

# **CHANDLER'S FORD AND HILTINGBURY**

## **LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 13 September 2017**

### **VARIOUS ON STREET PARKING RESTRICTIONS**

#### **Report of the Corporate Director (Strategy)**

---

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

- (1) In light of objections received, restrictions in Beresford Road/ Westmorland Way should be implemented as shown on amended drawing TM01/01555/001 REV A and the situation should continue to be monitored.**
- (2) In light of objections received, restrictions in Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close /Fir Croft Drive should be implemented as shown on the amended drawing TM01/01551/002 Rev A.**
- (3) Restrictions in Brickfield Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO as shown on drawing no. TM01/01551/004.**
- (4) In light of objections received restrictions in Castle Lane should be implemented as shown on amended drawing TM01/01551/003 REV A, further monitoring will be undertaken.**
- (5) Restrictions in Cuckoo Bushes Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no TM01/01551/008.**
- (6) Restrictions in Hillcrest Avenue should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no TM01/01551/011.**
- (7) Restrictions in Meadbrook Gardens should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no TM01/01551/009.**
- (8) In light of objections received, restrictions in Peverells Road/Sarum Road/Clausentum Close should be implemented as shown on amended drawing TM01/01551/006B.**
- (9) Restrictions in Roman Close / Peverells Wood Avenue should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown on drawing no. TM01/01551/005.**
- (10) Changes to existing limited waiting restrictions and the provision of a new loading bay in Station Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown on drawing TM01/01551/010.**
- (11) Restrictions in Valley Road/Neilson Close/Heathlands Road should be**

implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown on drawing TM01/01551/007.

## Summary

New, and amendments to existing waiting restrictions have been proposed in various locations across the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury area. During the advertisement of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, objections were received to proposals in some locations. This report summarises the responses received and recommends how to proceed with the proposals.

## Statutory Powers

Section 42 Highways Act 1980; Agreement dated 30 March 2009 between Hampshire County Council and Eastleigh Borough Council by virtue of Section 19 of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Arrangements and Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2000 and by virtue of Section 1 of the Local Authorities (Goods and Services) Act 1970; Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; Traffic Management Act 2004.

## Introduction

1. Various roads have been investigated in response to reported and/or known parking problems. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for parking restrictions has been progressed as prioritised by the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Local Area Committee.
2. The following roads were included in the TRO for investigation:-
  - Beresford Road/Beresford Gardens/Westmorland Way
  - Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close/Fir Croft Drive
  - Brickfield Lane
  - Castle Lane
  - Cuckoo Bushes Lane
  - Hillcrest Avenue
  - Meadbrook Gardens
  - Peverells Road/Sarum Road/Clausentum Close
  - Roman Close/Peverells Wood Avenue
  - Station Lane
  - Valley Road/Nielson Close/Heathlands Road
3. Site visits were carried out to determine whether restrictions would be beneficial for road users. For those roads where new restrictions or changes to existing restrictions were recommended, initial consultation was undertaken with the statutory consultees, which includes the emergency services, locally elected Members, Hampshire County Council (HCC) and public transport operators - no objections to the proposals were received.

4. The proposed TRO was subsequently advertised for public comment, during which a number of the proposals received objections, and expressions of support.
5. This report lists the roads that have been included within the TRO, and details the objections, comments and support received during the public consultation period. It also makes recommendations as to any changes that could be considered by the committee.
6. This Committee needs to address the comments received, before making a decision on the implementation, or otherwise, of the Traffic Regulation Order.

## **Consultation**

7. The formal consultation was advertised in the local newspaper, on the Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) website, the HCC Public Notices Portal and on public notices placed throughout affected areas.
8. Officers received comments regarding the proposals from 36 correspondents.
9. A breakdown of responses will be provided on a road by road basis and a more detailed copy of the comments received is shown in Appendix A to this report.

## **Beresford Road/Beresford Gardens/ Westmorland Road**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

To implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on the junction of Beresford Road, Beresford Gardens/Westmorland Way to improve visibility and reduce obstruction.

