

## Appendix 2

### Representations

#### Church Road/Longmead Avenue

1	<p>I am quite involved with church activities especially flower arranging for festivals, and memorial/celebration flowers at other times of the year. Often several people are involved all needing to park near the church and transport items in and out of the church. This is mostly on a Saturday but can be during the week too depending on the request or date of an event. I therefore object to parking restriction in the above area</p>
2	<p>There are many community groups and activities using the church on weekdays - when we're not in Lockdown. Some involve young children; others are more elderly residents with restricted mobility - even if not registered disabled. Removing parking from front of church - when there is no other dedicated parking for the building - will make their attendance more difficult or more dangerous. As a volunteer minister for the church, who lives in Eastleigh, not Bishopstoke, I know how difficult it is to find a car parking space elsewhere in the residential area. Some people would stop using our church, I'm sure, because of this additional constraint to their attendance. . What would make more sense, is to mark out dedicated church parking spaces in front of the church, yet protect the corner junction by very limited traffic lines. The benefit would be for church users to park safely by the church gate and to gradually slow the traffic on that broader stretch of road going down the hill</p>
3	<p>Access to activities that take place during the week at St Mary's Church will be impacted in a negative way if participants, many of whom are elderly, or who have small children, are required to scout around for suitable parking, which is already in short supply owing to contractors working on Bishopstoke Park and others parking on local roads. More parking needs to be provided in Bishopstoke in general, especially in areas near local amenities, such as the shops on Riverside or the Old Anchor Surgery.</p>
4	<p>My planning committee discussed the TRO in their meeting yesterday and had a couple of questions / comments which I hope you can help me with, both regarding the proposed restrictions outside St Mary's Church on Church Road.</p> <p>First, the map of the restrictions shows both dotted red and dotted green lines, and both are described as "No waiting at any time". From the schedule I believe the green line should indicate "No waiting from Monday to Saturday between 8:00 am and 6:00 pm". Can you please check and confirm this for me.</p> <p>Secondly, with this in mind, the Committee were concerned that this would mean people parking for weddings and funerals in particular could end up with parking tickets. They hope that some sort of exemption for attending that sort of event, even if only for hearses and wedding cars, would be appropriate and although there are some Councillors who believe that would definitely be the case we could not find anything specific in the orders as drafted. I would be grateful if you could update me on what is planned there.</p>
5	<p>I wish to object to the parking restriction proposed outside St Mary's church, Bishopstoke. It is not only weddings and funerals which take place during the week there are many other activities for which parking directly outside the church is required. These include: midweek services for all ages, toddler group, midweek prayer and admin meeting etc. Visits to the church yard by relatives, workmen needing access with equipment to the buildings and grounds.</p>

	<p>As pastoral coordinator for Bishopstoke parochial parish I am very aware that although parking is available on the road opposite the church gate it can be a “nightmare” trying to get an elderly person across the road to the church gate for a coffee morning whilst cars are travelling at speed southwards down the hill.</p> <p>There is no off road parking nor room in the residential roads around.</p> <p>This restriction will greatly affect the activities we are able to offer for and in the community of Bishopstoke</p>
6	<p>The proposed no waiting Monday-Saturday Restrictions on the East Side of Church Road southwards from Longmead Avenue will massively impact upon the amenity and community use of St Mary's Church. St Mary's is used regularly for Cafe fundraisers and Weddings on Saturdays, and on weekdays: a Mum's &amp; Tot's Group, Youth Group, Flower arranging, and Funerals, etc. Occasional events are held on Saturdays, including concerts. St Mary's has no offroad parking - older generation and young families in particular will struggle with this, or simply not come at all as a result. Those that do and forced to park across the road will be endangered when crossing what will become a more dangerous road as you will be encouraging vehicles to come downhill at more (not less) speed resulting from this TRO. Suggestion: replace with 4-hour no return? Otherwise just leave as is, 2 out of 3 Statements of Reason are not being met at all with zero consideration for this community and residents!</p>
7	<p>No parking outside St Mary's church will adversely affect the mission and ministry of the church. There is no off road parking and so people coming to church need to be able to park outside. The church is used most days, not just Sundays.</p>
8	<p>I do understand there is a problem with the number of cars parked in Church Road. This situation should be alleviated when the various building projects are completed. Would you please consider having 2-hour parking outside St Mary's church for people with limited mobility but not qualifying for Blue Badge status.</p>
9	<p>I wish to object to the proposed parking restrictions outside St. Mary's Church on the grounds that the work of the church is not restricted solely to Sundays, and extends beyond the weddings and funerals on the other days of the week. Therefore the proposed parking restrictions outside the church will have an impact on what the church does outside of Sundays. I run the Toddler group which benefits the whole community of Bishopstoke. It meets at St Mary's Church on a weekday morning. Some of our parents have to drive to the church, often with a baby and a toddler and it is really beneficial if they can park directly outside the church, to avoid having to cross the road or walking some distance to get to the church with their young children. I am also involved in other aspects of church life which again benefit the whole community, including running the youth group. These activities often necessitate bringing lots of equipment to and from the church building during the week. It would be hugely inconvenient to not be able to park directly outside the church in order to do this.</p>
10	<p>Bishopstoke Parochial Church Council wish to comment on and object to this proposal which restricts parking outside St Mary's Church.</p> <p><b>Use of the building and grounds for church and community</b></p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the exceptions made for vehicles for weddings and funerals, and those with a 'Blue Badge', the church is used for far more things from Monday – Saturday than weddings and funerals, and the need to park very near the church is also very necessary for other users of the grounds. In normal times, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a weekly toddler group</li> <li>• midweek daytime services</li> <li>• midweek daytime meetings</li> </ul>

