## Annex D

## **Objections**

| Comment Number | Objectors Comments  |
|----------------|---|
| 1              | I am emailing my concern regarding the proposal to remove the existing disabled bays and replace them with a length of  |
|                | double yellow lines.  |
|                | Firstly the road is wide enough for emergency service vehicles when vehicles aren't parked on the corner of Strode  |
|                | Crescent/Trinity Road where there are already double yellow lines.  |
|                | On the side of the road where the disabled bays are located the pavement is wide enough so that, again if used  |
|                | correctly, there is enough room for emergency service vehicles can still access the road.   |
|                | The issue with these bays actually comes from them being used incorrectly and illegally by non-blue badge holders so to remove the bays will not only deprive those with Blue badges who do use the bays as intended, but will encourage more         |
|                | parking illegally i.e. on the yellow lines. As its reoffending drivers there needs to be stricter punishment for them as this proposal will actually punish those who do use the bays correctly and legally.  |
|                | Parking in the area for residents is difficult already, not helped by the number of scrap/untaxed cars which are parked in  |
|                | Strode Cresent. One disabled bay had already been removed and double yellow lines put in it place just off of Trinity   |
|                | Road.   |
|                | As for the reports of people parking on the footpath, this in itself is illegal if all four wheels are on the path so putting   |
|                | double yellow lines down will make no difference to this, especially considering there are already double yellow lines where these vehicles "park".   |
|                | It states in the letter that was sent out that replacing the bays with double yellow lines will allow Blue Badge Holders to   |
|                | park on them for up to 2 hours. This will be of no help to the holder if they are a resident of Strode Cresent, Trinity Road or Winstanley Road as they will need to move their vehicles after 3 hours (not 2) and try to find an alternative parking |
|                | space which may be some distance from their property. The only other designated disabled parking is in the public car park and even then the maximum stay is 8 hours.   |
|                | As a blue badge holder I, for one, know the difficulty that has come from people misusing these bays and having to try and locate a parking space so I do feel that this proposal is only going to do more harm than good for the likes of myself     |
|                | and others.   |
|                | I do hope you take this email seriously and into consideration.   |

| 2 | I object as it's not, the church at fault, it's inconsiderate parking on the other side repairing cars parking Old vans that don't move I was under the impression that it's illegal to repair cars on the side of the road. That's why I'm objecting. |
|---|--|
|   | Re Strode Crescent, I think the problem is on the corner where they park and repair old cars and vans all the time.  |
|   | Rather than putting disabled bays outside the church, I think it would be better to put double yellow lines on that corner. Although whether it would be policed or not is another story.  |
|   | Just a thought.  |

## **General Comments**

| Comment<br>Number | Name          | Comment  |
|-------------------|---------------|--|
| 1                 | Police        | Kent Police have no specific observations to make regarding the waiting restriction proposals, however in general terms we would expect the following:  • The application meets the necessary criteria  • The introduction or removal of Parking restrictions complies in all respect with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016  • The introduction of such measures will not leave the Police with the task of carrying out constant enforcement issues  • The safety of other road users is not compromised by the introduction of these measures  Civil Parking Enforcement will require Local Authority to ensure resources are available to enforce these proposals. |
| 2                 | County Member | Thanks for your email. I have no objection to the proposal.  |