

# HEDGE END, WEST END AND BOTLEY LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

Monday, 28 September 2020

## TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER, CHELTENHAM GARDENS, HEDGE END

### Report of the Traffic Management Engineer

---

#### Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that a Traffic Regulation Order is made, the effects of which are to introduce waiting restrictions on Cheltenham Gardens as advertised on 17 July 2020, with the exception of the layby opposite Nos 42 and 44, and the parking bays at the rear of Cranleigh House, which it is recommended remain unrestricted .

---

#### Summary

A proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Cheltenham Gardens was advertised on 17 July 2020. Sixteen representations were received, fifteen of which objected to the proposals and one of which was in support. This report summarises the comments received and recommends how to proceed.

#### Statutory Powers

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; Traffic Management Act 2004.

#### Legal Agreements

Agency Agreement between Hampshire County Council and Eastleigh Borough Council dated 10 September 2019.

#### Strategic Implications

1. Creating an excellent environment for all by removing obstructive parking by commuters in Cheltenham Gardens.

#### Introduction

2. Cheltenham Gardens has been the subject of a number of investigations over the last several years, to which sought to find ways to deter parking by commuters using Hedge End railway station. An experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was introduced on 24 September 2018. This introduced waiting restrictions at various locations within Cheltenham Gardens on an experimental basis for a maximum period of eighteen months.

Following receipt of representations, the Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB) Local Area Committee (LAC) decided that a number of amendments should be progressed. Owing to being out of time to make amendments to the experimental TRO, the LAC decided on 2 March 2020 to authorise the Head of Legal Services to make a permanent TRO to replicate the experimental TRO with those amendments. The experimental TRO expired on 24 March 2020 and the Coronavirus outbreak led to a delay of three months in advertising a permanent TRO.

3. This report details the comments received during the public consultation period. The Committee is asked to consider the comments received, before making a decision to introduce, amend or withdraw the proposed Traffic Regulation Order.

### **Detail**

4. The details of the proposals are to replicate on a permanent basis the effects of the earlier experimental TRO, but with the following amendments:
  - (a) The removal of the “no waiting Monday to Friday 2 – 3pm” restrictions altogether
  - (b) The replacement of “no waiting at any time” restrictions with “no waiting Monday – Friday (except Bank and Public Holidays) 10 – 11am” restrictions within Cheltenham Gardens with exception of the “no waiting at any time” restriction at the junction of Cheltenham Gardens and Maunsell Way which should remain.
  - (c) Retention of the waiting restriction (no waiting Monday to Friday 10 – 11am) in the marked parking bays and layby outside Cranleigh House, the parking bays adjacent to 52 Cheltenham Gardens, and the layby opposite nos. 42 – 44 Cheltenham Gardens
  - (d) The removal of the “no waiting Monday to Friday 10 – 11am & 2–3pm” restriction” from outside nos. 42 – 44 Cheltenham Gardens.

A plan of the proposed restrictions is shown in Appendix 1.

5. Consultation was undertaken by means of a Public Notice on the Eastleigh Borough Council website, published in the Hampshire Independent newspaper, and posted on street furniture in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions. The Public Notice was also posted to properties directly affected by the proposals. Following receipt of objections, it is further recommended to remove two sections of proposed “no waiting” restriction as shown in Appendix 2.
6. Sixteen representations were received, fifteen of which objected to the proposals, and one expression of support. The representations are summarised below, along with the Engineer’s response. The full (redacted) text of the representations can be found in Appendix 3.

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Engineer's response</b>
a)	<p>The current restrictions mean residents and visitors cannot leave their cars all day in the parking layby outside No 121 Cheltenham Gardens, and have to park on the pavement.</p>	<p>The recommendation is to remove all restrictions from the layby in question, so that unrestricted parking would be available to anyone on a "first come, first served" basis. We would recommend that residents avoid parking on the footway, as this causes damage to the kerb and footway, and obstructs access for pedestrians.</p>
b)	<p>Support the change of restrictions to one time period only, but object to the removal of double yellow lines on the two corners as this will be a potentially dangerous situation.</p> <p>There have been near misses already and it is only a matter of time before there is an accident.</p>	<p>Information from previous investigations indicates that the majority of the on-street parking during the day is generated by commuters using Hedge End railway station. The recommendation is that the single yellow line restrictions (No waiting Monday – Friday 10-11am) are introduced on the two bends in question, and this will deter commuter parking. Cheltenham Gardens, along with the other residential roads on this estate, was designed with curves and culs-de-sac to maintain low vehicle flows and speeds. The level of parking observed overnight is consistent with other similar roads where residents park their additional vehicles at the kerbside, and it is not expected that residents would change where they habitually park. Being a suburban area, drivers will expect to encounter oncoming traffic, and drive at a speed appropriate to</p>

