| Road          |   | Comments   | Response  |
|---------------|---|--|---|
| AUBRETIA WALK | 1 | Remove some of the kerbing on north side of Fairview Road to provide additional parking and charge for permits   | Funding would need to be sourced for any works, and require consent of KCC Highways. Would need to determine whether land is Public Highway. Also many vehicle accesses off of Fairview Road which would need to remain clear   |
|               | 2 | Not prepared to pay for parking outside my own property, parking is not a major issue and permits would not work around here   | Introduction of Residents Parking Scheme would require majority support from residents, and would be subject to permit charges as in other areas  |
|               | 3 | Cars and lorries park on pavement and double yellow lines causing me to have to go on the road to get by   | Comments around parking on existing waiting restrictions will be passed to Parking Enforcement Team. Particular issues of obstruction caused by vehicles parking on footway should be reported to the Police  |
|               | 4 | Section of Fairview Road from Chilton Avenue to t-<br>junction is inaccessible to large vehicles including<br>emergency services. Needs double yellow lines down one<br>side | Some corner protection measures in the form of double yellow lines have previously been introduced along this section of Fairview Road, including double yellow lines on one side where the road bends. There needs to be a balance on the amount of restrictions introduced against the needs of residents to park on-street |
|               | 5 | Time limit for visitors to the estate. Suggest small section of road set aside for doctors surgery on a short stay basis at rear of surgery                                  | Any time limited restrictions would apply to both residents and visitors and may not receive a high level of support from residents. A minimum carriageway width of 5.8 metres would be required to install parking bays allowing clearance for emergency vehicles  |

| Road          |   | Comments  | Response   |
|---------------|---|---|--|
| EAST STREET   | 1 | The people parking to the rear are all people coming into town to work and want to avoid parking for parking, to be fair these are predominately Council employees  | Council employees are given permits to park in some SBC car parks but as these can be a substantial distance from the Council Offices, for example Cockleshell Walk Car Park, some employees will park in surrounding roads. The Council does not have any powers to control where staff park, and with limited staff parking there are no closer options  |
|               | 2 | I have to park at the rear of my shop. We have 3 cars approximately. Most cars that park there are Council cars. What you have got to understand is where do shop keepers park? The car park in East Street which is for Council workers is always empty, doesn't that say something?   | Any Residents Parking Scheme would allow for a maximum of 2 cars to be parked from each property at a given time.  Specific staff permits are required to park in the East Street Council car park and only a limited number of permits are issued by the Parking Section  |
|               | 3 | The Chestnut Surgery has 7 off road parking spaces, however we have a further 10 staff here at any one time and need to park at the rear of the surgery in Fairview Road. Also many of our patients need to park in the rear as the parking restriction of 20 minutes on East Street is not long enough for the average appointment | As above, a Permit Scheme would only allow a maximum of 2 cars for each property, which would not help staff at the surgery. Limited waiting bays have been suggested for the rear of the surgery, but these would need to be in excess of the 20 minute limit in East Street to assist patients. As stated above, a minimum carriageway width of 5.8 metres would be required to install parking bays |
| FAIRVIEW ROAD | 1 | The problem has unavoidably been exacerbated during daylight hours by the ongoing building works, but I do feel residents permits are the way forward   | Situation should improve on completion of building works. Residents Permit Scheme would require majority support from households and will reduce on-street parking capacity due to the minimum road widths required to install parking bays  |
|               | 2 | Fire engines, delivery vehicles, refuse collections cannot get down road. Cars have been damaged by heavy lorries   | Kent Fire and Rescue have reported that at times they experience difficulties negotiating parked cars on the s-bend in Fairview Road, and we are currently in discussion with them on possibly installing a short section of additional double yellow lines  |

| Road          |   | Comments  | Response   |
|---------------|---|---|--|
| FAIRVIEW ROAD | 3 | Despite there being yellow lines in certain areas, people still park on them as there seems to be a lack of policing. We oppose the introduction of permits   | Comments around enforcement of existing restrictions will be reported to the Parking Operations Team with a view to increasing enforcement in the area   |
|               | 4 | Double yellow lines in the area, cars still park over them. We do not want parking permits, it will not help the situation  | As above   |
|               | 5 | What guarantee do permit holders have to get a parking space beside their house? How is this going to be policed? Non-permit parking 2 to 4 hours is very obscure. Most of SBC workers are flexi, it will still be congested. SBC workers have badges on their windscreens. Will that allow them to park anywhere without restrictions? If so then this is a complete waste of time | A Residents Parking Scheme cannot guarantee that permit holders will be able to park outside of their properties, or indeed within the permit area, it merely limits the amount of time non-permit holders can park during the scheme operating times. Any scheme would be policed by Swale's Parking Enforcement Officers. The exact details of the amount of time non-permit holders could park would be confirmed through further consultation if majority support was received. SBC employees have permits to park in specified car parks, this would not make them exempt from the restrictions in a Residents Parking Scheme |
|               | 6 | I haven't a car but drivers of large vehicles are always knocking on my door asking if I know who a car belongs to as they can't get through  | We are currently in discussion with Kent Fire and Rescue over any possible amendments to existing double yellow lines  |
|               | 7 | When Planning Permission for more flats is granted I don't consider enough residential parking for occupants is provided.   | Planning consent does follow Government guidelines for off-<br>street parking provision but in many cases new<br>developments invariably leads to an increase in on-street<br>parking.   |

