

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 on the 13th December 2021 and the deadline for responses was the 24th January 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	1-3
2. Church Path	3-5
3. Matthews Close	5-12
4. Middle Deal Road	12-14
5. Sutherland Road	14-15
6. Summery	16
i) Albert Road	
ii) Church Path	
iii) Matthews Close	
iv) Middle Deal Road	
v) Sutherland Road	

1. Albert Road

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	20 Albert Road	I have off-street parking but when friends visit, they have to find alternative parking. I don't really want to buy a permit for occasional use (depending on the price).
2	32B Albert Road	I think it would be mean and unfair. People should be able to park for free in Deal.
3	41 Albert Road	Having your letter about the proposed expansion of Permit P parking in Deal I would like it noted that object to this move. My section of Albert Road has been asking to be included in the Permit scheme but was always declined, I'm talking about the terrace 27 - 65 Albert Road all the rest of Albert Road were allowed permits, but we were not. We were told that parking would be given to us when the Quinn building started in the form of a residents car park with our own permits and after years of waiting, this year we were finally given that concession. Now it would seem that Dover Council seems want to take that away from us.

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

		We have been treated like the 2nd class citizens for years, our road is flooded on a regular basis caused by the management of DDC, KCC, Southern Water and the Environment Agency.
4	49 Albert Road	The proposal is unnecessary and there is plenty of parking for everyone. No need to restrict people who commute. Please, whatever you do, do not create a permit system, making parking excludable is a bad idea and just pushes the issue elsewhere.
5	The Old Bake House, Albert Road	We are a small business in Albert Road, Deal. 3 Staff, where can we park? There does not seem to be a parking scheme to park nearby.

1. Albert Road

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	7 Albert Road	No Comments
2	9 Albert Road	No Comments
3	10 Albert Road	I whole heartedly support the scheme however it doesn't go far enough in the restriction to non-residents in terms on the duration. The duration should be limited to 1 hour parking and non-return within 4 hours. Restricting non-residents to just one hour will prevent the non-residents that utilise these spaces and then go shopping in Deal town centre. Two hours is too much as its gives them time to walk into the town centre, do their shopping, have a coffee, and also return to their vehicles, thus preventing residents parking near their homes. Limiting the duration would prevent this unwelcome phenomenon that we see.
4	11 Albert Road	No Comments
5	15 Albert Road	I am very pleased to know that this is being considered. Parking is becoming a real problem in this road and surrounding streets, often used for people working at the fire station and those working in the town centre
6	22 Albert Road	No Comments
7	23 Albert Road	Would like to know how much residents parking will cost per vehicle? Would we be able to buy parking tickets for visitors?
8	30 Albert Road	I am writing to say I approve of your intended parking plan for Zone P - which will be extended to include Sutherland Rd., Albert Rd., Church Path, Middle Deal Road. and Matthews Close.
9	33 Albert Road	No Comments
10	37 Albert Road	I have lived in Albert Road for 6 years and applied for a parking permit and was surprised this was not in place. My biggest bug is that I can't off load or park with shopping as the spaces outside my house are full of vehicles from Nolan's Gardens on the corner of Middle Deal Road and the Hair

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

		Gallery clients. This is daily occurrence, and they take all the spaces day in and out. I believe a residents parking permit is well overdue. I hope this is helpful.
11	40 Albert Road	No Comments
12	46 Albert Road	There are two vehicles on this site with three garages. Off street parking. N/A
13	68 Albert Road	It seems to work in Bridgeside near me.

2. Church Path

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	3 Church Path	Imposes two-hour restriction over too large an area. Don't believe the scale of non-residents parking affects such a large area. A lot of people will be expected to purchase parking permits, at a time when finances are not in abundance. Forcing residents to have to buy a permit to park near their home.
2	20 Church Path	I have family that visit from London & friends and need to park. Also, workmen need to park, and it is very hard for them, if there is no long-term parking, (Some of the words are difficult to read or make sense of)
3	34 Church Path	I do not support the proposed scheme. I do not believe there is a massive problem with working people/ people using the town parking in the area. There's just limited parking places for the houses that surround the area, especially when a lot of households have two cars - the proposed parking scheme will not fix this. We are on the pedestrianised bit of church path so we normally park on middle deal road or Mathews close and can always find a spot.
4	40 Church Path	Parking in the daytime between the hours of 8.30am & 5.30pm Mon – Fri is not the problem. It would make more sense too everybody to get rid of the double yellow lines in Middle Deal Road and surrounding roads.
5	42 Church Path	As a 78-year-old pensioner living in Church Path with no parking facilities, I rely on my son and grandchild parking in Middle Deal Road when they visit from Cambridge and need to stay overnight. I also have friends and family come to stay. If there is no parking nearby, my life will become very lonely. I ask you to consider everyone when you make your decision. Life is difficult and lonely already, these arrangements will only add to that.