### **Summary of Comments:**

10. 10 representations have been received, 8 objecting to the proposals, 1 with comment for consideration and 1 objection received after the deadline (which is outlined in appendices) which raised the following comments:
11. The statement of reasons bears no justification as has not known any accidents to ever occur at junction. By removing parked cars from this area it will result in an increase of vehicle speeds creating further safety issues rather than mitigating them.
12. A number of driveways in this area are steep and cannot be used, these restrictions will cause anger amongst neighbouring residents as cars will be parked close to driveways. Often there is no choice but to park on the corner due to shift work. Money would be better spent on school crossing patrols at Toynbee School.
13. No choice but to park outside property due to the poorly designed steep driveway and garage. Restrictions will increase parking problems here and devalue properties as there will be nowhere else to park.

14. Concerns that restrictions will result in having to park further away from property making life more difficult with young children and elderly relatives.
15. Concerns have been raised about length of restrictions and residents would like them reduced to accommodate parking space outside property. Restrictions are beyond what is required to enforce the highway code and resident believes implementing restrictions will not benefit complainant as view would still be obscured by hedgerow, wheelie bins and parked cars within the layby.
16. Requesting restrictions be reduced to allow parking space to be retained outside house number 37 as it is more than 10 metres from junction and therefore not in contravention of the Highways Code.

**Response to comments:**

17. Having obtained recorded injury-accident data from Hampshire County Council there has been no recorded injury accidents at the junction with the last 5 years up to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2017 so this assumption is correct. However, given the short length of restrictions, the proximity of junctions and the nature of road it is unlikely to result in any measureable increase in vehicle speeds.
18. It is acknowledged that residents are facing difficulties due to steep arrangements in driveways however the responsibility for this would lie with the individual owners. Funding for school crossing patrols is provided separately by Hampshire County Council.
19. The public's right to use the highway is limited to passing and re-passing and does not extend to parking a vehicle. Loss of value is a moot point therefore no account for loss of value to the property can be taken through the inability to park on the road outside.
20. Parking in this location does contravene the Highway Code which states that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, this is not a statutory provision in the 'code'. The junction itself has a limited amount of vehicle movements and those would predominantly be by the local residents themselves. In light of this, whilst the implementation of waiting restrictions would have a benefit to road safety by the reduction of congestion, it may create more issues that it would resolve.
21. Having reviewed this location and in light of the objections received restrictions have been reduced just cover the junction of Westmorland Way and allow for parking space to be retained outside house number 37, as shown in the revised drawing number TM01/01551/001A

**Recommendation:**

22. In light of the objections received, restrictions in Beresford Road/ Westmorland Way should be implemented as shown on the amended drawing no. TM01/01551/001 REV A and the situation should continue to be monitored.

## **Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close/Fir Croft Drive**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

To implement 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions at the junctions of Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close and Fir Croft Drive to improve visibility at the junctions and reduce congestion. Also to implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions to alleviate obstructions to the pedestrian crossing point west of Warren Avenue.

### **Summary of Comments:**

23. 5 representations have been received, 3 objecting to the proposals including a 31 signature petition objecting to the length of restrictions in Tadburn Close and 2 late objections received after the deadline (which are outlined in the appendices) The objectors stated the following reasons:-
24. The objector has to park family car on Bodycoats Road and Tadburn Close in order to have safe and level access to the car when carrying children. The objector does not believe that there have been in accidents at the junction and believes that consultation period should have been extended so residents could have raised this at the Chandler's Ford Parish Council meeting held in July.
25. An objector believes the order does not state clearly what restrictions are proposed and believes restrictions will significantly reduce the availability for residents in Tadburn Close. The objector suggests school keep clear markings to allow residents to continue park or introduce permit parking for residents.
26. Petition with 31 signatures stating that proposed restrictions are unjustified as they beyond the minimum requirement of the Highway Code and also they go against Hampshire County Council policy TM4 which relates to implementation of parking restrictions. Restrictions will reduce availability of parking for residents, displace parking into other areas and increase speeds having a negative impact of road safety. Petitioners do not believe that restrictions will result in a significant improvement in visibility or congestion.