| Road          |    | Comments   | Response   |
|---------------|----|--|--|
| FAIRVIEW ROAD | 8  | Off street parking no longer size for modern cars. We regularly need disabled access to vehicle at front of house, but can't get vehicle close enough. Non residents use most of the available places. Continuous building of flats on East Street adds to problem. Council workers park here  | Suggest that consideration is made to applying for Disabled Persons Parking Bay  |
|               | 9  | Several vehicles have been damaged due to so many large vehicles going to building works. Cars park here whether it's 2 hours or all day. As soon as a car leaves a space another one fills it. If double yellow lines went all down one side of road it would prevent vehicle damage and provide safer access but would create more parking problems. No magic solution | Comments suggest that there is a regular turnover of parked vehicles as well as all day parking. Residents Parking Scheme would not prevent shorter term parking by non residents. Double yellow lines down one side of the road would improve access but as stated would also create more parking problems as on street parking capacity would be greatly reduced |
|               | 10 | Fairview Road, Heather Close and Lavender Court should be for residents only but not with residents parking scheme charges   | Residents Parking Schemes carry an annual charge for parking permits to provide increased revenue to cover the required level of enforcement of such a scheme  |
| HEATHER CLOSE | 1  | I work in ****** (East Street business) and find I've nowhere to park in the week. Saturdays there are many parking spaces which I'm sorry to say means the spaces are being taken up by Council workers. People who live and work in East Street/Fairview is where we have to park, not Council workers   | As previously stated, there is nothing the Council can do to regulate where their staff park and any allocated parking can be a considerable distance from Swale House   |
|               | 2  | Cars are being parked behind other cars in the cul-de-sac, blocking cars from getting out  | Any issues with parked vehicles causing obstruction should be reported to the Police   |

| Road          |   | Comments   | Response  |
|---------------|---|--|---|
| HEATHER CLOSE | 3 | I do not agree with residents paying to park in their own road. Also had there not been so many flats built in Fairview Road the parking might not be so bad   | As above regarding necessity to charge for Residents Permits and also minimum off-street parking requirements for new developments  |
|               | 4 | Garage too small for vehicle. Being nearest free parking to the High Street and new properties built in and behind East Street, we feel that a Residents Parking Scheme is now essential.  | Majority support from residents would be required to implement Residents Parking Scheme   |
|               | 5 | I do question why some vehicles with SBC parking display have to park in this close. If I do have a parking permit will be they be regularly checked and endorsed correctly?   | As above regarding proximity of available allocated parking for SBC staff. Any Residents Parking Scheme would be enforced   |
|               | 6 | Issues around losing space when dropping children to school and space being taken up with mainly Council workers. Have to carry children from Chilton Avenue after picking them up from school. Do not mind public parking out on the road too much, it's when they park in our cul-de-sac that really annoys me. What would help also in our cul-de-sac would be painted parking spaces as a lot of the visitors, commuters and Council staff park in the middle of 2 potential spaces meaning less people can park in our cul-de-sac | As cul-de-sac is part of the Public Highway spaces are not reserved for householders. Will investigate possible marking of parking spaces, subject to funding, although in some cases the marking of bays can reduce available parking due to need to mark a minimum space width. Any bays marked would be advisory only and would be unenforceable |
|               | 7 | Unable to park between 9am and 5.50pm, if use car for any trip often unable to move car in day as blocked in, 6 people parking in middle of road   | Any vehicles parked in such a way as to cause an obstruction should be reported to the Police   |

| Road           |   | Comments  | Response  |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| LAVENDER COURT | 1 | When you have workers at Swale House who have parking permits for town car parks displayed on their windscreen who decide to park in Fairview Road, this then has a knock on effect for residents in this area, but as Fairview Road is nearer than Cockleshell Walk and St. Michaels car park is closer then why issue them with permits. Sort your staff out please. There is always at least 4-6 cars most days of the week here | As previously stated, there is nothing the Council can do to regulate where their staff park and any allocated parking can be a considerable distance from Swale House  |
|                | 2 | As the problem is during the day I don't see that permit parking will help. Doctor's staff use the court as a car park and visitors to the doctor's and Aldi's park constantly all day  | The introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme would not help solve the problem of short term parking as non-permit holders would still be able to park for a certain amount of time as the resident states   |
|                | 3 | No problem overnight and weekends lots of spaces.  Daytime even more space to park so no need for residents parking scheme. Today Friday 16 cars parked 5 spaces left at 1pm  | Comments noted  |
|                | 4 | At 9am it's like Piccadilly with commuters trying to find a space. I wonder if emergency vehicles could get through? People that live in East Street and further afield also park here for days on end. Permits please  | As stated previously, we are in discussion with Kent Fire and Rescue regarding any issues with access   |
|                | 5 | I do not have a car but do have a blue badge and rely on family visiting on a daily basis. What happens in this situation   | Generally, during the hours of a Residents Parking Scheme visitors would only be allowed to park for a limited time unless they purchase visitor permits. Blue badge holders are entitled to park on waiting restrictions for up to 3 hours as long as they do not cause an obstruction |
|                | 6 | Parking is also an issue at daytime weekends, during these times I try to avoid moving the car and going out as I know I'll have nowhere to park when I get back  | Residents Parking Schemes can be effective during their operating periods but the scheme does not operate on Sundays so would not assist then   |