### Belvedere Road, Faversham - Proposed Double Yellow Lines - Second Design

Response	Support	Object	Comments
1	1		
2	1		
3		1	There are enough yellow lines in the street. Proposed additional lines are totally unnecessary
4	1		I frequently have to pull out blind into Belverdere Road as corners obstructed by parked vehicles for the resturant.
5	1		Looks like a sensible approach is being adopted.
6	1		I support the proposal to amend the waiting restrictions.
7	1		
8	1		Generally as parking is at present the road is too narrow for emergency vehicles to get through. Particularly the vehicles parked on the corner, obscure vision for traffic coming out of the restaurant, and the restaurant of Creek House and Belvedere Wharf. Vehicles here often park on the pavement, blocking it for pedestrian traffic.
9	1		These sections in Belvedere Road are narrow, the proposed appears sensible.
Total	8	1	

Kent Police - No Observations KCC Bus Transport Team - No Objections

Properties Consulted	29		
No. returned	9	% Response	31
No. Support	8		89
No. Object	1	% Object	11

### South Road, Faversham - Proposed Double Yellow Lines - Second Consultation

Response	Support	Object	Comments
	1	1	Further to our conversation this morning, you may not be surprised to hear that I would still like to object to the Second Consultation proposal regarding double yellow lines along South Road, Faversham. In my opinion, the proposal will still restrict already inadequate parking in the area, so without any meaningful alternative, the proposal is unacceptable. My view
			is that local residents have brought about this proposal as there is an inconvenience getting in and out of off road parking
			facilities. Unfortunate, but better than no facility at all. The attempt then to suggest that buses are unable to pass safely in that stretch of road is without any credence. Currently, cars, vans and lorries have to negotiate the same issue and do so safely
			(and as far as I know without any great incidence of accidents) by patience and courtesy. The same applies to the buses. I do
			wonder whether the situation might end in that area being allocated as Residents Parking only may be considered, but hopefully again, only after prior consultation. This may or may not improve parking, but has no relevance to the initial reasons for parking objections.
	2	1	There is not enough parking spaces in this area as it stands now.
	3 1		
	4	1	Access on and off the drive will not be improved by this proposal.
	5 1		The proposed yellow lines needs to be extended across No. 58 to ensure exit from garage is not obsured by parked cars.
	6	1	Please refer to my previous concerns. The new proposal will still reduce the on-street parking available we cannot afford to lose a single space - it's that busy.
	7	1	I still hope for double yellow lines to extend between Lower Road and Tanners Street. Parked cars on the south side greatly obstruct the vision of those exiting the raised area and parked cars on the north side exacerbates the danger.
	8 1		I support the proposal to amend the waiting restrictions, as I have often seen the buses really struggling to get through there. However, this will add to the parking pressures around the smaller side streets, such as where I live on Nightingale Road. Could the residents permit system be extended or maybe no parking allowed on the side streets to non residents during the hours of 1 till 2, which will stop the London comuters using our streets to park on?
	9 1		Hi, we live off South Road in ******** and currently find it difficult at times to exit onto the main road. We have double yellows on our side opposite your proposed new ones, and they would make life much easier for us and also help to stop the traffic snarl ups which occur with large vehicles. Thus we are in favour of the proposal to amend the waiting restrictions.
Total	4	5	

# South Road, Faversham - Proposed Double Yellow Lines - Second Consultation

Kent Police - No Observations

<b>Properties Consulted</b>	39		
No. returned	9	% Response	23
No. Support	4	% Support	44
No. Object	5	% Object	56

# <u>Luton Road, Faversham - Proposed Double Yellow Lines</u>

Response	Support	Object	Comments
. 1	1		
2	1		I feel 3 metres would be sufficent
3	1		It can be difficult to get past any car that is parking right against the lines to get into our car park even with a car sometimes.
4	1		Agree to extended lines as it is tight sometimes trying to get out off the close, worse for heavy vehicles. Concerned that losing spaces people from Luton Road are going to start to come into the close and park so residents will not be able park.
5		1	there is little enough parking as it is
6	1		yes we need this. The lines were cut back about 4 years ago.
7	1		About time, the refuse trucks always struggle to get in.
8	1		Support in order for a steady flow of traffic in and out of this private land.
9	1		Support the proposal for short section of double yellow lines.
10	1		Agree but should be done at the other entrance (Gordon Square) side as parking is also bad there. If an emergency vehicle had to get it they would stand no chance. If it was at only one entrance the other would end up being worse than ever with parking.
11		1	Luton Road already experiences problems with a limited amount of parking and this would only compound the problem. The Council should make the residents interests a priority in this case rather than the occasional larger vehicle requiring access to Sommerville Close. In fact the entrance area to Sommerville Close is often free of parked cars during the day when people are at work. I was surprised to learn of the proposal. If you must go ahead then I suggest you remove the double yellow lines at the other end of Luton Road, near the sub station, I can see no purpose for these other than revenue from parking fines.
12	1		
13	1		Work is essential as restricted access for refuse collection refuse is a real issue.
14		1	The parking is already awful. Never park near my home. You would need to remove double yellow lines else where close by if you were to add the proposed ones.
15	1		I support the proposal to extend the Yellow Lines in Luton Road Faversham. I hope that; (1) This will give Swale's contractors one less excuse for failing to collect our refuse. (2) It will improve access for fire engines & other emergency services.(3) The restrictions will be ENFORCED.
Total	12	3	

