more than adequate provision in the present location but the number of stalls has dramatically decreased over the years. On the other hand a Saturday market may well increase the number as instanced by those that appear for the special events on Saturdays, including craft and food stalls. If the Council wishes to have a Faversham situation then the answer is to have a Saturday market.

> 2) If the market is to be relocated more than adequate provision would be available on Saturdays as the whole of the High Street is already closed to traffic on those days. Let the market move its day.

> 3) A far better and more practical location if the market is to be held on a Friday is that area of Central Avenue which runs from the High Street to the roundabout below the public library. Hitherto all farmers' and continental markets have been held in that area without hindrance. A re-routing of traffic for the upper part of Central Avenue would cause far less inconvenience and disruption to that which would because if the present application is granted. The buses would then be totally unaffected.

> 4) The proposed re-routing of traffic is both unacceptable and potentially dangerous the more so with the greater amount of traffic that would have to use it. It is unacceptable to the bus companies and I have both sympathy and understanding for them and am supportive of them. The re-routing will doubtless cause a reduction in bus services and the lower part of the High Street will not then be served by buses. There will be a serious adverse effect on the provision of public transport.

> 5) The proposal takes no account of the difficulties that would be encountered by the travelling public, in particular the elderly and the disabled, so many of whom place great reliance on the buses, for whom they are a lifeline and for whom no other alternative form of transport is available, and shopping in the High Street. A service which the public have enjoyed for countless years will be taken away purely for a one day a week non event. Parking spaces for the disabled will disappear from the High Street and their travelling distances will be increased.

> 6) Doubtless buses would have to go to the back of the Forum for both passenger access and egress. That area cannot cope with the amount of traffic both in terms of the number of vehicles and members of the public at present and the increased traffic would make the situation there intolerable. It will be an accident waiting to happen. As proof, visit that area on a Saturday at present.

> 7) The making of a traffic order in advance of the planning application smacks very much of 'putting the cart before the horse' and rather seems a tactic to twist the planning committee's arm to grant the application or to tie its hands.

> 8) To fully appreciate the problems that granting the application will cause it is actually necessary to both travel on the buses and to shop in the High Street and to see what life is actually like for ordinary members of the public and how much more difficult it will be for them if the application is granted. I think it unlikely that members of the planning committee or its officers have or will have had this experience.

>  
> Accordingly I oppose the application.

>

> Yours faithfully  
>  
> John Greenhill  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Sent from my iPad