- a monthly café for the community on a Saturday
- occasional concerts, sometimes on a Saturday during the day
- flower arranging at festival times, normally done on a Saturday
- churchyard grass cutting and maintenance
- contractors working on the building
- those visiting graves
- those giving lifts to people who need a lift when the driver does not qualify for a 'Blue Badge'

Whilst it would be possible for some of these people to walk a little way to the church, it would not be easy in some cases, and the reduction in parking space would make it much harder for people like the grass cutters or those coming to the toddler group to find space nearby. Ideally these would be able to park right outside in order to avoid having to cross the road. In the case of those doing flower arranging or running the cafés, they often have to bring a lot of items into the church and it is much safer for them to be able to park on the church side of the road than to have to cross it repeatedly.

We think that one result of these restrictions would be to push parking into other roads, although there tends to be little free space in neighbouring residential roads. We therefore fear that it would make it much more difficult for people who need to drive to attend church or community events, thus affecting the turnout. Although we are only talking about space for approximately five cars, on many occasions those five spaces make quite a difference.

#### Rationale

We note that these restrictions are being proposed:

- a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road to which the order relates
- b) for facilitating the passage of vehicular traffic on the road,
- c) or preserving or improving the amenities of an area

We appreciate the danger posed by parking near to corners, but we do not think that parking outside the church is unduly dangerous. We have no recollection of accidents due to parked cars there in recent years. If anything, the proposals increase danger for people who may have to cross the road with young children or equipment.

In recent years we have also been concerned about the speed at which some drivers come along this stretch of road when it is very clear, only to have to slow down when the road narrows down the hill. Facilitating the passage of traffic on this very short stretch of road may in fact not make things safer.

At the moment a number of contractors working at Bishopstoke Park leave their vehicles outside St Mary's during the week. Whilst this may have its frustrations, this is temporary and the contractors have taken our needs into account where necessary. Before building work began it was quite usual for this part of Church Road not to be particularly busy with parking, and on a Saturday it can be extremely quiet. Pre-Covid, we were able to accommodate church user parking without difficulty or obstruction. On the afternoon of Saturday 6 February I walked along the road and there were no cars at all parked by the church and only one opposite; further up the hill opposite Bishopstoke Park there were no parked cars.

We find it hard to see how St Mary's Church can be better preserved or improved as an amenity if parking is so restricted for those wishing to use it. Not least, as there is no dedicated off-road parking for St Mary's, unlike many community buildings, we feel that we really need this to be possible outside the church.

In conclusion, we object to this scheme as proposed as we believe it will be to the significant detriment of our community.

With many thanks for your consideration,

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 11 | I am supporting the objections of St Mary's & St Paul's Churches PCC to the proposed no waiting restrictions on the eastern side of Church Road outside St Mary's Church. The church is used for several community events as well as for church services. Such community events should be encouraged rather than discouraged. If parking restrictions are required in |
|----|---|

	places along Church Road to enable free flow of traffic there are other places which would be more suitable. Speed of vehicles on Church Road can be a problem and sections of parked cars do help to slow traffic as long as there is sufficient visibility.
12	We wish this area to be free for parking and access to the front of the property when vehicles are parked on the drive way. We understand the intent of the proposed restrictions but would plead that the restrictions not extend beyond the opening of the dropped kerb of 2a & 2d Longmead Avenue. If we are unsuccessful in our objections to the above proposed restrictions we would ask through the freedom of information act all information and documentation that has led to this decision which we will challenge and appeal.
13	I am strongly objecting to this proposal, I have lived here for 22 years without restrictions but for the last 3 years have been subjected to the the turmoil of building works and heavy vehicles parking and creating havoc outside my house due to the Anchor project opposite in the grounds of the old hospital. therefore I breathed a great sigh of relief that I and my visitors could park outside my own home now the building works have stopped, ! 2 of my visitors are registered disabled so m really upset at this proposal. I'm 70 years old now and I need to be able to have the right to park outsid my own home!
14	I Object to this proposal. My reasons being are, we need access to the front of our property when there is no convenient parking in the vicinity or more than one car on the drive. There is little to no reason why the parking restrictions should come up as far as our property, and if the plans go ahead, we ask that the restrictions stop at the drop curb at our driveway. We are happy to meet and negotiate a compromise that suits all parties. However, if there is a failure to resolve the restrictions proposed, we will look to appeal the process.

