

## COMMENTS FROM OBJECTORS:

- Already difficult enough to park in Priory Grove. As Priory Grove is flat and a cul-de-sac it is incredibly popular for non-permit holders to park. If Priory Grove is the same as Priory Hill, all persons will park here making parking impossible. As permit zone in Priory Grove ends at 15.30 hours most non-Grove residents park in here. This will be massively exacerbated by most of Dover becoming one zone. I feel this is purely so the Council can create revenue as their car parks are not utilised. I fully protest Priory Grove becoming the same zone as Priory Hill and all the other bits that have been added to the gargantuan zone M. Please leave Priory Grove alone and increase the frequency of the wardens attending.
- It will severely impact the ability to park in Priory Grove and for my family to park when they visit and buy day permits.
- There is no problem with the parking arrangements in Priory Hill. Yes, when residents leave for work in the morning owners, managers and employees of close by shops and businesses use the vacated space. This arrangement works very well. If there is a problem it is not on the lower and middle section of Priory Hill. Any 'problem' is not the parking but safe access through the narrow section of the road running along the top section of Priory Hill. This is a totally separate issue and acknowledged by your proposed modifications. Approximately 50% of the residents of upper Priory Hill have off road parking I understand their issue is access due to the narrowness of the road. By removing entirely the narrow shave of pavement at the southern edge of the road would greatly improve pedestrian safety. Residents parking was proposed some years ago by DDC, which residents and local businesses robustly opposed by petition. I have spoken to a number of neighbours in the lower and middle end of the road and also to local business owners. There is no majority who desire a change to the existing arrangements.
- This does not alleviate the problem but only makes things worse especially for those that have more than one car per household. Where are people meant to park if someone else is occupying the space? Miles away from the house isn't practical for families with young children or the elderly carrying shopping. From the drawing there does not seem to be enough spaces anyway. Not only this, there isn't space for visiting family either which causes an issue.
- No, same answer to all other times you tried to introduce.
- No, due to lack of parking space on your plan. When DDC gave permission for 30 Priory Hill to create three flats this suggested the possibility of three more vehicles outside this dwelling. If each dwelling along Priory Hill has one plus vehicles, your proposed plan does not provide sufficient parking for everyone. If I can't park outside my own garage to offload my weekly shopping I shall struggle. I cannot afford resident/visitor fees as I'm on a low income. As DDC set the precedent for number 30 becoming flats it is now possible other dwellings will follow suit. What does that suggest to you?
- The situation seems as yet to be equitable + works.
- It is far too restrictive. The proposed layout would make it dangerous by facilitating speeding vehicles.
- I only park across my garage if I put it outside to clean it. I will get a ticket. The Council has too much power at the moment. Can't they let people live without interfering.
- Unnecessary regulation. Parking is adequate in this part of the street. Most houses have garages including ours but ours is not marked on the map of the proposed scheme. Scheme will make parking worse not better from 36 to 60 Priory Hill.

- I prefer the status quo and I do not wish for my guests to have to pay for parking. My friends come to me for lunch - two hours is not enough. We need to be tolerant and flexible. The High Street shops suffer from lack of customers – we should make their parking impossible. Too many double yellow lines just invite drivers to break the law.
- We strongly object to double yellow lines being put in front of residents' homes, garages and driveways. It would also reduce the amount of parking currently available.
- I am in favour of residents parking but not this scheme. This is because you remove parking opposite my house completely. I am also opposed to two-hour parking for non-residents. Putting double yellow lines on both sides between numbers 48 and 54 will severely reduce the availability of parking. I will be forced to park further up the road and my car will not be in sight of my house. I see no reason for this as the road is no narrower and there are no garages or they are not in use to park cars. You will reduce the parking for residents and at the same time nuisance parking of small lorries (a frequent event) will still happen as from 3pm to 11am non-resident parking will be possible.
- I do not see how it will make the parking situation any better. It will make it worse for other residents; not being able to park outside their own premises.
- The proposals will not help the situation. The two-hour parking window would make parking still difficult with limited parking spaces. This would be a financial burden for our residents.
- I feel this scheme covers too great an area and will not provide enough permit parking for any visitors who may have difficulty walking any distance.
- The number of parking spaces would drastically reduce under this proposal. I do not wish to pay for a space for my daughter's car yet not be able to park due to the public using two-hour parking spaces. I do not want double yellow lines in front of my driveway as I need to load/unload and my guests could no park there.
- Although it would deter people from parking in the road before travelling by train this proposal has huge flaws. The homes in Priory Hill and Priory Grove are mostly large properties with four to six bedrooms. Older families including ours, often have three cars through necessity (five adults in our house). Where would we be able to park? There is not even enough proposed parking for two cars in our road. Lots of houses don't have garages. Most don't have drives. This proposal will not even facilitate two cars per household as there are too many yellow lines. Although it is problematic at times I feel that it will be worse if you implement residents' parking. There is nowhere near enough proposed parking space and for our third car there is simply no other option whatsoever. Why are people living in nearby streets parking in Priory Hill? Because there is sadly not enough space in their own roads. If it has to go ahead I suggest that some of the double yellow lines marked on the map please be considered again. These areas are currently parked on with absolutely no problems and without hindrance to emergency vehicles.
- I have two baby children and it's hard enough to park outside my house as it is. You cannot guarantee me a space outside my home and your proposal will make matters worse and you will charge me for the pleasure. This is nothing but a money making scheme at the cost of the residents which does nothing to improve the situation on Priory Hill and only causes further problems.
- Do not see why we should have to pay to park outside our own house in a residential street. Scheme still doesn't we can park outside or even near our own houses.
- I strongly believe it will make matters worse.
- The double yellow line extends much further down the road both opposite and outside my house. This is going to restrict the amount of available parking to everyone and it's

not necessary. The proposed scheme is active on a Saturday which means that if I have family around on a Saturday they are restricted to parking for two hours, using a visitor's permit or parking on The Abbots. As there would be considerably less overall parking available it is unlikely that our visitors would be able to find a space near our house. The resident's permits have a cost associated with them and a level of administration. We don't wish for additional stress and worry in our lives.

