

CFH Various Order 2017

Objections/Comments Received during Advertising Period

Road	Comments	S/O/C
Beresford Road	<p>The reasons for the above implementation cite "to improve visibility and reduce obstructions" which I firmly believe are unnecessary and a waste of public spending. I have lived in Beresford Gardens for 9 years plus and never had an issue with entering or exiting the road, our waste is always collected and there have never been any accidents at this junction which would support the visibility issue. Further, the vehicles act as traffic calming in a residential area with young children. By removing the cars and improving visibility you will increase vehicle speeds (I don't see speeds being enforced by the police in this area). These proposals would create further safety issues rather than mitigate. Lastly, the displacement of vehicles within the area will only lead to a catalyst of further spending and restrictions when the residents who live here are managing the road space between themselves in an amicable manner. The lack of car spaces will only create anger and aggression.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>loss of parking space outside my own home, plan shows no parking restriction 21m from junction, why so far when highway code states 10m. we have lived in this house for 30 years & I have never known an accident on this junction so why when reasons given to improve visibility & reduce obstruction is it this junction the one you are looking at, when there is far worst parking on bends & junctions on the estate in Beresford road & westmoreland way where I have known of near collisions & damaged door mirrors in the past. When we first moved in to this house there was a lay-by which held 5 cars since then Eastleigh borough council have allowed residences to drop the kerbs & reduce the spaces from 5 to 3 cars therefore taking spaces away from other residence & visitors. With this in mind please consider allowing us to have a parking space outside our front gate, which would still allow 10m clear of the junction.</p>	O

Beresford Road	<p>I am asking why its now been decided that we need parking restriction's on the junction of Beresford Road and Beresford Gardens. The drive ways in Beresford Road are very steep on the side of even numbers and not used. Your map only shows a few roads then shorely it should be EVERY JUNCTION This will cause MORE problems and anger the residents, as cars may be parked closer to peoples drive ways I have been living here for a number years and its not been a issue so why now put this in place now. if this is going to be monitored by Traffic Wardens then who is pay their wage as I think a crossing warden would be better at Toynbe School. If you have to do parking then stop the big vans parking taking up two spots as I work very odd hours I often have to park on corner as leave home at 4am returning at 5:30 pm (on day shift) and nights I get home around 5am and leave home at 3:30 pm any day of week as I am in security.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>Objection of proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions outside my property 32 Beresford Road that I have lived in for nearly 19 years. I park outside my property due to the very poor design of drive and garage. As built in 1974 the garage is too small for a family car and drive is the steepest along Beresford Road at an angle of 45 degrees making long time parking very dangerous. I have a daughter who owns a car, my son will driving in a year and we also park to the side of my property in Beresford Gardens along with multiple tenants from 34 Beresford Road, other locals and visitors. With 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions this will reduce the parking, if parked correctly to just 2 spaces before blocking 1 Beresford Gardens drive. Already problems with parking around here as parking between 37-45 and 21-35 has been greatly reduced with dropped kerbs and you now want to take away more parking spaces, so where are we supposed to park? I understand it is to improve visibility and reduce obstructions but drive round any road around here and it is the same problem. My daughter hit a parked car between 48 and 50 Beresford Road because of cars doubled parked on a bend and she had to swerve when another vehicle tried squeezing through. I've been led to believe the homeowner opposite in 35 Beresford Road is complaining he can't get his car in his drive which is utter rubbish as he's done it every day for years with no problems and at speed. No doubt 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions will also devalue my property as there will be nowhere to park.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>I have recently purchased a property within the parking enforcement and feel the this will devalue my property. As the driveway is to steep to park on and with having two very young children it will not be safe to make them walk across roads to get to the car. I also feel there will not be enough adequate parking for all properties that are effected by this which will just cause issues in other roads that are used. Myself and my partner have been bullied and harassed by one resident since the first day of moving in to the area and have tried our upmost best the park without causing disruption to him and no other residents have had any complaints to us.</p>	O

