

**Formal Objections Received to Traffic Regulation Order Swale Amendment 20**

**Objection 1 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Cormorant Road/Wigeon Road, Iwade**

*Good morning,*

*I am writing regarding the proposed installation of double yellow lines around the junction of Cormorant Road and Wigeon Road, Iwade.*

*I live on Avocet Walk, ME9 8WS. I would like to raise a formal objection to these proposals. I have lived here for over 3 years, I have had no issues with the parking along the suggested roads. Weekly the waste disposal carts come through with no problems, I have seen delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles also access the area with no problems.*

*My concern with the proposal, is that there is minimal parking already available on the estate. This will then move the problem to another area, causing more congestion which will then in turn potentially effect emergency services etc reaching certain areas of the estate. As of course any car that does park there will need to park elsewhere, but there is no where. Unfortunately, there is not sufficient parking for the number of properties here. These double yellow lines will cause multiple more problems than there are already.*

*The area the double yellow lines are being suggested on is barely used for parking. It is mainly used for visitors and vehicles are vary rarely there longer than a day.*

*I do not think this proposal will be beneficial for this estate.*

**Objection 2 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Cormorant Road/Wigeon Road, Iwade**

*I am writing in objection to some of the planned double yellow lines on Cormorant Road, Iwade, in particular the proposed lines in front of houses 18, 20 & 22 for the following reasons:*

*As you are aware, the whole area has a lack of parking, I understand that when you buy or rent a property that these are things to consider, however, may I be as bold as to ask you to reconsider a slight adjustment to some of the proposed lines, as some of which are directly in front of properties drives. Numbers 18, 20 & 22 all have 2 car parking spaces; this is one of the areas where yellow lines are proposed. As a resident of over 18 months, I have never seen anyone park in front of these houses, this would not be cost effective at all and in my view a waste of our money. This money could be spent in other areas of improvement in Iwade.*

*I fully understand the need for access for the emergency services and refuse collections and for those reasons I agree to the rest of the proposed lines, I do however; feel strongly to the cost effectiveness of the lines in front of properties with driveways. It makes me doubt if anyone has actually viewed the area and seen the driveways where the proposed lines are to be placed, if so, is there any justification to this?*

### Objection 3 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Cormorant Road/Wigeon Road, Iwade

*I am writing in objection to the proposed enforcement of yellow lines installation off cormorant road , avocet walk.*

*I completely agree with the yellow lines on the 2 corners proposed but to put them outside a driveway that no one parks on is complete waste of resources .*

*I myself have been a victim of damage caused by parking in this area totalling several thousand pounds but my question is what are your proposals for accommodating the already problematic parking problems we have on this estate, maybe rather than putting notices up overnight about parking on the side of the road it may be beneficial to make use of the edges of the play areas that the builders installed but never finished by using parts they edged off but never completed and put either tarmac or type 1 material in place to allow extra parking facilities rather than slap a fine on the already frustrated residents, we already have problems with certain residents thinking they can take up 2+ parking spaces with poor parking so why add to that frustration*

*hope common sense prevails*

### Support 1 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Cormorant Road/Wigeon Road, Iwade

*I am writing for the traffic regulation order in Cormorant Road. I live where the double yellow lines are proposed. This estate was built as a trial estate with narrow roads so it did not look like a car park which a lot of people obviously don't know. I know I had to sign an agreement for no parking on the street before the keys got handed over. I know that KCC agreed with this development only if there was an agreement for parking put in place. Homeowners moved out and new ones moved in and no agreement has been passed on. The road is 20cm? bigger then a bin lorry outside our house. The only people that are objecting to the double yellow lines are the ones that do not live where they are proposed. We can't and have not had family up for 8 years due to visiting bays are always occupied by homeowners and can't block our own driveway because someone is parked opposite. The pavement is used as a bypass, our dropped kerb is starting to come loose, the water meter in the footpath has been damaged (leaking) and now our water cover has been damaged again. I don't feel safe letting my son on or near the pavement or my driveway between the cars on his own as the cars come to fast round the blind bend. I have had 3 accidents and my insurance company have been in contact with the police, Swale borough and KCC about double yellow lines to be placed or bollards. As some of these people claim to leave their cars on their... [no further text]*