- We can park on Priory Hill 100% of the time. The situation may be helped by opening extra car parking at Priory Station. The proposal for double yellow lines in certain places on Priory Hill may restrict residents parking.
- Won't work, who's going to police the parking? Not good when relatives visit – our son comes almost every day. He does shopping for us as we are pensioners without a car and don't agree having to pay for workmen to park if we need anything done to our home. Ridiculous!
- There is ample parking space on the street. We have never been unable to park close to our house. As we do not currently have an issue with parking, paying to be able to do so is unreasonable and extortionate.
- No problem with parking.
- We don't generally have a problem, if we can't park outside our property we can always find a space in the same area. This is an attempt to screw residents out of more money by the Council. We are pensioners, we don't need it! Since moving to Dover we've not had any problems parking in Priory Hill.
- I will not pay to park outside my own house as space would not be guaranteed even with a permit. My husband does shift work so due to times (8.30 to 5.30) he wouldn't be able to park.

#### COMMENTS FROM SUPPORTERS AND OTHERS:

- I would prefer costs of visitor permits to be much higher, or number restricted, as £2 per day will not deter those who rent out rooms through holiday letting companies. I am unable to create off-street parking space so should have free pass to compensate. Visitor passes allocated for one week at a time with reg number linked + checked against household for excessive use of day passes.
- 2 permits only would not work for us as we have three cars. Would restricting parking during certain hours work just as well. Does not seem enough parking bays for residents on proposal.
- More thought needed. This will not alleviate the problem. To add to the problem of parking on the pavement, forcing school children, those with prams or disabled buggies to use the road, we have a commercial vehicle parked here every night. Non-residents will still be able to park from 15:30 – 10:30. I don't understand the reason for no parking both sides from No.54 – 46? Also, to allow parking both sides from No 91 – 119.
- We cautiously support the scheme hoping that it will resolve: a) Regular parking of lorries overnight by one particular non-resident; b) Vehicles parking over the pavement and blocking footways for people with buggies or wheelchairs forcing them into the road; c) Vehicles parked on both sides making access for emergency vehicles, bin lorries difficult (although we note there is still proposed parking on both sides of the road on the south western end of Priory Hill); d) Dumping of abandoned vehicles.
- Both of us are disabled we are very concerned if we cannot park outside our house. Please may we have a disabled bay.

- Priory Hill No.s 2 to 76 and Priory Grove tend to only experience parking issues during the proposed restricted hours. Many of the properties have a garage or hard standing so will avoid paying for a permit anyway. From 76 to 129 we have the same problems as the lower end but which continue outside the proposed hours from people in Tower Hill, North Road and Tower Street so these people will continue to clog up the street and not be paying for the pleasure. It needs a full restriction of 24 hours or is pointless and unfair.
- The Abbots is not included in the scheme so parking will become chaotic in the close. Please include The Abbots in your proposal.
- We very much appreciate the scheme. Thank you.
- We point out that some non-residents park for a lot longer than the “bulk of the working day” (many parked for 1 to 3 weeks).
- We have been waiting for permit parking for over ten years as business and estate agents park cars all day leaving no room for our cars.
- About time!
- Although I do not possess a car I do have relatives and friends who do and who visit and sometimes stay overnight and weekends. They find parking difficult and I therefore support the scheme.
- We do have a drive but it is constantly partially obstructed by people parking over and blocking it
- Long overdue, much needed. It will improve the area significantly and will assist the passage of service vehicles and reduce parking on the footpaths. There is a lorry driver who parks on the pavement every day (this does not help pedestrians and disabled).
- As things stand you can't walk on the pavement on Priory Hill because of parked cars, you are forced to walk on the road which is extremely dangerous. Also, it must be extremely difficult for emergency vehicles to gain full access along Priory Hill because of the parked cars.
- Double parking allowed at narrow end of Priory Hill seems stupid. Who is going to police this area once parking in situ? £60 per resident parking seems expensive. Restrictions are required but not sure this will work.
- Priory Hill is increasingly used by people parking their cars to then go to Dover Priory Station and pop in to Dover Town Centre (for free) making the road congested with parked cars.
- Concerned about proposal with yellow lines on both side of the road outside No.s 48 – 56 Priory Hill. Not all properties have hard standing/garages so no ability to park at all.
- I feel this is a good idea. Will consideration be given to additional cars owned by households? Presumably towing will be more common than now.
- The parking has become much worse over the last few years. Cars parking on pavements is also restricting access to pedestrians who have to move in to the road – especially parents with pushchairs.
- This is long overdue, I have lived here since 1981 and the parking issue has got increasingly worse – particularly pavement parking. I regularly have to move my car from outside my house to allow services (e.g. dust cart) to pass through.
- We would welcome it. As parents to a young child not being able to park outside or close to our home is very difficult for us especially if we are on our own (perhaps parent and child spaces should be available like disabled for a fee of course 😊).