

## **Appendix 3 – Representations**

### **Representation 1 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I live at --- Cheltenham Gardens and are a two car family. The parking bay area opposite 121 - 235 has been subject of no waiting Mon-Fri 10-11am. This is very inconvenient as my daughter/other residents in Cheltenham Gardens unable to leave their vehicle's all day in the parking bay and effectively means they have to park on the pavement. This in itself I think is more of an issue as it means people with prams, or disabled persons have to negotiate a parked vehicle which is not only obstructing the pavement, but in doing so narrow the roads for cars to pass. I believe these parking bays were designed for households as extra parking, the majority of whom are two car families. It is causing a problem to local residents who have to either park on the pavement, or some distance away from their own house. On that basis I object to the proposed permanent restrictions and ask this become an unrestricted bay affording residents additional parking which currently is causing a great deal of inconvenience.

Many thanks for your consideration

### **Representation 2 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I support the change of the waiting restrictions to 1 time period only as this still will deter the commuters who would require the full day parking.

However, I am concerned over the removal of the no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on 2 of the corners. Without these double yellow lines on the corners this will lead to the junction areas being obscured and a potentially dangerous situation to both vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists as cars are forced on to the wrong side of the road to go around the corners. I support the proposals put forward by ----- (*resident of Cheltenham Gardens*)

### **Representation 3 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

Most of the additional parking in our part of the close appears to be due to visitors to other parts of Cheltenham Gardens who are unable to park near the house they are visiting due to the double yellow lines. We hope that making the parking only limited to a specific hour will allow visitors to park near where they are visiting while also preventing commuters from parking. Additionally where people are forced to park on the corner outside our house cars and particularly larger vehicles struggle to get ro7nd the corner.

### **Representation 4 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

We live at --- Cheltenham Gardens and fully support -----(*resident of Cheltenham Gardens*) view that removal of the no waiting areas is dangerous and that it is only a matter of time before there is an accident.

we respectfully request that this amendment is reconsidered

### **Representation 5 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I am objecting the amendment of the double yellow line to replacing with single yellow line with no parking between 10 and 11 am, I do not agree with this as the cul-de-sac will be misused by commuters parking their cars around the cul-de-sac to avoid parking charges at the train station.

### **Representation 6 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

The removal of the "no waiting at any time" notice is likely to lead to an increase in general parking. The on street parking currently allowed already does give rise to constriction of vehicle movements sometimes due to the width of the road and the proximity of bends and driveways. The drives from my house and 3 others open onto a sharp bend and the proposal to remove the double yellow lines facing the drive seems dangerous. Parking should not be allowed there on a sharp right hand bend in any case. Any vehicle so parked cannot be parallel to the kerb and so takes up more of the road. The proposal creates similar problems on other bends and corners.

### **Representation 7 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I have been resident in Cheltenham Gens for nearly 30 years. In more recent times, in part due to high numbers of new housing developments in the region, the railway station has seen a big increase in demand. Unfortunately this has impacted on residents due to rail users seeking to avoid car parking charges, or because of the lack of spaces, has lead them to park in nearby roads, some without much consideration. In order to deter such actions, an experimental Traffic Regulation Order was devised, which in my view has been largely successful over quite a long period of time. In fact, I believe it was reported that only four actual objections have been registered. None the less, a revised TRO has been proposed, but in some respects in seems to be a case of taking two steps backward.

I can really only speak in regard to my experience of parking in front and around my property i.e no --. In front of my house there is unrestricted parking. On the far side of the road there is currently double yellow lines. The intention in the new TRO is to remove these yellow lines which thereby effectively allows parking on both sides of the road. As can be witnessed on other similar roads, this can lead to vehicles being "half parked" on road, and "half parked" on the pavement. This is because it is impossible to park on opposite sides of the road at the same time. In reality therefore, extra parking capacity is not achieved as a vehicle can only be parked on one side of the road or the other. As such, it could be argued that even if cars were sensibly parked this would lead to a more hazardous style of driving as one would have to negotiate the staggard parking pattern.

Furthermore, I get the impression that all white line markings in front of driveways are to be removed. I hope this decision can be reversed, particularly in respect of the driveways that affect my property. Prior to the experiment taking place there was unrestricted parking available in the opposite side of the road to my driveway. Quite often, vehicles would park there in a way that interferes with the ability to safety and easily perform access and egress. At least the bold white lines clearly indicate that this space should not be obstructed. This may well catch the eye of anyone parking opposite in an inconsiderate fashion, thereby suggesting they should think again. Retaining these markings would help ensure that enough clear turning space was allowed for, and a safer and clearer sight line would be better achieved.

I trust you will find my objections to be both reasonable and logical, and certainly as equally justifiably when compared to previous objections that you have included in your

ammendments. As such I look forward to you supporting my objection and incorporating it within this latest version which will apparently be the final and permanent TRO applied.

### **Representation 8 (from non-resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I am writing to object to, and request an amendment for, The Borough of Eastleigh (Hedge End, West End & Botley) (Amendment No 11) Order 2020. This is the TRO affecting Cheltenham Gardens in Hedge End.

As previously detailed in my representation for the review of the Experimental TRO, the plans that have been put forward are not equivalent to the statement of reasons for their requirement. These concerns were not addressed then and remain for the proposed TRO.