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

6	44 Church Path	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 23rd December 2021, which starts we are aware that there are some issues with non-residents regularly park using the roads in your neighbourhood. I strongly disagree with your opening sentence. My property is in Church Path, which doesn't have parking and I never had an issue parking during the day or in the evening.</p> <p>To introduce a parking scheme because you believe there is a problem is simply not true.</p> <p>Secondly, I see this as an unnecessary additional cost to home owners, at a time when most people are financially struggling due to price increases, because of the pandemic. According to your website the cost is £425/year</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you after the closing date for the survey.</p>
7	55 Church Path	<p>I do not have off street parking or a garage, therefore nowhere for friends or family to park when visiting. Most residents on The Grove/ Sutherland Road, have off street parking, whereas we, on Church Path have neither. Friends & family would have very limited stays when visiting us, whereas residents with off road, can get friends to park there and move own car with permits on to the road. I have only the choice of parking on road & family for 2 hours that day!</p>

2. Church Path

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	1 Church Path	If it means that were eligible for a parking permit, then yes.
2	6 Church Path	We have 1 car, we which we park in a rented garage off Albert Road, access next to Cavell's Funeral Parlour. If we take up this facility, it would enable us to park our car on the road and any visiting car in the garage.
3	9 Church Path	As a long-time owner of a house, 9 Church Path, Deal, I welcome the possibility of being able to park nearer the property without moving the car after a few hours. I have enquired to obtain a permit for Bridgeside which would be ideal for the position of the house currently, but do not fit the criteria. I do not have a garage or off-street parking and there are regularly two cars in our household. I would support the introduction of residents parking permits in the Sutherland Road, Albert Road, Church Path, Middle Deal Road and Matthews Close area.
4	24 Church path	<p>1 we have no off-street parking.</p> <p>2 we have one vehicle.</p> <p>3 we would like to say YES TO THE RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME.</p>

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

5	25 Church Path	No Comments
6	31 Church Path	Hopefully, any charge will be low, just enough to cover council admin costs. Would residents receive visitor parking permits for friends/family/contractors?
7	36 Church Path	What about parking for visitors? Would they be able to purchase a temporary permit
8	52 Church Path	In Middle Deal Road and surrounding areas, if white lines were painted on to the road as a guide, (as in Bridgeside), it would also help with local parking, stopping one car taking up two spaces
9	64 Church Path	As there is no road along this part of Church Path, we have to park in Sutherland Road. I agree to the proposal providing it doesn't result in any reduction in spaces for parking.

3. Matthews Close,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	1 Matthews Close	<p>Taking all your proposals into account and giving them very careful consideration, I would have to object to part of this proposal</p> <p>I reside in Matthews Close, literally at its entrance and I have honestly felt the real problems on a regular basis of cars and regularly very large vans, or lorries parked opposite my house. I fully appreciate the parking problem and accept the need for one to park where they can when not having access to a garage or hard standing area on their property.</p> <p>The expansion of Parking Zone P will inevitably force some residents in Matthews Close to have to pay for permits between £30 - £150 and having to pay a further £30 for a book of ten temporary parking permits for any visitors or family followed by a further £30 when these run out</p> <p>The total parking availability will inevitably be severely reduced, unsightly yellow and white road markings, grey posts throughout and restriction signs</p> <p>For me personally and which I can prove with evidence, have had to contact the Police on more than one occasion where large vehicles park directly opposite my driver or 'even' just next to my garage hardstanding leaving me unable to reverse when called out at night. I am a Community Midwife regularly on call 2 or 3 nights a week for emergencies and homebirths. Certainly, more recently I have been forced to park on Middle Deal Road, on double yellow lines at night when I know I will be called out on that particular night. This I am aware is an abuse of my Community Business Parking Permit with yourselves, but I feel I do not have any choice as it could otherwise put my</p>