#### **ANNEX B**

## <u>Luton Road, Faversham - Proposed Double Yellow Lines</u>

KCC Bus Transport Team - No Objections

Properties Consulted	47		
No. returned	15	% Response	32
No. Support	12	% Support	80
No. Object	3	% Object	20

### All Saints Close, Iwade - Proposed Double Yellow Lines (1st Consultation)

Response	Support	Object	Comments
1		1	Object on the grounds that number 24 lose its parking, which will force them to park further into the Close creating a parking problem for the rest of the residents. This could be sorted if someone from the church just places some cones out on the days needed, like in my last village. Much cheaper and avoids a 24/7 problem will residents arguing over parking.
2	1		Support, but it would benefit the residents greatly if the double yellow lines were extended as shown on attached map. By not extending there is a high possibility the public will park cars after the proposed double yellow lines. This would create problems with 24 hour access needed by elderly residents and put young children at risk who play around this area. Cul-desac's are deemed to be a safe environment for them to play.
3		1	On road parking is needed due to the number of vehicles already parking in the area. This will only make parking more awkward. The large car park by the barn should be made available. The junction is safe and no accidents have taken place in this location for the last 4 and half years.
4	1		Support as long as residents do not park on the road leading into the areas that are not marked by double yellow lines as this will cause less parking for residents living further into the close. Some park in The Street and not in the garages belonging to their homes.
5		1	The installation of double yellow lines to the entrance of All Saints Close is completely unnecessary. It will cause people to park on the main road disrupting the flow of traffic. Waste lorries have on issues with access so why can't a hearse? Change double to single yellow lines.
6		1	By cutting the opportunity for local residents to park their cars near the entrance to All Saint's Close you are only solving a minor problem by creating a major problem. Residents who park at the top of the road are mainly those who live on The Street. They have to park somewhere so it is likely they will park further along All Saints Close causing major problems. When the plans were passed for the development, it clearly wasn't taken into consideration that most residents were likely to own two vehicles. The second vehicle has to park on the rather narrow road, this might lead to the occasional unpleasant conflict. The residents wishes must be taken into consideration. If the church has requested this proposal they might reach a compromise solution, if they want double yellow lines then they must allow residents to larm their cars in their rather large and unused car park overnight as long as they are moved by say 9am the next morning, leaving the church exclusive use of their own car park during the day. As funerals are only carried out during the day put single yellow lines at top of the road with restricted parking during certain hours, e.g. 9am - 5pm so the cars can still park there during the night. Neither the church or residents would be entirely happy with this but it might be a compromise solution and wouldn't be expensive for the Council.

## All Saints Close, Iwade - Proposed Double Yellow Lines (1st Consultation) (continued)

Response	Support	Object	Comments
7			Seemed a good idea at first but the vechicles who park in the proposed area will have to park further into All Saints Close.
			Most parking takes place in the evening and/or weekends and therefore would not affect any funeral traffic. Yellow lines do
			not seem necessary and would affect parking 24/7
8			Good idea but worried that parking for us residents will have problems parking as the cars that park on the proposed
9	1		I would like to see yellow lines extend down All Saints Close.
10		1	Single yellow lines would be better so residents can still have parking in evenings and weekends - down to poor
			planning. To force double yellow lines would be very unfair to residents and penalising residents living in a road not
			suitable for its residents. The gate for the church entrance is in wrong place.
11		1	Parking will become an issue with neighbours, particularly at weekends. Plenty of room to allow parking on car park
			side and put yellow lines on the opposite side of the road, with a short section in front of the car park entrance. ( see
			modified)
Total	3	6	

Properties Consulted	19		
No. returned	11	% Response	58
No. Support	3	% Support	27
No. Object	6	% Object	55
No. Undecided	2	% Undecided	18

## All Saints Close, Iwade - Proposed Double Yellow Lines (2nd Consultation)

Response	Support	Object	Comments
1	1		fully support the amended consultation plan
2	1		
3	1		
4	1		
5			Agree with Double and Single yellow lines. Do not agree with times on single yellow lines. Most people work 9-5 and as no funerals take place before 9am, the times should be 9.00 - 17.00
6			This is a better solution but could you look at the times, as it is people would have to go out and move their cars. May be 8.30am - 4.30pm as there will be no funerals before then or after.
7		1	Amended proposal does not help in any way. There is no need for any restrictions, if a dust cart can access fine why can't a hearse? Suggest you meet residents of 24, 26, 28,30 we are going round in circles.
8		1	I work nights and this restriction will be a major inconvenience to my parking as my car is there during these hours. The houses on this estate already struggle. Could the church car park be unlocked and left open to aid the parking?
Total	4	2	

Properties Consulted	19		
No. returned	6	% Response	32
No. Support	4	% Support	67
No. Object	2	% Object	33
No. Undecided	0	% Undecided	0