

APP 2

D E BOND
DIRECTOR OF LAW & DEMOCRACY
MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS
CHURCH ROAD
STOCKTON ON TEES
CLEVELAND
TS18 1LD

38 DURHAM STREET
STOCKTON ON TEES
CLEVELAND
TS18 1QE

30/10/09

Dear Sirs / Maddam

I am writing to submit my views on the proposed resident permit parking scheme and I totally disagree with the proposal.

I and many other residents feel it is not required as we see no problem for parking in the area, personally I think its the council them selves that are just trying to force shoppers not to us these areas and make them pay to us the car park in Wellington Sqe to create revenue.

Today I can see only two cars parked in Durham Street and these belong to residents and this is regularly the case.

I for one will not be paying any money into this scheme as I find it unjust to the area and just another levee for the road user to pay out, but as with my objection to the alley gates and closure of the through road between Stamp Street and Berguss Street it will fall on deaf ears.

Yours truly
Mr Clive A Swainston



6 CORPORATION ST,

STOCKTON-ON-TEES

TS18 1QG

1st November 2009.

Tele No 806245

frightening to say the least, plus cars would
not be safe there unless CCTV cameras
were installed to protect both residents and
vehicles.

D. E. BOND

CHURCH RD

STOCKTON

Therefore as a "pensioner" I really need to
be able to park in front of my home

Dear Sir,

Yours sincerely

With regard to restricted parking on
Corporation Street,

E. A. Flintoff

I'm not too happy with these arrangements
on the grounds that I have no parking facilities
to the front of my house at 6 Corporation St, which
I have parked in front of for the past 10 years.
I would be forced to park at the rear of my
property in the alleyway and this is not a safe
place for me to park, especially at night as its
used by drug addicts, youths drinking, this is not
a position I would like to find myself in, its

Mrs. E. FLINTOFF

29.10.09

Mr. R. F. Weighell
6 Milbank Court
Stockton on Tees
TS181PH

Tel

01642 653234

SUBJECT

The Proposed Parking
Arrangement in Milbank Court

Dear Sir,

I am writing to say
that I and my wife are strongly
opposed to your intentions to having
Parking Area along the East Side of
Milbank Court. Furthermore as
these parking spaces will be filled by
non residents, with no guarantee
of a parking space for Milbank Court
residents. I am not opposed to a
couple of spaces being made
available at the Sydney St end, but

2

I do object to having a string
of cars parked permanently along
the road in front of my House
taking up half the width of an
already narrow road.

I think I should state here
that my wife is an Invalid, and I
often have to park outside the
house to pick her up and drop her
off with her Mobility Buggy and
any groceries we have bought.

Also on occasion I have to park
for a short while with my wifes
Blue Invalidity Badge displayed
until a legitimate parking spot
becomes available.

However if you allow parking
along the other side of the road
I would no longer be able to do
that as I would be obstructing
traffic both in and out.

3
Added to my objections is the fact that we live and sleep in the front of the house, and we would be subject to the sound of doors slamming and engines starting day and night.

Over the years the residents of Milbank Court have solved their own parking problems and its my contention that the Court be left alone, and a pleasant little road not turned into a glorified carpark.

Yours Sincerely

R Weighell

Please Acknowledge Receipt

Thank You

54 Mill Street West
Stockton-on-Tees
Teesside
TS18 1QB

Monday 2nd November 2009

09 NOV 2009

Dear D.E. Bond

I am writing to you to formerly convey my opposition and outrage to the proposed resident permit parking scheme West of Stockton Town Centre. I cannot speak for any other street in the area but Mill Street West has NO parking problems. I have owned my property here since February 2006 and have always been able to park in either a bay opposite my property or directly on the street outside my house. I have never once in the past three years not been able to park my car. Your proposed plans will include stopping me parking my car outside of my own house, allowing me to only park in a bay. As many houses in the street have more than one car your plans will clearly result in far more cars than bays. The council then plan to charge myself and other residents for the privilege of causing this problem for us! This is clearly not a plan to help the residents as there is no existing underlying problem. It is merely another money making scheme for the council.

The most frustrating part is that you now plan on charging us to park our cars, or should I say NOT park our cars as there will not be enough parking places available. May I ask whether you plan to sell parking permits to the residents of Derby Street and Hutchinson Street? These residents have their own private parking but out of convenience park in the bays directly opposite my own property on Mill Street West. At the moment this is not an issue as residents of Mill Street West currently are able to park directly outside their own property, however if permits are issued to these residents, the nightmare parking will escalate for us residents on Mill Street West due to the waiting restrictions installed outside the properties of Mill Street West. I have no idea why you wish to stop us parking outside our own houses and activate a waiting restrictions zone, there is no problem with double parking in this street, it does not happen. The current parking situation is perfect as it is. Surely it is feasible to propose resident parking places on Mill Street West directly outside property numbers 50-58? There is absolutely no reason why this cannot happen.