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

		<p>mothers and unborn babies at risk when time is of the essence to get to them as fast as possible</p> <p>Although I strongly disagree with this proposal (and not just for my own personal reasons) I am sure you will proceed with it</p>
2	3 Matthews Close	95 percent of vehicles that park in the road, are from that road that would be affected.
3	10 Matthews Close	You are penalising the residents of Matthews Close by joining our close within Zone P and not dealing with the problems
4	13 Matthews Close	<p>We do not support the introduction of the residents' parking scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •We have never had any issues with parking in Matthews Close at any time of the day or night in the 17 years that we've lived here. •The parking capacity within Matthews Close would undoubtedly be greatly reduced by the introduction of parking bays and would turn something that isn't currently an issue into an issue. •The introduction of a parking scheme would ruin the aesthetics of Matthews Close. It would lose its current open, uncluttered look with the addition of double yellow lines, parking bays, and numerous signs needed to display the information to those parking here. It would invariably also result in the loss of the open front gardens in Matthew Close, as it would force people like ourselves to have to turn the front garden into paved parking areas. Environmentally, this would result in a loss of a large amount of green space. •If the number of parking spaces in the surrounding roads, namely Middle Deal Road, Church Path, Sutherland Road and Albert Road, is reduced due to the introduction of designated parking bays, it will invariably lead to greater congestion and number of cars trying to park in Matthews Close. •Reduced parking capacity and the introduction of permits will force people to park away from their homes and make parking/congestion worse in adjacent roads such as Church Lane, Southwall Road, The Grove, Middle Deal Road (past Southwall Road) and London Road. •If this scheme were to be implemented, we would see the necessity to purchase a parking permit as simply a money-making exercise for the local council. If you like, a stealth tax on local residents. •In summary, ultimately, this proposed parking scheme is totally unnecessary for Matthews Close, as we have no significant issues with parking. Any scheme will be of zero benefit and only serve to make the situation significantly worse.
5	15 Matthews Close	Thank you for the letter explaining the proposed extension to residential parking to include Matthews Close.

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

		<p>May I please put forward my objection for this to take place.</p> <p>Yes, we have some parking issues within the Close but with the proposal of possibly only 25 in the new allocation I feel this will not help or indeed solve the situation.</p> <p>The new yellow and white road markings along with the new grey posts and restrictions signs will be an unsightly addition to the Close.</p> <p>The temptation for people to change their front gardens over to concrete parking areas surely goes against the Council's green policy.</p>
6	15 Matthews Close (A)	<p>I am emailing to confirm that I am NOT in support of the proposed parking scheme for Matthews Close.</p> <p>This proposed scheme would not help the parking issues in our Close and residents would be struggling to park as the available spaces would be considerably reduced.</p> <p>The main problem at present is that vehicles are parking on the bends and therefore vision when driving in to the close is very dangerous. Maybe double yellow lines on these bends would help the situation.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces that would be created would not be enough for the amount of cars that residents for the proposed 5 streets in this scheme need.</p> <p>Similar parking restriction scheme introduced into Bridgeside, and Astor Drive have resulted in these roads being vacant of cars parking, only pushing the cars further afield.</p> <p>Would this then lead to residents converting their front gardens in to car parking spaces, not helping environmental policies.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing that this scheme will be turned down. Resident for over 34 years.</p>
7	17 Matthews Close	<p>After much deliberation, my wife and I have decided to vote against the proposal.</p>
8	18 Matthews Close	<p>I do have a driveway which I park on.</p> <p>I am not in support of your proposal for introducing a residents parking scheme in our road. I strongly object to it. I am perfectly happy with the current arrangement and feel that you will create a much larger parking problem if you introduce your proposal. There is not a problem with parking in our road, it does not matter if people from a different road park in our road as there are spaces and I am aware that other road have very few parking places and it is not their fault. If you develop parking bays, there will be much fewer spaces to park, and you will create a problem with people constantly driving around looking for available spaces.</p> <p>In this economic climate , it feels very unfair to expect people to have to pay to park in their own road or outside their house. Once it is introduced, you will be able to charge increasing amounts each year for permits.</p>

