

Appendix E

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

Letters were distributed to residents of Alfred Road, Church Path, Matthews Close, Middle Deal Road and Sutherland Road for a second time, on the 18/02/2022 and the deadline for responses was the 21/03/2022 2022.

Contents:

Collation of public comments in response to the informal consultation in the above areas.

<u>Road Name</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1. Albert Road	1-2
2. Church Path	2
3. Matthews Close	3-5
4. Middle Deal Road	6-7
5. Sutherland Road	8
6. Summery	9
i) Albert Road	
ii) Church Path	
iii) Matthews Close	
iv) Middle Deal Road	
v) Sutherland Road	

1. Albert Road

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	43 Albert Road	No comments
2	39 Albert Road	No comments

1. Albert Road

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	15 Albert Road	Given the number of houses being close to town and staff of the fire station opposite, it is impossible at times to get parked anywhere near your own house. I really feel this road is desperate for permit parking to be introduced.
2	26 Albert Road	You still allow parking outside 31 – 39 Albert Road, even though spaces are allocated in Quinn's' Estate for all residents . This not only defeats the object it remains a blockage to the flow of traffic and several times during the working day when the crossing gates close it can become gridlocked.

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

		I have not ticked the boxes as I have already stated, I have parking for 5 cars, 3 of these in garages, so I am not implicated.
3	23 Albert Road	No comments
4	9 Albert Road	No comments
5	5 Albert Road	We are applying for a Blue Badge and would require a disabled bay to help my wheelchair using partner.
6	30 Albert Road	Proposed Residents' Parking Scheme - Sutherland Rd., Albert Rd., Church Path, Middle Deal Rd. and Matthews Close, DEAL If a scheme is introduced in neighbouring roads, I would want my road to also be included

2. Church Path

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	22 Church Path	I do not support the scheme. With the cost of living on the rise, asking people to vote on something which may result in extra expenses is wrong. I simply can't afford it.
2	44 Church Path	I attach a response to your letter, if you find it necessary to introduce a permit system in Middle Deal Road, then it would be convenient to have parking available in St Matthews Close Your letter as it confusing and ambiguous. If you ignore residents opinions and go ahead with the permit scheme, then YES, the permit should allow parking in ANY Permit Area. If you decide that a Permit is not required then NO to including Middle Deal Road & Matthews Close in a scheme out in neighbouring roads. Many residents have explained to you that there is not a parking issue in Middle Deal Road or St Matthews Close. Now the lock down has finished, and people are back at work the road is empty with spaces for parking in both roads.
3	55 Church Path	

2. Church Path

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	6 Church Path	We rent a garage off Albert Road accessed by the funeral parlour. We would find the scheme very useful for visitors and for the times we need to leave our car out of the garage for any reason.

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

3. Matthews Close,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	27 Matthews Close	I would not want our road to be included in the proposed parking scheme
2	65 Matthews Close	NO to proposed parking scheme
3	47 Matthews Close	In addition to my previous comments, I do believe in some cases restrictions could result in front gardens becoming hard standing areas for 2 nd and 3 rd vehicles in the household.
4	1 Matthews Close	In response to your further letter of 18 February 2022 asking whether if the scheme was introduced in neighbouring roads, would I want my road to also be included?
5	15 Matthews Close	My answer to the question about inclusion is definitely NO. Recent parking schemes introduced to include Bridgeside, and Astor Drive have resulted in minimal parking in these roads throughout the day, these vehicles just migrating out to neighbouring roads. The roads now mentioned in the above ! Maybe this scheme should've revoked to allow additional parking spaces ! The proposed scheme does not offer any additional parking spaces so will only move the problem to neighbouring roads. How about a free residential permit for those choosing to live in this area and a small charge for visitors to the town for work etc.
6	10 Matthews Close	No, we don't want our road to be included in the scheme proposed. Further Comments We would agree to permits for Matthews Close residents only, to be able to park on the estate as by doing it the way you suggest isn't going to make parking any easier or better for Matthews Close residents and introducing an extra cost at this particular time when people are struggling financially isn't a good idea.
7	1 Matthews Close	In response to your further letter of 18 February 2022 asking whether if the scheme was introduced in neighbouring roads, would I want my road to also be included? My answer is definitely NO

3. Matthews Close,

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	2 Matthews Close	There are often vehicles parked on the street opposite my property. Often, they are unsightly vans or large vehicles