Beresford Road	<p>The new parking restrictions appear to include in front of our drive way (30 Beresford). We have been parking along here for a long time with no problems much like all other residents along the road. Our driveway is not suitable to park on, and we have two vehicles like most family's do. If these restrictions go ahead it will force me to park much further away from my house. I have two very young children and do not wish to cross roads with them by myself. I can not carry all of our belongings a long way to the car. I also do not want to leave them in the car by themselves so I can go back for bags etc. This would not be safe. I very much object to these parking restrictions, as I'm sure many resided ya do! There is no were else we could possibly park without it being too far to walk.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>As my young family have recently moved into the area this act will devalue there new home. It will make dropping off shopping and young children impossible and unsafe. It will have an in pack on elderly relatives that can not walk far to visit.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>I have had a request from residents in Beresford Road, Chandler's Ford, for a slight amendment to the above Order where it relates to their road. I understand that Mr. and Mrs. Lane of 37 Beresford Road have already submitted an objection to the Order. I have been round to see them and have looked at the situation from their point of view. They would be quite happy if we could make a slight amendment to the length of the double yellow lines from their corner of the Westmorland Way/Beresford Road junction. If we could stop the lines at the far end of their dropped kerb, thus leaving a small area which would allow one car to park on the road outside their property, they would be willing to accept this. This seems to me to be quite reasonable. Could we therefore please make this slight amendment.</p>	C
Beresford Road	<p>Further to our original objection to the parking restrictions in Beresford Road I would like to enclose photos which I have sent to engineers@eastleigh.gov.uk. The first photo is taken at the drivers eye view from the junction of Beresford Road & Westmorland Way looking right up Beresford Road past number 37 & you can clearly see with no obstruction all the way up to the next corner even with a car parked outside number 37. The second photo, you are looking left from junction & again you can clearly see all the way to next corner with no obstruction, the kerb has been lowered outside number 35 so you are unable to park outside the layby without blocking the dropped kerb. Looking at the pictures I don't see what you are going to gain by putting double yellow lines on this junction. I am lead to believe the original complaint was raised by number 35 Beresford Road, who has had a parking space built in his front garden which backs out straight into the stop lines of the junction, as you can see from the photos even with double yellow lines, he would still be reversing straight into the line of approaching traffic, he will still not be able to see past his own over grown hedge row on the westmorland side of his drive & on the opposite side his own wheelie bins followed by the vehicles parked in the authorised parking bays in the layby, how will double yellow line help him as his vision is still obstructed by vehicles parked legally.</p>	C

Beresford Road	<p>I am writing to you to ascertain why a decision has been made to restrict parking at the junction of Beresford Road and Beresford Gardens. I am angry and disappointment in this decision. I am writing to you to ascertain why a decision has been made to restrict parking at the junction of Beresford Road and Beresford Gardens. I am angry and disappointment in this decision. I think the money this will cost could be better spent elsewhere, I.e traffic lights at the Toynee School junction or cctv around the streets of Chandlers Ford to prevent the street crime we have experienced recently in the area. (Smashed windows, cars vandalised, graffiti).</p> <p>This seems like a knee jerk reaction to petty complaint by a minority that will affect the majority of residents in the area.</p> <p>Your urgent response to this email would be greatly appreciated.</p>	O
Beresford Road	<p>Ridiculous. I'd is every other corner on that part of the estate going to be the same? How inconsiderate - some of those drives need cramp-ons and cars cannot park on them. There is a coverted pull-in opposite and God help us should we park in there !!!! The complaints will come via those next now.</p>	O LATE
Bodycoats Road	<p>We live at 142 Bodycoats Road on the corner with Tadburn Close. Our back garden is split level with only one capraking space on the high ground. We have a 7 month old baby and 3 year child. We have to park our family car on the road near the corner of Tadburn Close and Bodycoats Road in order to have safe and level access to our car when carrying the children. Our neighbour's at 144 have the same problem. There have never been any accidents here in the 10 years I have lived here. We could only cope with these changes if we were allowed to park our car in the front garden first. The consultation period prevents local residents discussing the proposal at a parish council meeting and should be extended so the parish council can respond after holding its July meting.</p>	O