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

9	19 Matthews Close	Reduced parking bays, these are already greatly reduced in this area.
10	29 Matthews Close	<p>I write to inform you that as a resident of Matthews Close, I regret:-</p> <p>I DO NOT support the proposal to extend the Zone P Residents Parking Scheme.</p> <p>(1) I have access to garage and driveway parking.</p> <p>(2) I park 1 car outside my home (to prevent long term and unpredictable parking by others) I consider the proposal is an inadequate and unfair particularly the residents of Matthews Close. It will not necessarily resolve the issues it is designed to address. I favour a more comprehensive analysis of the traffic problems in Middle Deal Road, Southwall Road, Albert Road, and Matthews Close, with the development of Wallers Field, playing a part in providing a solution to the acute lack of off-road parking. This analysis should include Kent County Council Highways Division, Deal Town Council and Dover District Council Planning Committee. They contributed to the current problems with historic planning decisions and the use of Zone P restrictions applied to Bridgeside.</p> <p>(a) The proposal document does not mention the costs or entitlements for residents and visitors permits.</p> <p>(b) It does not mention dealing with the unsafe junction between Matthews Close and Middle Deal Road.</p> <p>(c) It assumes that the problems caused by parking are related to commuter type behaviour. They are caused by residents of Middle Deal Road and Church Path nominating spaces as their own.</p> <p>The Highway Code rules are regularly flouted by parking on junctions and use of the pavement in Middle Deal Road particularly.</p> <p>(d) The proposal would not alter this behaviour in evening and weekend hours.</p> <p>(e) The proposal disadvantages residents compared with Pottery Grove which has been protected by extensive use of double yellow lines.</p> <p>(f) As a resident if I pay for a permit, I cannot be guaranteed myself and visitors will be able to park outside my house, as we have been able to do for 30 years.</p> <p>(g) I share the concerns of other residents; that the necessary road markings for the scheme would be unsightly.</p> <p>(h) If adopted; residents of The Grove would see the problem shifted to their road. Other roads could also be affected as the proposal will lead to fewer parking places.</p>
11	33 Matthews Close	I don't see why we should have to change and be penalised financially to park in our own street. Some households have 1 space and 2+ cars, it's not fair on them, we are not a cash cow!!

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

12	39 Matthews Close	I am against any additional charges. I pay road tax to park and drive on our streets and roads.
13	42 Matthews Close	<p>The prospect of being forced to pay for parking permits outside our own home, as a result of the Council's own failings in understanding the parking needs of other nearby streets, is unfair, and we vehemently oppose the proposed introduction of permitting in Matthews Close as a result. Additionally, we oppose the permitting of the entire proposed area, as we feel it would only make the problem worse, not better. By reducing the available parking on the streets in the area, people will park further down on Middle Deal Road/Southwall Road, so moving any apparent parking issues to other areas. The proposed scheme feels like a money grab by the Council to penalise those already living in the area, as opposed to trying to solve a problem, especially when other living costs are rising significantly. The reduction in available parking places will push people to park where they see a spot, as opposed to where they currently park, so making it difficult to park near their own properties, which could unfairly penalise people who may find it difficult to park away from their homes (e.g. older/food shopping/young children).</p> <p>Finally, the fact the consultation is being conducted in the manner it is being done so (i.e. by email/post), as opposed to a town hall meeting, allows the Council to hide away from the true frustration such a proposed scheme causes, by making it harder for residents in the proposed area to be consulted together. We appreciate the on-going pandemic makes such a large gathering near impossible, but it should be noted that many of our immediate neighbours are opposed to the scheme, and we daresay (but of course clearly cannot tell) many others around our area are likely to be also.</p> <p>We implore the proposed scheme to be scrapped.</p>
14	45 Matthews Close	<p>Please find attached our objection to the proposed parking scheme (Sutherland Road, Albert Road, Deal etc). I cannot object more on this proposal. An unnecessary waste of council (residents) money.</p> <p>I can only hope the residents will object to this plan. It will reduce the actual parking for residents who can't park at their properties, making their lives more and more difficult, and I say that from the perspective of having a driveway after moving from a home that didn't. People have to be able to park, without having to pay for permits when they have already paid vehicle tax.</p> <p>Crazy idea. Unless it is ultimately a money-making idea for the council. Maybe put the costs of this towards better parking facilities in town, area behind Guildford Road or extend the parking at Tides Leisure or in Victoria Park, just an idea.... Must be a better solution that the disruption this will cause.</p>