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

		that stay all day/weekend. Cars also partly block my drive on occasion. I welcome this new scheme, Middle Road is a particular problem
2	6 Matthews Close	Cars are constantly parking on double yellow lines opposite the entrance to Matthews Close making it difficult to exit and enter the close, as it forces traffic coming up and down Middle Deal Road, to drive on the wrong side of the road.
3	5 & 7 Matthews Close	I would like to register both my and my wife's support for the proposed resident's parking scheme.
4	22 Matthews Close	I am writing to confirm that I would support the introduction of the residents' parking scheme in Matthews Close, Deal. At the moment cars are often parked on corners in the Close which obstruct the drivers view as to whether a vehicle is approaching in the opposite direction . . . In my opinion this is an accident waiting to happen. I feel the scheme would not only make it easier for residents parking but safer too.
5	23 Matthews Close	Cars parked on both side of the road including corners, many non-residents, giving difficult access to all properties, especially emergency vehicles.
6	30 Matthews Close	No Comments
7	35 Matthews Close	No Comments
8	36 Matthews Close	The sooner the better
9	40 Matthews Close	I thank you sincerely for your communication about the proposed scheme and would overwhelmingly support your scheme. As a former Police Traffic Patrol Officer, I often wonder if the Highway Code has reached Deal!
10	51 Matthews Close	<p>We support the scheme, with provisos, as below ("Other" response) -</p> <p>24/7 permit-controlled waiting restrictions are required in Matthews Close. Emergency vehicles, and residents, have experienced obstructed access to/ from Matthews Close at various times of day and night due to what we understand (from knowledge of our neighbours and fellow residents) to be non-residents parking on both sides of the road in Matthews Close, with insufficient room to allow vehicles to pass. A daytime and weekday only scheme is, therefore, we believe, not fully adequate for Matthews Close.</p> <p>Equally, were restrictions/ permits to be introduced, adequate, alternative parking for non-residents/ non-permit holders must be provided to avoid the obstruction and congestion issues being displaced elsewhere, rather than genuinely and fairly alleviated.</p> <p>For example, extensive on-pavement parking currently evident in Middle Deal Road presents a significant, inconvenient, and potentially hazardous challenge to both road users (obstructed visibility, and transit past parked vehicles) and pavement users alike. For pedestrians, those with impaired sight, range/ stability of movement and/ or</p>

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

		<p>wheelchair/ mobility scooter or those with buggies/ pushchairs are particularly inconvenienced or put at risk. We trust that our feedback is helpful and constructive, and look forward to hearing from you concerning next steps in this important consultation,</p> <p>Further to your later letter dated February 18th, we confirm that we do want our road - Matthews Close - to be included in the Scheme, were it to be introduced in neighbouring roads.</p> <p>Our answer to the question is therefore "YES".</p>
11	53 Matthews Close	We have hard standing parking for 1 car 2. We Park 2 cars regularly in Matthews Close 3. Yes, we would support the introduction of the scheme. We would not want our road to be left out so that it becomes the overflow parking place.
12	59 Matthews Close	No Comments
13	40 Matthews Close	I would say that some work should be done to parking on bends and corners and double yellow lines.
14	36 Matthews Close	A.S.A.P
15	8 Matthews Close	No comments
16	6 Matthews Close	No comments
17	19 Matthews Close	Matthews Close is already used as a car park by some who live in neighbouring roads. If the scheme is only in those roads, it is inevitable that Matthews Close will be used much more – probably so much that parking restrictions would soon be needed to ensure the continued free movement of legitimate traffic. It would be less painful to include the Close in the scheme from the outset. My letter to Dean of 06/01 already elaborates on these issues.
18	22 Matthews Close	No comments
19	38 Matthews Close	No comments
20	18 Matthews Close	The question is ambiguous. No to introducing a parking scheme. Yes to be able to park in Middle Deal Rd. if you forcibly bring in residents parking. Now residents aren't working from home there isn't a parking problem. Just visit during the day you see empty spaces in both roads.
21	?	<p>I do support the proposed scheme for Matthews close, Deal.</p> <p>This email is in response to the letter sent from DDC to my home address.</p>
22	35 Matthews Close	<p>1) If a scheme was introduced in neighbouring roads, would you want your road to also be included?</p> <p>Yes, we would.</p>

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

4. Middle Deal Road,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	24 Middle Deal Road	<p>I object to instituting a residents' parking scheme unless there is direct evidence of its necessity. The pavement outside 26 – 36 Middle Deal Road is parked upon most of the time. Yet directly opposite is a verge between the road and pavement which is never used. Parking on that verge would then leave both pavements clear and traffic flowing. Obstructions on this stretch inhibit the independence of many vulnerable people, especially older or disabled people with visual or mobility impairments; and families with pushchairs are often forced into the road and into oncoming traffic, so it is simply dangerous. Pavement surfaces are not designed to carry the weight of vehicles, so the added maintenance cost of repairing cracked, damaged paving adds an unnecessary financial burden to our already cash-strapped council. Also, the TRO relating to the disabled bay outside 36 Middle Deal Road should perhaps now be abandoned given the family have now moved (see below). You really should come and visit this stretch to see for yourself. I would be happy to accompany you to show you the layout.</p>
2	28 Middle Deal Road	<p>There is parking available during the day. Majority of people are at work.</p>
3	30 Middle Deal Road	<p>In response to your letter dated 18th February regarding the additional question of would I like my road to be part of this scheme. My answer is a resounding "No".</p> <p>No, I do not support the introduction of a residents' parking scheme. For the following reasons:</p> <p>a) In the 7+ years of living in Middle Deal Road, I have always managed to find a parking space.</p> <p>b) The proposed extent of parking bays on Middle Deal Road between 22-26 have not taken into account 2 dropped curbs and the width of the road at this point if parking bays are put there. Unless this road is made one way, then traffic will not be able to pass each other. No HGV would be able to get through. You now have less spaces than you think you do.</p> <p>c) I do not wish to have the expense of "purchasing a permit" when parking is not really an issue. This is just another tax on the motorist.</p> <p>d) No doubt the majority of residents in Matthews Close will support this scheme as they all have driveways/garages unless they have multiple cars of course.</p> <p>e) The parking issue on Middle Deal Road is down to Church Path residents having nowhere to park. They cannot even</p>