### Objection 4 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Dark Hill, Faversham

*You recently sent this Regulation Order - Swale Amendment 20 to me at my home (which I own) at \*\* Dark Hill, Faversham. This is in relation to proposed extension and additions to the double yellow lines in our vicinity.*

*While my husband and I support the addition of these double yellow lines generally, we have a concern about those immediately outside our home. You extend the yellow lines only half way across our drive entrance (which incorporates the lorry turning circle opposite the bottom of Davington Hill). It appears there will be a space of 6.5m without double yellow lines marked GP (ie from the storm drain to bottom of Monks Alley) Our concerns are:*

*a) We dont understand why you are only extending the double yellow lines half-way across our drive entrance. We fear this will encourage people to park up to the point where the lines begin, which they don't tend to do currently. This may make things worse for us rather than better.*

*b) From experience, anyone parking there (which has happened occasionally) makes it very difficult for us to exit or enter our drive safely as our view is impeded. \*\*\*\*\* we have various people visiting (potentially ambulances in future), and this makes me anxious.*

*c) At present Openreach, Royal Mail and Delivery lorries use the layby to park temporarily, and we are of course happy for them to do so. However, if cars were parked in the 6.5m stretch, and these lorries and vans are parked in the layby, we will not be able to get in or out of our drive at all.*

*To conclude, we would prefer the double yellow lines to extend all the way across our drive/layby (up to the bottom of Monks Alley), or not be added at all as it may confuse people into parking in the area not covered by the lines. I'd be grateful if you could let us know your decision, and any reasons for them.*

#### Support 2 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Dark Hill, Faversham

*As a resident in this area I fully agree with the proposed yellow lines changes.*

#### Support 3 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Dark Hill, Faversham

*I write to support the proposals for additional double yellow lining at and around the junctions of Dark Hill and Davington Hill and Stonebridge Way and West Street. Additional lining will increase pedestrian safety (especially for local schoolchildren), reduce traffic congestion and air pollution, and improve residents' amenity. Retaining some on-street will also assist with achievement of those outcomes. At the same time new lining at the Dark Hill and Davington Hill junction will stop parked cars preventing misdirected HGVs from returning to the Western Link via Bysing Wood Road.*

*I understand other residents support the scheme and would like further additional lining; maybe this can be looked at in due course, but this scheme should go ahead in the meantime as representing a good traffic and pedestrian safety improvement measure.*

#### Comments 1 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Dark Hill, Faversham

*I wish to make comment on the proposed double yellow lines around dark hill and west street faversham. (Swale amendment 20).*

*I feel from a design point the brief given by the residents has been clearly missed. The double yellow lines should be extended completely up the right hand side of dark hill at present this area creates a bottle neck and buses struggle to get through this area.*

*Once this action is carried out you need to double yellow line the side of the road directly opposite the 19m stretch of double yellow lines or all that will happen is people will switch sides to park and in 6 months from now we will be revisiting this issue. There are enough council run car parks in faversham they can pay for parking and walk down to the area.*

*I hope my views are taken in to account. Should you wish to discuss my comments please email me directly*

#### Objection 5 – Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines and Residents' Parking Bay Reduction – Side of 6 East Street, Faversham

I am writing in reference to the above traffic regulation order to register my objection to the proposed change to the parking regulations, which from the details I can only assume are to do with additional access to Faversham Tyre Services at the corner of St. Mary's Road and East Street.

I am a resident of St. Mary's Road and have first hand experience of Faversham Tyre Services.

While I fully support the efforts of a small business to increase it's market, I feel this is not the place to have a full-fledged garage. In the last couple of years there seems to be a wider range of servicing being carried out at the premises, which means there are often people working on cars in the street, frequently while parked on the existing double yellow lines approaching the corner with East Street, along with an increase in the noise associated with engine testing, etc.

I can support their efforts to take this off the street, but I suspect that all it will mean is even more of this sort of trade and I have to reluctantly say that this is the not the place have a larger business of this type.