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

15	47 Matthews Close	The scheme is too costly. It's also ineffective as most parking of non-residents vehicles seems to be after 5:30pm and Sundays. There is a reduced number of places, therefore, no guarantee of getting a space anyway. This would also apply to visitors and families.
16	49 Matthews Close	This proposed scheme does not greatly affect me, however there are a number of homes without a garage or a hard standing, Middle Street for instance, and will be forced in to having to pay for a permit to park outside their own house, as well as the Road Tax they already pay. There is a problem, yes, but this proposed scheme is not going to change anything
17	65 Matthews Close	It will mess access to driveways. I see no benefits and in fact the only beneficiary will be DDC from permit review from residents.
18	Matthews Close (No Number)	I would like to register that I am opposed to the proposed residential parking scheme as described in your communication on the 13th December 2021. This seems to be favouring the residents of albert road and middle deal road who park on the street in Matthews Close as they are unable to find a parking space outside their own home. All this would ensure is that these residents would continue to park in Matthews close and actually would lead to more cars on the bends around the area that is already dangerous. I would like to formally urge you not to put these parking permits in the close as this will only add to the problem, not solve it.
19	Matthews Close (No Number)	I would like to register that I am opposed to the proposed residential parking scheme as described in your communication of 13th December. The issue of limited parking in Matthews Close is primarily due to residents in the surrounding area (Middle Deal Road, Sutherland Road, Albert Road etc.) not being able to park in their area. It is not primarily non-residents going about their routine business. Having a permit scheme will not alleviate this issue it would mean the introduction of a tariff for the chance of parking outside my own residence. If you are serious about tackling this issue you should only offer parking to the residents of Matthews close for Matthews Close. This would remove the constant safety concerns arising from people parking on corners, causing restricted views, and potentially leading to accidents. To help matters further a one-way system introduced on the lower end of Middle Deal Road would greatly improve the situation. The issue with Parking and traffic congestion in the area has been compounded by the building of additional residential properties around Pottery Grove and a badly developed traffic management policy for the area.

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

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 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	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	We support the scheme, with provisos, as below ("Other" response) - 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. Equally, were restrictions/ permits to be introduced, adequate, alternative parking for non-residents/ non-permit holders must be provided to avoid the obstruction and

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

		<p>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 wheelchair/ mobility scooter or those with buggies/ pushchairs are particularly inconvenienced or put at risk.</p> <p>We trust that our feedback is helpful and constructive, and look forward to hearing from you concerning next steps in this important consultation,</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
12	59 Matthews Close	No Comments

4. Middle Deal Road,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	24 Middle Deal Road	I object to instituting a residents' parking scheme unless there is direct evidence of its necessity.
2	28 Middle Deal Road	There is parking available during the day. Majority of people are at work.
3	30 Middle Deal Road	<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 drive on their own road. That is down to poor decision making by your own housing planning department.</p>

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

		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.

4. Middle Deal Road,

Fore-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	3 Middle Deal Road	I would support the introduction of the residents parking scheme as long as two permits for parking per household are available.
2	18 Middle Deal Road	Hopefully, it will stop cars parking on double yellow lines which are opposite my house, making it difficult to access my drive. We never see a parking person
3	20 Middle Deal Road	My husband and I have considered the proposal and would support the introduction of the residents' parking scheme as detailed in the accompanying documents we received in the post.
4	53 Middle Deal Road	Must be worst road in Deal, cars park on both sides of the road and pavement. I know I have four cars outside my house from Church Path plus more
5	55 Middle Deal Road	We recently had our access protection markings repainted as cars were parking over our driveway on both sides making it hard to leave or enter. Since then, the owners of the cars are still doing it. Hopefully, this scheme will help everyone who lives within this area
6	57 Middle Deal Road	Thank you for your letter detailing some possible changes to on street parking in the areas listed above. I would make the following observations; I would like to see a width restriction or weight restriction in place at the junction of Albert Road and Middle Deal Road to stop HGVs using this route to access the industrial estate in Southwall Road. The new relief road at Court Marsh Road is now open and HGVs should use it. Many still do not. I would like to see a lower speed limit of 20mph introduced and enforced to include speed ramps if necessary. I was surveyed over a year ago about a 20mph limit and in keeping with a proposed one-way system and double