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

		drive on their own road. That is down to poor decision making by your own housing planning department. f) This scheme doesn't take into consideration family and friends who come to visit for more than 2 hours within the limited waiting restriction.
4	37 Middle Deal Road	Because there is no guarantee of a parking space. So, paying for a permit not to be able to park is not viable. No mention of cost. Church Path residents, like us in M.D.R. (Middle Deal Road), have managed for many years without a permit. It would be more helpful to remove some double yellow lines on southside outside No's 23-29 inclusive, this used to protect a bus stop, long since gone.
5	39 Middle Deal Road	I can usually park and the scheme doesn't guarantee a space, so what would I be paying for?
6	73 Middle Deal Road	The main problem is when people come home from work in the evening. Permits won't help.
7	52 Middle Deal Road	Too many cars parked in road. Emergency Ambulance and fire service would not be able to get up the road in a rush & nothing to stop people parking on the pavements.
8	34 Middle Deal Road	There is no parking issue in Middle Deal Road. DDC is proposing to charge us for parking where we park anyway with no guarantee that more space will become available - I oppose any change.
9	35 Middle Deal Road	No comments.

4. Middle Deal Road,

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	53 Middle Deal Road	Too many cars parked in road. Emergency ambulance services and fire would not be able to get up the road in a rush.
2	71 Middle Deal Road	We support the introduction of a parking permit scheme specifically only for Middle Deal Road, Sutherland Road, Albert Road, Church Paths and Matthews Close. However, <u>if the scheme for these roads (including our own) isn't approved, then WE WOULD be supportive of our road being included in the scheme of neighbouring roads instead.</u> I trust I have explained this clearly, but please let us know if more detail is required.
3	55 Middle Deal Road	Please just don't make this applicable midweek; car parking in Middle Deal Road is absolutely awful at weekends. For us to leave our own property is difficult because of cars parked on both sides of our drive.
4	73 Middle Deal Road	My reply to the question 'If a scheme was introduced in neighbouring roads, would you want your road to also be included?' is YES..... This reply is ONLY if the scheme is introduced in Sutherland Road, Albert Road, Church Path and Matthews Close

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

5. Sutherland Road,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	8 Sutherland Road	I only want residents parking permits to be for Sutherland Road residents. There aren't enough spaces otherwise and the lack of spaces will become worse than it currently is.
2	10 Sutherland Road	No comments

5. Sutherland Road,

Fore-

No.	Resident	feedback
1	26 Sutherland Road	There is limited parking space in Sutherland Road. A residents parking scheme needs to be introduced to reduce parking by non-residents.
2	15 Sutherland Road	Thank you for explaining the question when I phoned.
3	3 Sutherland Road	The sooner this is in operation the better. The refuse lorries, ambulance, fire engines will then be able to have free access.
4	17 Sutherland Road	No comments
5	6 Sutherland Road	Very long overdue
6	14 Sutherland Road	I strongly agree that if a parking scheme is introduced in neighbouring roads Sutherland should be included. We have numerous drop curbs as well as two households that use their front gardens for parking but have to cross the pavement for access. Sutherland is a cul de sac with a Church at the end .Parking is normally done on one side except at the entrance. Parking is then on the pavement both sides. Vehicles are parked by owners using the train station, residents of Albert Rd and Church Path .We also have a Disabled Parking Bay. It's a crowded road area. I have concerns for the safety of pavement users with the current situation of Parking in Sutherland Road.
7	11 Sutherland Road	I WOULD WANT MY ROAD TO BE INCLUDED IF THE SCHEME WAS INTRODUCED IN NEIGHBOURING ROADS.
8	13 Sutherland Road	No comments
9	26 Sutherland Road	There is limited parking space in Sutherland Road, so a residents parking scheme needs to be introduced in order to reduce parking by non – residents.

Collation of public comments in response to consultation for the extension to the existing residents Zone P parking scheme.

Summary

i) Albert Road,

Against	2
Fore	6

ii) Church Path

Against	3
Fore	1

iii) Matthews Close

Against	7
Fore	22

iv) Middle Deal Road

Against	9
Fore	4

v) Sutherland Road

Against	2
Fore	9

TOTALS

Against – 23

Fore - 42