There is also the significant issue of reducing the amount of parking in a town centre location where residents often have trouble parking at peak times. The loss of what will amount to two parking spaces would have a noticeable detrimental effect on this situation.

The people who run the business are friendly and helpful, and it is with reluctance that I feel it necessary to register my objection to this change.

#### Objection 6 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*I am the home owner of \*\* Nutfields Sittingbourne. I would like to strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines opposite our house. Parking is very scarce for us and visitors. Parking restrictions will only cause more problems. It would be more beneficial to increase the small bay at the top of the road to receive 2 more cars, having no impact on the recreation ground.*

#### Objection 7 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*My partner has already emailed you we live at number \*\* Nutfields. I just wanted to add a couple more thoughts to his email. If you install double yellow lines at the top of the road then the problem will just move down the to the bottom. During the summer when the hairdresser re open cars parked either side of the road at the entrance to Nutfields and on two occasions the bin lorry was unable to access Nutfields resulting in bins not being emptied. Another thought is there is a bin store on the*

*verge of the park and the top of Nutfields which is never used by the residents that live in the bungalows if this was taken down and the road widened at this point would give a better turning area for larger vehicles. To lose parking where you propose I feel is just going to cause problems at the bottom of the Nutfields and Rectory Road which has its own problems of parking and speeding vehicles.*

#### Objection 8 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*I wish to object to proposed double yellow lines. There is insufficient parking in Nutfields for residents, and there is always room to drive into the access road leading off Nutfields, even though the junction is tight.*

*Residents of 16-20 Nutfields have a surfaced bin area near No.12 and do not use this area as they are disabled so cannot get bins to the end of the road. Could this area be used to widen the entrance to Nutfields rather than installing double yellow lines which will affect residents, including myself who has lived in the road for over \*\* years.*

#### Objection 9 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*Now you have brought this problem forward, maybe you could look into the building of disabled Bungalows on the old garage sight without thinking about proper access to them?*

*Nutfields is a very narrow road with no footpath on the left hand side from Rectory Road. Therefore courtesy parking has always been on the other side of the road. Over time, parking on the corners happens. I think that double yellow lines, if they are to be put anywhere, would be better placed both sides of access to Nutfields from Rectory Road. This will stop large cars parking on the footpath (mostly customers of the shop opposite). In the past waste collection vehicles have not been able to enter Nutfields due to cars parked in this way. Imagine if a Fire Engine or Ambulance needed to gain access to Nutfields?*

*If double yellow lines are put where proposed it will have a knock on effect to parking along the road. Maybe instead look to widen the entrance to the bungalows giving cars the ability to turn the sharp corner more easily, potentially with the removal of the brick wall on the left-hand side (as you look towards the bungalows). This brick wall causes other problems with children and others congregating.*

#### Objection 10 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*Please find attached a letter from my Grandmother (in-law) who lives on Nutfields.*

*I would also like to add my support to her email by stating that if Double Yellow lines are to be installed on Nutfields they need to be at the entrance to Nutfields from Rectory road.*

*\*\*\*\*\* is \*\* years old and lives on her own. My wife regularly visits her with our daughter and on several occasions has had to walk out into the road to go around often large vehicles that park blocking the pavement side of Nutfields coming from Rectory Road. Often when we have driven, having cars parked opposite the junction and on both left and right sides of the road on the bend, has made it difficult to enter the road in general. Additionally when the obstruction is a large vehicle, the*

*bend is blind and you have to be very careful taking that junction, often meeting oncoming traffic who also are taking the junction blind.*

### Objection 11 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

I live at number Nutfields next door to where the double yellow lines are to be put. If this happens it will cause a lot of problems, losing two parking spaces. We have to share these parking spaces with people visiting Rectory Park with their children to play and when there's a football match. There is nowhere to park in the park area. At the bottom of Nutfields there is a hairdressing salon whose customers also use these parking spaces if vacant. There is a driver who drives a large van that parks outside number Nutfield, he never has a problem getting in or out of this area. There is a 3 kerb up stand on the lower side of our drive and number 8's driveway where sometimes people park, making it nearly impossible to get off our driveway. If the yellow lines go ahead someone will park there all the time. All you would've achieved is you've moved the situation down outside our house, all you have done is made it better for one and far worse for me and many others.