Bodycoats Road	<p>I am objecting as my parents live at 201 Bodycoats Road and have done for over 30 years so I know the operation of the area well and often visit. The extent of the TRO restriction is excessive. No clear reasons for the required TRO have been set out and the restriction to parking will displace resident and visitor parking in the area onto the southern side of Bodycoats Road causing a nuisance to residents on this side. Given the area in question is subject to traffic calming parking itself within accordance of the highway code does not cause a safety concern and actually aids with reducing traffic speeds when staggered. There is no known or acknowledged safety issue with the current informal white lining arrangement and therefore no justification under the current Traffic Management policy to have double yellow lines which extend beyond enforcing the Highway Code of no parking within 10m of a junction. I therefore object to the proposed extent on the loss of amenity to existing residents and visitors of on street parking.</p>	O LATE
Bodycoats Road	<p>As a resident of Bodycoats Road I feel this proposal is a complete over reaction. The proposed reason for reduced vision when cars are parked etc seems justifiable, but this would impact residents who need to use the road for parking (myself) and those visiting residents and would lead to clustering of parking on the already busy corner of Bodycoats road where it is already poor for those speeding and being able to see them coming. I feel "parking anytime" restrictions are unnecessary due to the negative impacts it would have for ten minutes of the day, traffic is not an issue in the morning where students attendance to school is stagnated but only in the afternoon when they finish. although this is troublesome, blocking off parking by the school will only increase the issue down the road and in oakmount road. inputting these restrictions is extremely inconvenient for those who live by the school. And isn't justified as there are rarely accidents there due to the traffic calming on the road and doesn't provide a solution as it would just move traffic to a narrower bend where the problem would be worse, As well as oakmount which already queues badly due to people parking by the crossing outside the school. Please reconsider this stupid reactive idea as it would solve nothing.</p>	O LATE
Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Cl	<p>this order does not clearly define what type of restrictions will be in place, single or double yellow lines however regardless of that fact I object as this will highly reduce the amount of parking spaces that are available in the close. I'd suggest implementing "School Keep Clear" markings but allow residents to continue to park OR implement permit parking for residents and "School Keep Clear"</p>	O

Castle Lane	<p>There is a problem for what we are proposing in Castle Lane. It is not what the residents and Local members asked for or agreed. I could not support the amendments to the order as published, in fact when this last came to the LAC it was clearly stated that what was needed was the limited waiting extended outside of numbers 2 and 4 only largely over the area now protected by "bar markings". This was promised at the LAC (publically) we (officers and members) are here to serve the public.</p> <p>This is what is needed I CANNOT AND WILL NOT support extended the limited waiting in front of number 2A (opposite Castlewood).</p>	O
Castle Lane	<p>If I see any more attempts to ignore member's decision we will need to take the matter to managerial level. The debate has been had, the decision made, it just needs implementing. It would be a mistake to publish a proposal to put lines in front of the Castlewood houses, there is no prospect that 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 an end to the matter.</p>	O
Castle Lane	<p>As a resident, the parking opposite the Castlewood houses is the only parking available for visitors between the hours of 10-11 and 2-3 due to parking restrictions we already have along the road If the double yellow line are to go ahead people have no where to park between those hours which seems unfair to have no where to park outside our house. Also the traffic coming from Bournemouth Rd is also halted due to cars blocking our driveway when we are trying to drive into it, but we've had a conversation about that before and it's been ignored</p>	O

