

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Hilton Close, Faversham

2 Indications of Support, 2 Formal Objections

First Indication of Support (TRO Support 1)

I wish to support the extension of the double yellow lines at the beginning of Hilton Close. Currently the pavement (on the even side of the road) is used to avoid restricting the normal flow of traffic and this means that there is not enough room for disabled people to either walk round with assistance or in a mobility scooter without venturing into the road. In spite of asking for them to move their cars there is a persistent refusal. Most of the owners who park their cars live on the other side of the A2 even though there is room for cars to use available spaces in the road. On the odd number side of the road frequent parking takes place, again using the pavement. Some of these people use this in car sharing exercises on work days.

Second Indication of Support (TRO Support 2)

I refer to your letter of 8th February (Ref: H4.1/TRO AM 22) regarding the proposed additional double yellow lines around the entrance to Hilton Close. I support the proposals which will greatly improve the safety of the junction.

First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 1)

I refer to your letter of 08 02.21 concerning proposed double yellow lines on the corner in Hilton Close and comment as follows

The road is very narrow and parked vehicles cause a dangerous hazard when coming out of my drive my vision is obscured and therefore your proposal will just move the parked vehicles down the road to the straight section causing further hazards which we definitely do not want

You need to put a parking time restriction of 30 minutes in the straight section at all times

If you go ahead with the proposal we require a parking time limit of 30 minutes in the straight section to avoid potential accidents

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 2) (plus comments)

Please find attached observations concerning the above proposals.

I also wish to re-iterate my willingness to meet with any involved representative of the Council who may be interested in a full on-the-spot appraisal of the situation.

I refer to your letter concerning the above, received yesterday.

- 1) ***The situation near the exit from Hilton Close outside House No 1 has simply been ignored for almost 20 years now. Drivers of vehicles entering and leaving the Close are almost without vision at all at the point of the 'S' turn. It therefore seems to me to be important that several measures are applied in this vicinity.***

*Because in this general vicinity not only are vehicles commonly parked within 10m. of a corner, but those that are not, even if thoughtfully parked, are partly on and partly off the pavement – and these cause the driving line to approach the corner (from within Hilton Close) to have restricted vision, **I support double lines being located on the corner outside No 1.***

*However, in my opinion, on its own, this will do almost nothing. Unfortunately, people widely ignore double lines when parking, however inappropriate that may be. **So, in addition, you will need to ensure that there is regular enforcement of the Traffic Regulation.** I would point out that the authorities could have been doing this for a*

*long time now – as vehicles parked within 10m of a road junction are already violating Traffic regulations. **It does not require double lines to address this issue.***

On a separate and more difficult point, the problem outside No 1 is mainly a problem of adequate vision – so that drivers entering Hilton Close can see beyond the large dense hedge in the garden at No 1. I cannot understand then why those who gave planning permission to Crest Nicholson to build in this pattern did not require a significantly better proposal for the entrance.

Truthfully, I believe you should approach the owners at No. 1 and negotiate with them over the size and height of their hedge in order to arrive at much better sight lines. This would make a huge difference.

2) *With regard to vehicles being parked on the opposite corner, between No 14 and the small cul-de-sac, objectively speaking it would seem logical to install double yellow lines here also as vehicles exiting Hilton Close have to sit wide in the road to avoid parked cars, thus reducing the drivers' vision around the corner in question. **However, I would caution against doing so at this stage.** My reasons for saying that are :-*

(i) *If lines are in place outside No. 1 and no parking at any time is enforced here and if sight lines are significantly improved through negotiation with the occupants at No. 1, **safety in this vicinity will be much improved.***

(ii) *If lines are put in/ near the cul-de-sac area - **parked vehicles, of which there are quite a few regularly there, will be displaced. Where will they go? I fear some at least will come further down into Hilton Close and outside our front door.** Already, for some long time now, as soon as a parking problem of any sort occurs nearby, we see people parking directly outside our home, thus restricting our own access, particularly when we need to get heavier items into the house from our car. Vehicles come from Finch Close, The Football Club (which has its own parking area), the cottages on the main A2 near Salter's lane – and elsewhere.*