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

		<p>yellow lines, which had also been mentioned in the past nothing ever happened.</p> <p>I have off road parking for each vehicle (3) at my household. This is not luck or fortune, I paid for it as a choice.</p> <p>I think it is correct to canvas the opinions of Church Path residents, but I do not think they should be included in any ballot that may sway the decision for action either way.</p> <p>Large sections of Church Path are pedestrianised, and the residents knew this when they moved there. Most people would see this as a positive and attractive feature of living there. If they influence traffic issues for a road they do not live on and then return to their vehicle free street, they do not have to live with the consequences of their choice.</p> <p>How will the residents permits be allocated ? Are they vehicle specific? Will household visitors be able to temporarily use a permit? How much will they cost ?</p> <p>I broadly support the proposed scheme as some change will be better than no change. More creative action will be needed as society transitions to electric vehicles so this will not be the finished article.</p>
7	71 Middle Deal Road	<p>Thank you for your letter detailing the proposed residents' parking scheme.</p> <p>We support the introduction of the permits.</p>

5. Sutherland Road,

Against-

No.	Resident	Feedback
1	1 Sutherland Road	I resent having to pay to park in my own street and expect visitors, some of whom have a disability, to play musical cars every two hours and even then, not to be guaranteed a parking place, especially as one resident in this road has four cars which occupy spaces.
2	8 Sutherland Road	Yes, if it's just Sutherland Road. No, to everyone else parking in here.
3	10 Sutherland Road	We do not see any advantage in this scheme, because it will not address the problem of double parking at the entrance to the road

5. Sutherland Road,

Fore-

No.	Resident	feedback
1	3 Sutherland Road	It would be a great help to park on our own front without having to dodge other cars parking over the white lines

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

2	11 Sutherland Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have off-street parking 2. None 3. I support the introduction of the Residents' Parking Scheme as outlined in your letter.
3	12 Sutherland Road	<p>I would like to confirm that all household members at 12 Sutherland Road, CT14 9TQ, are in favour of the proposed residents parking scheme and hope that it is approved and implemented asap. We have a few notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We don't really like the visitor voucher system - Folkestone have a pay per visit online system which seems much more of an up-to-date way to do things (and its £1 per day not £3!!) What are the chances of this being updated in the future? 2. Assuming that yellow lines will be painted on one side of Sutherland Road, can DDC work with the relevant parties to ensure that these are well policed - cars regularly park on the yellow lines that do exist already at the entrance and seemingly without consequence 3. How do we go about ensuring that vehicles parked on the pavement at the entrance to Sutherland Road are actually dealt with - again a regular occurrence that means that parents with buggies/toddlers, disabled buggies etc. have to walk in the road to pass at what is a fairly dangerous junction. (Photo example from last week are attached
4	13 Sutherland Road	A bayed-out road would stop inconsiderate parking
5	14 Sutherland Road	Parking and delivery of goods is becoming more difficult. We have D.F.C. church at the end of our cul-de-sac
6	15 Sutherland Road	Thank you for the letter regarding the proposed residents' parking for Sutherland Road and other immediate roads. I am in support of this however would like to ask a question in relation to the bays themselves. We live at 15 Sutherland Road and there is space for 1.5 vehicles between us and number 17. It has been an ongoing issue that two cars park in the space and overhang both ours and number 17's drive making it very difficult to get in and out at times.
7	16 Sutherland Road	No Comments
8	19 Sutherland Road	<p>I strongly support the above scheme.</p> <p>I have permanent off-road parking in Sutherland Road, so do not park in any of the listed roads.</p> <p>However, bringing in the scheme is easy, but it must be vigorously enforced all day, every day! Sadly, enforcement in other zones is frequently neglected!</p>
9	26 Sutherland Road	<p>In order to provide a better turning space for delivery and utility vehicles at the end of Sutherland Close, remove the proposed parking bay outside No. 19 Sutherland Road.</p> <p>Erect a proper 'T' sign at the entrance to Sutherland Road</p>

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

Summary

i) Albert Road,

Against	5
Fore	13

ii) Church Path

Against	7
Fore	9

iii) Matthews Close

Against	19
Fore	12

iv) Middle Deal Road

Against	6
Fore	7

v) Sutherland Road

Against	3
Fore	9