Castle Lane	<p>Taking into account the misuse of this residential area for commuter parking, I strongly object to an extension of the double yellow lines that exist in some areas of Castle Lane currently. We, and our neighbours, feel that this would penalise residents and we would prefer a parking permit scheme in operation so that we can ensure that residents and our visitors can park. The current end point of the double yellow lines is currently more than 15meters away from the junction and does serve to calm the traffic on this end of Castle Lane – another concern of ours. Extending the double yellow lines would only increase the speed at which cars travel on this stretch of road - either racing the traffic lights, or gathering speed as they travel downhill in the other direction. I am of the understanding that the proposal for the extension outside the Castlewood homes comes from officers and not councillors which is concerning. We have been regularly communicating about our need for the parking outside our home for several years and found them understanding and sympathetic to our needs. This proposal once again has caused us unnecessary stress, further compounded by letters being sent out which told residents that there would be no changes to the current arrangements, only to then find out from a sign outside our house that further changes are proposed! As the head of a primary school and my husband as a shift working police officer, we rely on two cars for work purposes and we are anxious about what these proposals might mean for us. To reiterate, we are strongly opposed to any changes outside the Castlewood properties.</p>	0
-------------	---	---

Castle Lane	<p>I have seen the proposal for the planned parking restrictions on Castle Lane and although I agree with them, I don't believe they go far enough. Since you brought in the other restrictions a few months ago on the rest of Castle Lane I found it strange that this section you are now proposing the restrictions on had not been included at the time of the original amendments. However the fact that you are putting restrictions for just a couple of hours throughout the day doesn't seem right, not for the section nearest the traffic lights on Castle Lane. I think you should review this, as even with these new restrictions you are implementing, this won't stop people parking in the section nearest to the lights. I feel this is dangerous and also restricts the flow of traffic. Double yellow lines are on one side of the street nearest to the lights and I think there should also be double yellow lines on the other side of the street nearest to the lights. Currently you can only get two cars waiting at the lights to exit Castle lane as people park in the section on the other side of the road. Your proposal will only stop this for 2 hours of the day and these aren't the busy periods. The flow of traffic and safety would be improved by extending the current double yellow lines (on the left side of the road as you enter Castle Lane), as cars often have to wait for the lights to change or have people move out of the way to get round parked cars and all this happening close to a busy traffic light junction which has seen a number of crashes over the years and really should have a right arrow indication when it is safe for cars to proceed off Bournemouth Road onto Castle lane, as often it's not clear when it is safe to proceed and normally you only know this when people start to exit Castle Lane, at which point you need to move out of their way. I've seen a number of crashes happen this way and nearly had one myself when turning right off Bournemouth Road onto Castle Lane. The whole junction should really be looked at in ways of how to improve safety, but I think a good start would be to extend the double yellow lines nearest to the junction. Parked cars shouldn't be this close to this busy junction</p>	S
Meadbrook Gardens	<p>As the Managing Agents for Mead Court we would like to support this traffic regulation as the vehicles that park on the road that belong to the houses are blocking the access for the refuse team to empty the communal bins at this development. This then results in additional costs for the residents at Mead Court to have their bins emptied.</p>	S
Peverells Road	<p>I am objecting because proposal according to drawing shows double yellow lines right up too my neighbours (no 34) driveway). This is a nominal distance of 20 metres from the corner and means no one can park in road directly outside my house. I have quite a few family members and friends which would then have to park outside neighbours if my driveway was full which would not make the neighbours happy. The drawing shows the double yellow lines on no 31 (opposite) to finish at same location as the double yellow lines outside my house. However this line is only a nominal 12 metres long because no 31 is further back into Peverells Road than no 38. To make double yellow lines 20 metres from a corner makes no sense (non of the other corners have no way near this proposed distance). I would be happy for the double yellow lines from corner of 38 Peverells road to my property to be reduced from 20 metres to 12 metres as corner opposite.</p>	O