As you can tell I will not be standing for this. If you go ahead with your plans I will take any and all legal action in my power to stop this outrage. It is clearly nothing more than an appalling money making scheme from the council in the hope that in town car parks will be used more often.

Yours Sincerely



Miss Amy Jordan

William Crutchley Esq.

Chairman, Board of Directors

Stockton Masonic Hall, Wellington Street, Stockton on Tees, TS18 1RD.

Home Tel No. 01642 291022 Mobile 07736 825558 Work 01642 213377 Fax 01642 213388

E: mail bill6457@gmail.com

Friday, 06 November 2009

DE Bond Esq.

Director of Law & Democracy

Municipal Buildings,

Church Road,

Stockton-on-Tees.

TS18 1LD

Reference; Masonic Hall / Parking Permits/ Victoria Street

Dear Sir,

Please accept this letter to register our objection to the imposition of the Resident Permit Parking Scheme – West of Stockton Town Centre.

Despite a recent meeting with Council representatives our concerns have not been addressed in any constructive manner as highlighted in our recent email communication (attached).

We have not been given & indeed would welcome an opportunity to fully explain our serious concerns regarding the detrimental effect these restrictions may have on our community & charitable efforts.

I look forward to your response hoping that an agreeable solution can be determined.

Yours faithfully



W Crutchley
Chairman

Copy of Email communication to date.

Hello Ann,

Many thanks for your response, quoted below.

Bill,

I would like to confirm what was agreed during our site meeting this afternoon.

As agreed I can confirm that once the Resident Permit Parking Scheme is in place that we will make an amendment to the Order to include 2 mandatory Disabled Bays at the end of Victoria Street. I will also look into the car park design to try and better utilise the space available and provide appropriate white lining. Further to this I will investigate the possibility of funding for tarmacing the car park area and will let you know the outcome on that later.

I realise we were unable to give you the answers you hoped for but I hope you are happy with our compromise.

Regards
Ann McLone

As you clearly state you were unable to provide the answers to address our concerns, I am therefore prompted to comment further.

Although your kind offer, detailed above, would soften the initial impact on our daylight community efforts, I believe the proposed scheme is overall detrimental to our current community commitments.

Mark did indicate he would contact me with some further guidance, that not done please accept the following.

We have, as you may know, been on this site since 1864, indeed Stockton - on - Tees can trace its Masonic history to 2nd December 1756, and we are committed to maintaining this wonderful history.

The building is unique within the locale and as such is expensive to maintain. Accordingly it is a fact that the number of visitors we attract to the venue is paramount to its financial stability of course any agenda that may impact on their ability to attend, such as the Proposed Parking Scheme, does indeed raise our concerns.

Whilst I accept that any council schemes are for the benefit of the community as a whole, it must be also stressed that our very existence is dedicated to the raising of Charity within this and the wider community.

When the "greater scheme" for Wellington Square was initially set up we were served with a compulsory purchase order for the very land you now wish to prevent us from using, We although having several opportunities to reclaim the purchased land kept faith with the Council, eventually ending up with this farcical system we have currently in place.

I do acknowledge the car parking facilities to the area; however we can only provide security to our visitors when parking within the confines of the Hall itself.

The design map / diagram of the "turning circle" was never offered for approval or consideration as indicated in the deeds nor was the painting of "Double Yellow lines" conducted as prescribed by the Road Traffic Act.

We are classed neither as a "Resident" nor as a "Business" would either classification enable us to maintain the present status quo, very doubtful! Even if classified as either, the proposed system of purchasing the number of parking permits we could need would prove extremely difficult to both operate and also ultimately fund. It is a disappointment that no due provision through legislature seems to have been made for us & it appears that we are in a minority of one with respect to the proposal and as such would seem to be left with no alternative, therefore I would again ask;

- 1] As the "Highway" leads only into the Masonic car park could a Planning Application be raised for Stopping Up?
- 2] Could we repurchase the land, or even adopt it from the Council, thus freeing you from its upkeep?
- 3] Could the Restriction time be altered from 1800 to 1600hrs?
- 4] Could certain days be booked in for a waiver of the restrictions to be applied?
- 5] If all else fails do we have to apply for a Judicial Review?

I am conscious of the time restraints placed upon us therefore in closing may I thank you for your time and efforts to date.

Awaiting your response and looking forward to a mutually beneficial conclusion!

Kind regards

Bill Crutchley