The statement of reasons for this TRO state "to facilitate the passage on the road for any class of traffic", this is required in Cheltenham Gardens as unsafe parking, particularly on both sides of the road between 111 and 129, does make passage difficult - this is likely felt more keenly on this winding part of the road by refuse collectors and emergency vehicles. This is a requirement at all times, not just between 10-11, Mon-Fri. As such, the restrictions in this part of the road should be extended.

Furthermore, the proposed plan continues to include paved parking areas near number 141 and opposite number 153. These areas, by their very nature, do not impact on the passage on the road. If the intention is to make these available for residents, to free up the remainder of the road, then throughout the Experimental TRO this has failed. These spaces remain empty, I'd estimate that across the 18-month period these were only at about 5% usage and yet the dangerous parking between 111 and 129 remained.

These proposals do not address the issues they are purported to and as such require amendment before implementation.

I appreciate that the closure for objections was meant to be 7 August, however, I'd like to query the timing of the notice. I appreciate that COVID restrictions have made things more difficult, however, the experimental order was meant to run for a maximum of 18months to 14 Mar 2019, this was prior to the COVID lockdown and notice could have been provided before this period. Furthermore, the notice has been provided during a period that coincides with school summer holidays, further reducing its exposure to non-resident road users. This appears to have been deliberately targeted to make it unavailable for commuters, a sub-section of the affected parties who it would appear you are looking to exclude from the public consultation. Therefore I would be grateful if you could consider my objection.

If you have any queries then please let me know.

I look forward to hearing from you and thank you for taking these objections into consideration.

### **Representation 9 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

The proposal has left the close in a dangerous condition as was specified at the meeting dated 2nd March where I voiced the concerns of residents from 141 to 153 and our concerns. Our comments although heard were dismissed and at that time were not even debated.

Therefore we re-iterate that the removal of no waiting in the areas highlighted will allow parking of vehicles outside the specified hours by residents and rail users alike and cause

the lines of sight for oncoming traffic to be obscured thus resulting in an extremely dangerous hazard for vehicles entering and exiting the close. These areas have already resulted in near misses even with the current no waiting but to remove them is an accident waiting to happen.

**Representation 10 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

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.

**Representation 11 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

EFFECT OF ORDER: For an experimental period of up to 18 months, introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on sections of Cheltenham Gardens. The proposed restrictions are to facilitate the safe passage of vehicular traffic and to prevent obstructive parking. I would like this order to be made permanent, as it will stop people parking whenever and our little close will turn to a little car park!

**Representation 12 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I would appreciate if current marking (double yellow lines) will be left in place as it is now. Its helping us to avoid commuters or visitors to leave their cars in our close instead of parking at train station. I would ask to consider to put double yellow line "No waiting at any time" on the corner entering close next to house number 2 opposite house number 26 as well. Lots of people parking on that corner making its very unsafe entering our road. Its makes refuse collection drivers and any delivery, emergency vehicle almost impossible to enter our road because of parked cars.

**Representation 13 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I write with reference to the Eastleigh Borough Council proposal to amend the waiting restrictions in Cheltenham Gardens. I would like to express my concern that the proposal causes a great safety concern to the close (141 to 153 Cheltenham Gardens). This was outlined in representations made by ----- and ----- (*residents of Cheltenham Gardens*) at the Local Area Committee meeting on 2 March 2020.

The removal of the no waiting on the areas indicated in red on the attached document will allow parking of vehicles outside of the specified hours by residents, visitors and rail users and will cause a safety hazard for vehicles entering and exiting the close by affecting the line of sight for oncoming traffic to be impaired.

I understand there has already been a number of near misses entering and exiting the close and I would therefore kindly request further consideration be given to ensure the safe movement of traffic in this area.

**Representation 14 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

I am writing to object to any change to the current double yellow lines on the spur to 8 to 28 evens, Cheltenham Gardens, Hedge End (now referred to as the Close).

We have recently received a letter advising that these are to be changed to single lines. 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 change to the double yellow lines in this spur.

I have attached photos of the information sent to me. The Public Notice does request that a form is completed on the Council Website. I could not find this form. I phoned the council and was helped by Irina who could not find the form either and advised me to email you.

### **Representation 15 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

The new proposal has left the close in dangerous condition which I believe was specified at the meeting dated 2nd March.

Like many of my neighbours, I would like to reiterate that the removal of no waiting in the areas highlighted on the attached plan will allow parking of vehicles outside the specified hours by residents and rail users alike. This will cause the lines of sight for oncoming traffic to be obscured thus resulting in an extremely dangerous hazard for vehicles entering and exiting the close.

These areas have already resulted in near misses even with the current no waiting but to remove them is an accident waiting to happen.

We respectfully suggest these areas are revisited and amended.

Look forward to hearing from you.

### **Representation 16 (from resident of Cheltenham Gardens)**

The removal of double yellow lines outside number 30 and 139 Cheltenham Gardens- opposite the flats on the bends

Since you have put in the yellow lines it's made it clearer and safer to see up the road by number 30 and 139.

If you take the double yellow lines away people will park closer to the corner and on the bend by 139 and we would have to go across the other side of the road into oncoming traffic.

I know it's not a busy road but it is awkward to see round the bends I would like these lines to stay in place if possible.

Thank you