Peverells Road	The No waiting at any time should start/stop on the boundary of Nos38/36 Peverells Road. 2. We are concerned for the 'school run mums'. Therefore we would like to see the section of Peverells Road alongside 38 Oakmount Road and 1 Clausentum Close set up with a time limited zone and only Monday to Friday. This would assist Mums whom are always in a hurry with little ones. We have kived on this junction for many years. We have never had any problem with the school run traffic/parking	O
Peverells Road	I would like to object the current parking restriction you are looking to put in place on Peverells Road. I will not be able to park outside the side of my own house. Family members will not be able to visit with me and have three very young grandchildren, if my daughter are not able to park outside my own home then how are they meant to visit? Me and my husband will miss out, which I'm very unhappy with. Therefore we fully support the objecting of the parking restrictions.	O
Peverells Road	I reject the parking restrictions you are looking to put into place on Peverells Road, we will not be able to park outside our own home which we have lived at for over 30 years! Where do you expect us, family & friends to park? Therefore we reject the traffic restrictions you are looking to put into place.	O
Peverells Road	I object to the parking restrictions as I will not be able to park outside my own home, I work shifts at the hospital I need to be able to park outside my home at different times of the day.	O
Peverells Road	I object to the parking restriction you are looking to put intoplace. I walk my dogs everyday as they are living with family, I want to be able to park outside the property not 10 milesdown the road!	O

Peverells Road	<p>I'm objecting the proposed no waotong zone along Peverells Road: Firstly a selfish reason. My parents live local to Peverells Road and I have two children under 16 months old. I rely parking along Peverells Rd to visit them, as you can imagine getting two children (16 months and 9 weeks) out of the car is a task in itself, but being able to access their address from Peverells makes life a lot easier. If the parking restrictions where to be put in place it would be a massive deterrent for visiting and my children will miss out on time with their grandparents and vice Versa. Is this fair?</p> <p>Secondly looking at it from a community point of view. People predominantly park along this road to access the local amenities such as the library and doctors surgery. A majority of the people parking here are elderly, and use the back alley. I am basing it on personal experience but I can imagine they park here because the Parking behind the library is diabolical, and you can not get a space along Oakmount Rd. So is it fair to hinder people particularly a vulnerable part of the community going about their daily business??</p> <p>If it's the school traffic you're trying to stop why can there not be parking restrictions at certain times of the day? So therefore I am objecting.</p>	0
----------------	--	---

Peverells Road	<p>We are not against the proposal for an extension of the no waiting zone from Oakmount Road into Peverells Road and up around the corners of Sarum Road and Clausentum Close in its entirety - this area does get quite congested, which does cause issues around the junction, albeit only really for the short time each day when the Fryern schools are dropping off and picking up. Our concern is that this solution is a little over zealous and will negatively affect local residents without due cause. In particular the stretch of Peverells Road between the unnamed road running behind the Oakmount Road properties and Clausentum Close is a particularly useful overspill parking area for people living in Oakmount Road, who generally only have restricted rear parking and have restrictions on parking in front of their houses already - particularly in the section from opposite Fryern Close to roughly opposite the entrance to Fryern School. This section of Peverells Road is rarely congested (except for school times), it does not naturally front any particular property and therefore it's a really useful space for about 5-6 vehicles, especially for visitors etc without causing anyone an issue. Current parking habits are that people already only usually park on the Clausentum Close side of Peverells Road (other than at school times when people park both sides). Therefore could I request an amendment to your proposals - namely that the section of road in Peverells Road, between the unnamed access road behind Oakmount Road properties and Clausentum Close is excluded from the no waiting zone as currently drafted. This would be to the benefit of local residents who currently rely on this area for guest and overspill parking, for which there is little alternative. Introducing a no waiting zone on the opposite side of the road would sufficiently help to ensure that the area does not get too congested at school drop off and pick up times. I know it might be out of scope for this particular TRO, but would it also be possible to request that some visible no waiting paint (perhaps some yellow hatchings or something similar?), be applied to each end of the unnamed access road that goes behind the section of Oakmount Road that we live in (roughly house numbers 40-62)? As waiting areas for school drop off are limited, discourteous parents regularly park in the entrance to our access road, effectively blocking us in. This is very frustrating and is particularly frequent at the end which joins Oakmount Road opposite the Fryern School entrance, but happens at both ends. It would help a great deal if there were some clear road markings to show that it is an access route and waiting is not permitted.</p>	O
----------------	--	---