		<p>give way if necessary. Cheltenham Gardens has an excellent safety record with no recorded injury accidents in the last 20 years.</p>
c)	<p>Object to replacing double yellow lines with single yellow lines as commuters will park there.</p> <p>If the double yellow lines are removed we will end up with train commuters parking in our close. Parking is bad enough with vehicles obstructing the view when pulling out onto the main road</p>	<p>Experience elsewhere has shown that a “no waiting” restriction for an hour during the working day has the effect of deterring the majority of non-resident parking in the vicinity of railway stations. This is also consistent with the treatment of other nearby roads in the vicinity of Hedge End railway station.</p>
d)	<p>Removal of “no waiting at any time restriction” is likely to lead to an increase in general parking. The drives from my house and 3 others open onto a sharp bend and the proposal to remove the double yellow lines opposite seems dangerous. The proposal creates similar problems on other bends and corners</p>	<p>The proposals should deter commuters; previous complaints from residents indicate that the inconsiderate parking in the past was largely due to commuter parking. There are no nearby centres of shopping or employment to attract non-resident parking, therefore an increase in parking is not anticipated.</p>
f)	<p>Removing double yellow lines opposite driveway is retrograde step. The road is not wide enough to allow parking both sides of road. it is more hazardous to have staggered parking on alternate sides of road. Would wish to retain bar marking outside my driveway.</p> <p>The lines on the bend opposite the drive to no’s 8, 10, 12 and 14 are essential. I live at number 12 Cheltenham Gardens. If parking is allowed here at any time it will obstruct access to the drives. The other double lines in this Close are also on bends and parking here would also cause an obstruction. I therefore object to any</p>	<p>Parking opposite driveways is a common occurrence on most residential roads of similar width, because residents have no convenient alternatives to parking their additional vehicles at the kerbside. It is recommended that residents reverse onto their driveways if possible, as this is usually an easier and safer manoeuvre and is recommended in the Highway Code (rule 201)</p>

	<p>change to the double yellow lines in this spur.</p>	<p>Parking on alternate sides of the road helps to reduce traffic speeds by creating a “chicane” effect, although this can reduce the level of available kerbside parking.</p> <p>There are no proposals to remove “bar markings” at driveways unless residents wish.</p>
<p>g)</p>	<p>Unsafe parking on both sides of road between 111 and 129 impedes passage of vehicles at all times of day and restrictions should be extended. The paved parking areas near No 141 and opp 153 remain largely empty and yet the dangerous parking between 111 and 129 remains. the proposals do not address the issues and require amendment prior to implementation. Appreciate this objection is after the closing date, but would query the timing of the notice. During school holidays it seems deliberately targeted to be unavailable for commuters, a sub-section of affected parties whom it would appear you are looking exclude from the public consultation.</p>	<p>The waiting restrictions on this section of Cheltenham Gardens should continue to deter obstructive parking. Observations during the working day and at night have shown that parked vehicles allow sufficient room on the carriageway for the passage of vehicles.</p> <p>The recommendation is to remove restrictions from the five marked parking bays at the rear of Cranleigh House, since observations have shown that there appears to be little demand for short stay parking during the working day.</p> <p>The timing of the advertisement was delayed due to the Coronavirus outbreak, there was no intention to exclude anyone from the consultation; representations are welcome from any interested party. This representation has been included although it was received after the end of the consultation period.</p>

7.

The supporting comment is summarised below:

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>Most parking seems to be visitors to other parts of Cheltenham Gardens who are unable to park near where they are visiting due to double yellow lines. The proposed restrictions should allow visitors to park nearby whilst preventing commuter parking. Also where people are forced to park on corner outside our house, cars and larger vehicles struggle to get around the corner</p>	<p>The comment is noted. It is hoped that the removal of excessive “no waiting at any time” restrictions will increase the scope for residents and their visitors to be able to park close to their properties, and to avoid those areas which reduce visibility of oncoming traffic and cause difficulty in manoeuvring.</p>

## Financial Implications

8. The cost of the TRO is funded through the Hampshire County Council Highways Agency budget; the estimated cost is £5,000. The cost of advertisements is approximately £300; the cost of amending the signing and road marking will cost approximately £2,000. The remainder is made up of officer time. Requests for further measures would need to be addressed as a separate scheme.

## Risk Assessment

9. If the proposals are withdrawn, all the road markings and signs would require removal, at a cost of approximately £1800. This is likely to be unacceptable to some residents, because the previous issues with obstructive and inconsiderate parking would be likely to recur.

## Equality and Diversity Implications

The Equality Act is relevant to the decision and an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and attached as Appendix 4 to the report. In summary the EqIA shows that:

- The waiting restrictions will assist in improving access for pedestrians, including wheelchair users and pushchairs.

## 10. Climate Change and Environmental Implications

The proposals would not increase Greenhouse Gas/CO<sub>2</sub>, or damage ecology or the environment. The scheme may assist in encouraging residents of Hedge End to walk or cycle to Hedge End railway station.

## **Conclusion**

11. The proposals have due regard to the requirements of S122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, by securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway. This report takes the representations into account and makes a recommendation to make amendments to reduce the impact of some of the restrictions. This would address some of the objections, whilst retaining waiting restrictions where necessary to maintain access and deter obstructive parking.

BARBARA THOMAS  
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ENGINEER

Date: 4 September 2020  
Contact Officer: Barbara Thomas  
Tel No: 02380 688231  
e-mail: barbara.thomas@eastleigh.gov.uk  
Appendices Attached: 4

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D**

The following is a list of documents which disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. This list does not include any published works or documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information.

None