---

### Objection 12 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

*I am writing in regards to the traffic regulation order of proposed double yellow lines to Nutfields Sittingbourne.*

*This is a formal objection to double yellow lines being put in on the road.*

*To start with in the document on Swale.gov that's available to read there are some things wrong it states that cars have to mount the kerb in order to get around the corner this is incorrect the kerb cannot be mounted here as the road sign is there and brick built bin sheds are also there so it would be physically impossible to mount the kerb to get around the corner this is false information.*

*The lady in which has started the petition seems to be the only person with a problem with cars parked on a road that she doesn't even live directly on, the reason she has a problem with this is because she has a disabled son who gets picked up via an 8 seater taxi, they are the only people that hit anyone's cars in these taxis because they have inexperienced drivers, there are bigger vans and bin lorries that come up this road and have no problem with cars parked on the road and do not hit any vehicles.*

*On the Kent.gov website it states "on road parking can mean narrower roads, causing traffic jams and delays especially during peak traffic hours." Nutfields is a quiet road, not a main road there is no through road and has no access to anywhere else, if you put double yellow lines it means the residents that park on Nutfields will be forced to park on rectory road which is a main road, which has a high volume of cars parked on it already and at most times is a single way road as you have to stop to let cars parked as there are cars parked on both sides of the road already. It also has a high level of pedestrians that use the road and cross it. Rectory road is also a cut through to ambulances and fire engines and other emergency services from the station to the other side were as nutfields is not. So why would you push more people to park on a main road that is already over crowded causing more risk to drivers and pedestrians which the majority are school children as it leads to a*

*school. The information given states there has been no pedestrian accidents on Nutfields due to the parking on the road but there has been on rectory road due to the parking and the dangers they cause but still your trying to push more cars onto the main road. There are no problems with the flow of traffic or public safety on Nutfields but there is on rectory road which would be made worse as a result of pushing the residents of Nutfields down to park on rectory road.*

*Many of the houses on Nutfields are privately owned and when purchased there was no double yellow lines in place, having double yellow lines will affect the price my property is valued at and will also affect me selling my property if I wish to do so and no parking is a put off to buyers.*

*Having to park down on rectory road especially when coming home late from work and having to walk up a road that leads to a park which is pitch black at night is very scary and also very dangerous as you cannot see if anybody comes at you from the park. There has been cases of drunken activity from the park and groups of teenagers which can become very intimidating when walking up a road on your own and having to walk past them.*

*There has also been robbery's at the local St. John's mini mart on various occasion on members of the public and the actual shop which is just meters from were the residents of Nutfields would have to park and walk from.*

*Every resident that parks on Nutfields parks respectfully nobody obstructs the corner nobody parks up curbs, every body parks to one side so there is clear access for any emergency vehicles to get past, the bin men come up every week with no problem with how cars are parked.*

*There is also a small business at the end of Nutfields, it would also affect there custom if there customers have nowere to park.*

*I can't see how putting double yellow lines on Nutfields is going to cause any good if anything I feel it will make matters worse for rectory road, it will affect people's safety. It is a waste of tax payers money and serves no real purpose on a dead end road the majority of cars that come up this road are residents there is no through traffic. All because one company can not hire experienced drivers to drive properly. The respectful residents of Nutfields have got to worry about there safety walking from such a distance from there car, multiple trips when doing shopping etc, the value of there home, the struggle of selling there home due to no parking, pedestrians and vehicle drivers put at risk down on rectory road as there will be more cars parked there instead of on a quiet low flow of traffic dead end road. You have to think of the knock on effect that this has here people have to park somewhere.*

*I would like to be kept informed with any updates regarding the double yellow lines and really urge you to look at the knock on effects that this has, especially as this appeal has come from somebody who doesn't even live on this direct road so it has no affect to them.*