Roman Close	<p>After seeing the proposed parking notice for Roman Close and Peverells Wood Avenue I was wondering if you would consider including the restrictions in Peverells Wood Avenue on the left hand side from Winchester Road to Vesta Way. The parking outside each and every house during the day makes it impossible to drive down the road safely if someone is driving up. Also cars parked outside 1 and 3 Peverells Wood Avenue, on the left, make it difficult to see past to over take . One or two times a week there is a large recovery truck that parks in this road which also makes it difficult to see past. By making these restrictions the cars will park further down Peverells Wood Ave as most of these drivers are parking here to catch the bus to Southampton or Winchester or working around the Fryern Arcade, leaving their cars for most of the day.</p>	O
Roman Close	<p>notices have appeared regarding restricted parking in roman close chandlersford . what i and other residents are concerned about is that this will push all of that traffic into peverells wood ave. We already have problems with parking some even park within 6 ft of the turning of peverells road and the ave nue There is going to be an accident at some time as the traffic cant always see what is coming down the avenue.</p>	O
Roman Close	<p>Petition containing 7 signatures supporting proposals in Roman Close</p>	S
Roman Close	<p>We live in this area and never see any problems with trafficnot being able to get through because of parked cars.People stop briefly to collect their children from ThorndenSchool, which is safer for the children and does not causeany undue problems. Elderly people who park in these roads to do a little shoppingin the few shops there are will struggle to find parking. The car park behind the Co-Op is dangerous and usually full, italso has restricted parking, as does the Waitrose car Park,which was originally a free car park for anyone and Waitrosewere allowed their bid for the site on condition that this carpark remained free and unrestricted for anyone to use. Chandlers Ford is already a dreadful bottleneck with queuesof traffic at a standstill, these parking restrictions will makethis worse, with more people driving around to findsomewhere that they can park. Already cars are parking inresidential Roads when they can't find anywhere else to parkand this will push more and more cars to park in the roadsthat are as yet unrestrictedChandlers Ford is a village without any amazing attractions,surely anyone who wants to come here should at least beallowed to park easily.This is clearly an environmental problem as well as more andmore people will pave over their gardens to provide their ownparking, which is bad for the environment.As you are forcing people to park further away from thecentre of Chandlers Ford, is this then to pave the way forparking charges in the car parks, which will be detrimental tothe local older people and devastating to small businesses.</p>	O LATE

Station Road	<p>We appreciate that removing the ability to move to another bay on the same road may limit the spaces being used by local businesses during the day, but feel that residents of Station Lane need to be considered. Many of us do not have allocated parking or own enough space for a car by our property. If we are at home on a weekday we already have to move our car throughout the day, which is difficult with young children. Could resident permits be considered? We also feel that the road and small car park is used by several local businesses as a form of advertisement during the evening and weekend; one example is Makley Motors who are based at the top of Station Lane and have spaces outside their unit but often park their signwritten van at the bottom of the lane or in the car park. It is becoming increasingly difficult to park when we get home from work and at least once a week we are having to park in the train station car park, which we shouldn't be doing but the alternative of parking on School Lane and getting a toddler home safely is not something we would want to do. Thank you for your consideration of the above comments.</p>	C
Tadburn Close	<p>Residents petition with 31 signatures of objection to the proposed no waiting at anytime restrictions at junction with Bodycoats Road/Tadburn Close</p>	O