In other words, you will simply displace the parking issue to another location and in so doing will create significant problems for pedestrians. *Whenever vehicles are outside our home for any period of time, young Mums with pushchairs and children are unable to remain safely on the pavement and are forced into the road, where they are much more vulnerable. Cars parked between No 14 and the cul-de-sac do not have this effect on pedestrians as extremely few people walk on the pavements in that area.*

So, both because the problem will not be solved by putting double lines on the Eastern corner and because of our own vested interest in maintaining such degree of privacy as we currently have, I believe you should not do so and am against such a proposal.

(our house is the ONLY house that sits forward and vehicles parked directly outside it are particularly intrusive in noise from engines and doors, in air pollution, and in people going about their lives).

I am more than willing to speak with any representative of those charged with deciding on this issue in order to clarify my perspective and discuss my general observations (as a retired person, I am often here at home and see the various situations which arise).

Finally, I take this opportunity to ask you to communicate with all elected and appointed personnel who may deal with Planning Permissions of all types, to take note of the many difficulties that arise if sight lines and parking issues are not properly addressed prior to construction.

I look forward to hearing more in due course.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Queenborough Road/St Peter's Close, Minster

1 Indication of Support

Indication of Support (TRO Support 3)

Thank you for your letter dated 8th February 2021.

In this letter, you reference previous informal consultation back in September 2020. I would like to point out that I did not receive any correspondence in relation to this matter. Nevertheless, I am in full support of this action.

My email is not only for support, but I would like to enquire into the possibility of the double yellow lines being extended further up St Peters Close than proposed. My reason for this request is that, residents from Queenborough Road regularly park on the left hand side as you look out of St Peters Close towards Queenborough Road. By parking here, and so close to the junction; this leaves only one side of the road to enter and exit into the close. The entrance to the close from Halfway is blind due to the high hedge row and St Peters Church.

As a resident of St Peters Close, the additional double yellow line would improve the overall safety of the junction, make it safe for pedestrians crossing and when Sheppey United play a home game, stop the close being used as an overspill car park.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Lammas Drive/Cortland Close, Sittingbourne

1 Formal Objection

Formal Objection (TRO Objection 3)

Whilst it is a good idea to install double yellow lines on this junction, consideration should be given as to why people park there in the first place and where they will park once the yellow lines are installed. Parking occurs at the junction for different reasons at different times of day.

Overnight, it tends to be residents of Lammas Drive, where there is a multi-occupancy property with insufficient off-road parking for the five occupants, plus the residents of Cortland Mews regularly park in Cortland Close as there is insufficient space in Cortland Mews for all the residents. Two other households in Lammas Drive have multiple white vans and other vehicles and do not use their off-road parking for any of them, preferring to line their vehicles along the street.

During the daytime, visitors to Cortland Close and Cortland Mews park in Cortland Close.

Visitors to the shops, chemist and dentist in Milton High Street including staff who park all day, park in Lammas Drive and Cortland Close as it is the nearest free parking to the High Street. Residents of Cortland Close are plagued by non-resident parking on the pavements and opposite the entrance to Cortland Mews making manoeuvring tricky in such a narrow road.

Consideration needs to be given to where people will park. I suspect there will be even more pavement parking in Cortland Close, blocking access to wheelchair users and forcing the elderly and parents with prams to walk in the road. A possible solution is to follow what other areas have done and create layby spaces along Lammas Drive and Beechwood Avenue and possibly also Forge Close. There is space between the Kerb and Milton recreation Ground in the shape of the grass verge to achieve this without any loss of amenity in the park itself.