### **Response to Comments:**

27. Numerous complaints have been received over a number of years from Toynbee School about inappropriate parking in this location.
28. Chandler's Ford Parish Council were given opportunity to comment on these proposals both at informal and formal advertisement stage and they did not raise any objections to the proposals.
29. Notices on site clearly stated that the proposals were for 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions, school keep clear markings are already outside the school. The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions states that these are not permitted beyond the immediate vicinity of the school gates.

The Council's policy on Resident Permit Zones is that they can only be introduced in areas it can be considered self-financing and therefore it would not be deemed suitable due to the small number of properties this would serve and the type of property as many have off road parking facilities available in the form of driveways.

30. Parking in this location does contravene the Highway Code which states that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction however Eastleigh Borough Council does have powers to implement no waiting at any time restrictions in locations where inappropriate and potentially dangerous parking occurs. It is however recognised that this issue is mainly present during school peak periods and restrictions to the extents advertised are likely to have detrimental impact of residents at other times of the day.
31. To reduce impact on loss of amenity to residents, restrictions can be reduced in Tadburn Close and Fir Croft Drive without impacting on the statement of reasons as shown on drawing TM01/01551/002 REV A.

**Recommendation:**

32. In light of objections received, restrictions in Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close /Fir Croft Drive should be implemented as shown on the amended drawing TM01/01551/002 Rev A.

**Brickfield Lane**

**Statement of Reasons:**

To extent of 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions to facilitate lorry movements in and out of Customs House.

**Summary of Comments:**

No comments were received relating to these proposals during formal advertisement

**Recommendation:**

33. Restrictions in Brickfield Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO as shown on drawing no. TM01/01551/004.

**Castle Lane**

**Statement of Reasons:**

To extend the 'No Waiting, Monday- Friday, 10am -11am and 2pm-3pm' restrictions in Castle Lane to prevent long term parking and alleviate obstructions.

## Summary of Comments

34. 5 representations have been received. 4 objecting and 1 comment of support. The comments stated are as follows:
35. An expression of support for restrictions was received however the commenter believes that proposals do not go far enough as it will still not stop vehicles from parking close to the junction outside of times of restrictions. The commenter believes that double yellow lines should be extended to include this area to prevent obstructive parking when queuing for the lights during peak periods.
36. An objection from Councillor Alan Broadhurst, Member of the Committee stating the following: 'Cannot and will not support restrictions outside house 2a it was not what was previously agreed with the Chandlers Ford and Hiltigbury Local Area Committee and not what the residents asked for. In fact it was clearly stated that restrictions were required outside of numbers 2 and 4 only which is an area largely protected by 'H-bar markings'
37. An objection from Councillor David Pragnell, Member of Committee stating the following: 'It would be a mistake to publish a proposal to put lines in front of Castlewood houses, there is no prospect that the members will accept it. This would really upset residents that have been given an absolute assurance that this will not happen. I trust this will be the end of this matter.
38. A resident stated that parking opposite Castlewood is the only parking available for visitors between the hours of 10-11 and 2-3 due to parking restrictions already in place along the road. If restrictions are to go ahead then there will be nowhere for visitors to park that seems unfair. The resident also pointed out traffic coming from Bournemouth Road is halted when turning into driveway due to cars queuing at traffic lights.
39. Another resident strongly objects to extension of double yellow lines outside Castlewood it will penalise residents and the resident would prefer a permit parking scheme. Extending restrictions will just increase traffic speeds. The objector understands proposals have come from officers not Councillors which is concerning. The resident was informed that restrictions would not be put here but they are now being proposed again.

## Response to Comments:

40. The support for the restrictions and request for no waiting at any time restrictions is noted. The proposed restrictions are to prevent all day commuter parking rather than prevent the amenity to park altogether which would have impact on residents and visitors.
41. As stated the restrictions are being proposed to prevent all day commuter parking on Castle Lane and are being proposed between 10-11 and 2-3 Mon-Fri so that it limits the impact to residents. However, in light of comments received it is possible to reduce restrictions so a length of un-

restricted parking can be retained outside of 2a as shown on amended drawing TM01/01551/003 REV A.