*The document published on Swale.gov also states that as health implications it would have a positive impact on the mental wellbeing of those residents and visitors currently suffering from the stress of negotiating parked vehicles on this junction. What about the negative impact on the mental wellbeing it would have on the residents who have nowere to park who are forced to park away from there home and risk there safety walking home every night and doing multiple trips to and from there car?*

*Could you please also tell me how many people have signed this petition also and we're the signatures have come from?*

Objection 13 – Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Nutfields, Sittingbourne

Dear Sir/madam

Thank you for your letter dated 2nd Dec 2020 concerning Double Yellow lines outside 12 NUTFIELDS + the Corner opposite, I strongly disagree with the planning of this idea the reasons are as follows.

It will do away with one parking space forcing cars to park on the other side of the road + possibly across peoples drop kerbs.

Will also force cars to park at the bottom of the road by the junction of Rectory Rd, the parking there is very dangerous + waiting for a serious accident to happen, thats where the "yellow lines" need to go, Not on a corner next to the park where nobody as ever parked.

I understand that somebody who lives in the bungalows has complained because a certain Van is unable to reverse or turn, Surley thats the driver of the Van not the cars that are parked there, Vans + small delivery lorries have been reversing down the road

---



For years with no problems or complaints,

I also believe a Personal Complaint against my father parking outside my house ( ), he is a blue badge holder + will continue to park there within his restrictions as will another member of the family who has a blue badge.

So summarising I believe this to be a waste of time + tax payers money it would be better spent putting the "yellow lines" at the junction mentioned earlier.

#### Objection 14 – Proposed Formalising of Disabled Bay – Invicta Road, Sheerness

After receiving your letter concerning the Proposed Formalising of Disabled Bay Invicta Rd Sheerness. I would like to inform you that as parking in Invicta Rd along with many other surrounding roads is at a premium. Even more so with many houses being converted to multiple occupancy, and more often than not these properties have more than one car to compete with parking. With this in mind I would like to say that I would like to see the Disabled Bay outside Number \*\*\* Invicta Rd removed.

It was originally marked out for \*\*\*\*\* (\*\* Invicta Rd). But unfortunately \*\*\*\*\* passed away back in April 2020.

#### Objection 15 – Proposed Formalising of Disabled Bay – Church Road, Murston

I am writing regarding the letter I received concerning the formalising of the disabled parking bay outside \*\* Church road. I am not in agreement to the formalising of this bay for the following reasons:

- The owner and driver of the car is not disabled or physically impaired.
- The owner and driver of the car does not have a disabled parking permit.
- The elderly woman who owns the house is a very rare occupant of the car
- Other family members have collected elderly woman and driven her away.
- The car is used to ferry non-infirm people or grandchildren or shopping.
- The elderly woman is sadly in poor health & requires oxygen therapy so rarely leaves her house
- Car owners would move to allow easy access for hospital appointments.

I did not object to the installation of the disabled bay as the gentleman who used it was in poor health and needed easy access to his car. He has sadly died, as expected. Parking my car remotely near or even in front of my home is not common. The houses adjacent to mine all have more than one car, some at least 3 parked in road. The woman who now resides at number \*\* with her mother has been aggressive and rude regarding parking only to see anyone but her elderly mother in the car!

Objection 16 – Proposed Formalising of Disabled Bay – Church Road, Murston

Dear Sir,

Traffic Regulation Order – Swale Amendment  
Proposed Formalising of Disabled Bay – 20  
Church Road, Murston.

I am writing to make a formal objection to the proposed formalising of the disabled bay at Church Road, Murston.

My objection is that the disabled gentleman who lived at No Church Road died in 2020. The lady who now lives at this address is housebound, does not drive, or own a vehicle. There is ample parking space in Church Road, on both sides of the road available for any visitors to No Church Road and so to formalize the space would cause unnecessary problems for the neighbors parking vehicles along Church Road. I don't consider the formalizing to be necessary as the space is marked as a disabled bay (albeit discretionarily) already and there is no point of the added expense or inconvenience to neighbors in formalizing the space, which is more than often left vacant anyway.