Please consider the "knock-on effect" before implementing this double yellow line solution. People only park there because there is nowhere else to park. please solve the parking problem, not just apply a bandaid to this one junction. If this must go ahead, please also consider double yellow lines to the following junctions, to stop the problem being pushed to another area:

Junction of Cortland Mews/Cortland Close & Junction of Lammas Drive/Beechwood Avenue

Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines – Gore Court Road/Whitehall Road, Sittingbourne

1 Formal Objection

Formal Objection (TRO Objection 4)

I am mythed to find that a further notic has gone up with proposals to extend the double yellow lines by a further 2 meters into Whitehall Road.

In October 2019 I objected to the proposal of excessive 15 meters double yellow lines into Whitehall Road and it was agreed that 10 meters was sufficient as per the highway code.

I note that nothing has changed with the junction layout in that time to now mean that there need be another 2 meters or indeed a justification for it. I object on the same grounds as my previous objection. The road is not a highway, 10 meters is sufficient. The transportation board also agreed with this previously.

I would expect a full justified and legally arguable reason as to why this is now looking to be extended despite the previous ruling.

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Periwinkle Close, Sittingbourne

1 Comment, 3 Formal Objections

Comment (TRO Comment 1)

I'm writing regarding the double yellow lines on the corner. I think this is a great idea as it's so dangerous. Especially when commercial vehicles park on the corner. I have seen two accidents where children have been hit off their bikes where you can't see around the corner and a car has hit them, luckily it wasn't serious.

*I live at ** and would like the double yellow*

Lines to go across opposite my driveway please so that people can't block me in so I can't reverse onto my driveway. I have attached some pics of yesterday outside my driveway, usually there is also a van parked on the far corner as well. I think we need to put a rule that no commercial vehicles are allowed to park down our road, they can park along the road where the flats are or even the road where the chip shop is and it won't obstruct anyone's view or cause accidents. They park on the pavements which meant that people can't get by. They also block the road so wide vehicles like fire engines can't get by.





First Formal Objection (TRO Objection 5)

I am writing to you to register my objection to the proposed double yellow lines on the junction with the spine road and spur road in Periwinkle Close.

Parking is a problem, not helped by also having commuters leaving their vehicles parked in the close as well as people who work in the town. If the proposed double yellow lines go ahead, this will take out a further 6-8 parking spaces. We currently have three empty houses within the close (house numbers 44-72) and when these houses are sold/let, further cars will need spaces to park.

Within the close with numbers 44-72 we generally park responsibly on the exit onto the spine road, giving consideration in the event of fire engines or ambulances requiring access to the close, as they have had to unfortunately attend certain neighbours recently. Neighbours who have company vans, there being only two who do not have a designated parking space, do park responsibly.

I quite often dread coming home when it is dark as it is difficult to park and do not like having to park out of the close and having to walk back. A few years ago there was the suggestion of parking permits, but there is definitely not enough space to cater for on average two cars per house, although this would help with the problem of commuters parking within the close and on the spine road of Periwinkle.

On the above grounds, I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines.

Second Formal Objection (TRO Objection 6)

*Regarding said yellow lines to be painted in periwinkle close, there are not enough parking spaces as it is in periwinkle close so doing this will make things worse, the parking does not affect anybody except possible number ** has complained because she puts notes on peoples cars that park near her drive which are not blocking her drive, she*

has two drives on her house one at front and back which she does not use because she only has one car, pics supplied



(other photos omitted to preserve anonymity)

Third Formal Objection (TRO Objection 7)

I am writing to complain about the proposed Order to introduce double yellow lines on the junction of the spur road and spine road of Periwinkle Close. The residents of Periwinkle Close find it extremely hard to park as many households have more than one car and are often hard pressed to find parking as it is. The introduction of double yellow lines will make parking even harder and for some, almost impossible in this road. Whilst I appreciate parking on those corners is far from ideal, sometimes there is just nowhere else to park, and every single parking space in this close is very much needed. I therefore object most strongly to the implementation of these measures.