42. The proposals were clearly advertised as a no waiting between 10-11 and 2-3 Monday-Friday (single yellow line restriction). 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Lines) are not part of this proposal. Implementation of further restrictions in Castle Lane has been deemed a priority by the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Local Area Committee to progress in this year's programme.

**Recommendation:**

43. In light of objections received restrictions in Castle Lane should be implemented as shown on amended drawing TM01/01551/003 REV A, further monitoring will be undertaken.

**Cuckoo Bushes Lane**

**Statement of Reasons:**

44. To implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions at the junction with Hursley Road to prevent parking to improve ingress and egress.

**Summary of Comments**

No comments have been received relating to these proposals during formal advertisement period.

**Recommendation:**

45. Restrictions in Cuckoo Bushes Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no. TM01/01551/008

**Hillcrest Avenue**

**Statement of Reasons**

46. To implement a limited waiting restriction in the layby between 08:30 to 09:30am and 3:30 to 4:30pm, Monday –Friday, limited to 15mins no return within 30mins to improve school pick and drop offs. No waiting at any time is proposed at the school car park entrance with its junction with Hillcrest Avenue to prevent junction parking as the School Zig Zag will be removed. School Zig Zag (No stopping at any time) to be extended at the south east side of the lay by to cover the pedestrian entrance to the school.

**Summary of Comments**

No comments have been received relating to these proposals during formal advertisement period.

**Recommendation:**

47. That restrictions in Hillcrest Avenue should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO as shown on the amended drawing no. TM01/01551/011.



## **Meadbrook Gardens**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

48. To implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' on the bend in Meadbrook Gardens to alleviate obstructions to service vehicles.

### **Summary of Comments:**

49. 1 comment of support was received relating to access difficulties of refuse collection vehicles due to obstructive parking on the bend.

### **Response to Comments:**

50. The comment of support has been noted.

### **Recommendation:**

51. That restrictions in Meadbrook Gardens should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no. TM01/01551/009.

## **Peeverells Road/Serum Road/Clausentum Close**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

52. To implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' Restrictions to improve road safety by reducing congestion and obstructions caused by parked vehicles.

### **Summary of comments:**

53. 8 representations have been received. All of these have stated objections to the proposals.
54. Proposals show restrictions right up to driveway of house number 34 which means no one can park outside number 36. The objector would like the restrictions reduced to enable a parking place to be retained outside number 36.
55. No waiting at any time should start/stop at the boundary of 36/38. Also the objector was concerned for the 'school run mums' and would like the section between 38 Oakmount Road and 1 Clausentum Close set up with a time limited zone Monday to Friday. The resident stated that there has never been an issue with school run traffic/parking in this location.
56. Objectors stated that restrictions will prevent parking outside house and there will be no available parking for visitors.
57. Restrictions will take away parking amenity from users of the library and doctors surgery of which is accessed via the back alley off Peeverells Road.

### **Response to Comments:**

58. Having assessed the extents of restrictions at the junction with Peverells Road, Clausentum Close and Sarum Road junction, it is possible to reduce the restriction to enable parking outside of 36 Peverells Road as requested.
59. In light of objections and comments relating to the section of Peverells Road alongside 1 Clausentum Close, it is recommended that a section along the northern kerbline is left unrestricted to retain amenity to residents.
60. Please refer to amended plan TM0/01551/006 REV B attached showing the recommended reduced length of restrictions.

### **Recommendation**

61. In light of objections received, restrictions in Peverells Road/Sarum Road/Clausentum Close should be implemented as shown on amended drawing TM01/01551/006 REV B.

## **Roman Close/Peverells Wood Avenue**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

62. To implement 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions at the junction of Roman Close and Peverells Wood Avenue to prevent junction parking to improve ingress and egress. No waiting at any time is also proposed along the north western side of Roman Close for its entire length to prevent obstructive parking. No waiting 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm Monday to Saturday is proposed to prevent non-residential parking obstructing vehicle accesses.

### **Summary of Comments:**

63. 4 representations were received relating to these proposals, a petition of 7 signatures stating its support, 2 objections and 1 objection received after the deadline (which is listed in the Appendices)
64. Objectors stated the following reasons:-
65. Would like restrictions included along the left hand side of Peverells Wood Avenue from Winchester Road to Vesta Way as on-street parking here makes it difficult to see past to overtake. It has been noted that a large recovery truck regularly parks in this location several times a week.
66. Concerns that this proposal will move parked vehicles further down Peverells Wood Avenue

### **Response to Comments:**

67. The support for the restriction is noted.
68. Restrictions here are being proposed to predominately prevent obstructive non-residential parking in Roman Close and have been included on this

year's priority list for delivery by Chandlers Ford and Hiltingbury Local Area Committee. Requests to implement further restrictions are noted but these would need to be investigated separately and weighed up against other locations within the area where implementation of restrictions is deemed a higher priority.

69. It is recognised that implementation of restrictions here will displace some parking into adjacent roads. Peverells Wood Avenue already has no waiting at any time restrictions on the southern side so there should be no obstruction to through access or obstructive parking opposite drives.

**Recommendation:**

70. That restrictions in Peverells Wood Avenue/Roman Close should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no. TM01/01551/005.

**Station Lane**

**Statement of Reasons:**

71. A loading only bay is proposed at the rear of the Co-Op this is to provide a dedicated loading bay for deliveries as currently delivery vehicles obstruct Station Lane. Proposed changes to limited waiting bays to state no return to this road within the same day. This is to prevent users from shuffling between bays all day reducing the on-street capacity.

**Summary of Comments:**

72. 1 comment was received relating to the proposals appreciating the need for no return within same day restrictions but also requesting permit parking for residents on Station Lane.

**Response to Comments:**

73. Residents parking schemes are normally introduced across large areas to avoid moving problems and to ensure that there are sufficient spaces to satisfy demand and make them more equitable. The implementation of a residents parking scheme is very costly and policy states that that all residents parking schemes should be self-financing and therefore the capital costs and on-going revenue costs to operate the scheme must be funded from penalty charge income and the cost of permits. In this location, the majority of costs would fall on residents themselves with the cost of permits, which may be met with some objection.

**Recommendation:**

74. Changes to existing limited waiting restrictions and the provision of a new loading bay in Station Lane should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown on drawing TM01/01551/010.

## **Valley Road/Neilson Close/Heathlands Road**

### **Statement of Reasons:**

75. To implement a 'No waiting at any time' restriction in Valley Road at its junction with Neilson Close and Heathlands Road to prevent junction parking to improve ingress and egress.

### **Summary of Comments:**

76. No comments have been received relating to these proposals during formal advertisement period.

### **Recommendation:**

77. That restrictions in Valley Road/Neilson Close/Heathlands Road should be implemented in accordance with the advertised TRO, as shown in drawing no. TM01/01551/007.

## **Financial Implications**

78. The cost of the TRO and associated signs and road markings are funded through the Traffic Management Agency budget. There are no cost implications for this Committee.
79. Any amendments or new proposals which require the Traffic Regulation Order to be re-advertised and further consultation to be carried out will incur additional costs in terms of staff time and advertisement expenses that were not included in the original estimate for the work. Due to time and budget limitations such changes would be better addressed through inclusion in a future various TRO.

## **Equality and Diversity Implications**

80. An equal opportunities assessment has not been carried out because the report does not contain proposals for significant changes to existing services, policies or strategies and does not introduce any new services, policies or strategies.

## **Conclusions**

81. The proposed Traffic Regulation Order to introduce new waiting restrictions in Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury received objections.
82. The Committee needs to decide whether to proceed with the proposals to which objections have been received.

**NATALIE WIGMAN**  
Corporate Director (Strategy)

Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2017  
Contact Officer: Steve Hellyer  
Tel No: 023 8068 8044  
e-mail: Steve.hellyer@eastleigh.gov.uk  
Appendices Attached: Appendix A – Objections/comments received  
Report No: 5

**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.