### Church Road/ Bishops Court

1	Could there be an extension of the yellow lines to follow the wall of the care home into Bishops Court?
2	To extend the length of the proposed double yellow lines around the entrance, exit to Bishops Court. The road narrows, anyone parking just after the standard length of 10 meters would be causing an obstruction.
3	Double yellow lines should continue into the narrow neck of Bishops Court Road after the junction with Church Road.
4	The yellow lines need to extend further along where the road narrows. This is essential to stop cars parking preventing ambulances or fire engines entering into the road at its narrowest. There have been occasions in the past with cars parked and larger vehicles being unable to gain access
5	The proposed lines need to be extended further than 10m into Bishops Court to include the narrowest section at the entrance to the road. With the existing proposal it would still be possible for an ordinary vehicle to park in a way that would obstruct access to emergency vehicles. In addition, a large vehicle parked just over 10m into Bishops Court would make it necessary to mount the pavement in order to pass.
6	please extend no parking/waiting further into Bishops court this is a narrow piece of road and there have been many occasions when cars have been parked which have meant all manner of vehicles, including ambulances cannot access Bishops court.
7	To help facilitate the safe passage of vehicles on this narrow road, Would commend an extension to the Proposed Traffic Order to the point of constriction of the road,
8	Could I request that the double yellow lines be extended around the corner into Bishops Court the length of the wall on the carehome side of the road.
9	We fully concur with the proposal to introduce parking restrictions at the entrance to Bishops Court. Having been a resident for forty one years we have witnessed many incidents of very poor parking at the entrance and along the narrow part of the road. We enclose nine photographs

	<p>of typical problems encountered. At times parking has been so bad as to potentially prevent the access of emergency vehicles.</p> <p>We would like you to consider an extension to the current proposal by approximately 35 metres both sides of this narrow part of Bishops Court entrance. This would then take the restriction up to the driveway of No 2 and No 23. In recent years there has been an increase of delivery vehicles both large and small throughout the day. The parking of vehicles on the pavement regularly obstructs the passage of parents with prams and wheelchair users. Some drivers enter Bishops Court at speed and may encounter pedestrians on the road due to the poor parking as seen.</p>
10	<p>I applaud and support all the proposed parking restrictions on Church Road and in particular the restrictions in Bishops Court itself. May I respectfully suggest that restrictions are extended beyond the where the road narrows to a single vehicle width. Parking in this area between the junction of Church Road and the first drives into private dwellings can obstruct the flow of traffic into and out of Bishops Court and block the view from vehicles reversing out of these drives. I would recommend the double yellow lines extend to 35 metres into Bishops Court.</p>

### **Breach Lane and Church Rd in vicinity of Dartington Road**

1	<p>Can I query the reason for the existing No Waiting Restrictions outside Highfield House. This was a health authority property, but is now a private residence. When I first moved here 4.5 years ago parking was available there, but the restrictions were reinstated.</p> <p>I live in Church Road, &amp; along with my neighbours struggle to find parking spaces on a daily basis, primarily due to builders from Bishopstoke Park, &amp; other neighbours having dropped kerbs to access their drives.</p> <p>Could the parking restrictions outside Highfield House be reviewed, with the prospect of then being removed.</p> <p>As to the proposed new yellow lines, I have no objection to them</p>
2	<p>The proposed 'no waiting at any time' along Breach Lane, Bishopstoke will encourage parking directly outside my property. No 6, 8 and 10 Breach Lane have not been included on the map shown in the plan, however all properties have driveways between them that could easily be obstructed with parking forced to this side of the road only. I do not feel this is needed on Breach lane, with exception to the corner of the road next to the grass verge, from church road to no 1 Breach Lane. From houses 1 - 8 the restriction would not be necessary and would cause more parking issues that it would solve. Our property has been built slightly below street level and if a car or van is parked outside the property it blocks most of the light coming into the house.</p>

### **Sedgwick Road**

1	<p>I would like to object to this proposal because we have recently had a driveway, drop-curb and white line put in at our property. The proposal to put in double yellow lines means that we will not be able to park in front of our driveway. We paid for the white line to be put there, completely for this purpose.</p> <p>Should this proposal go ahead, we would, at least, expect to be compensated for the cost of putting in the white line, (approx £160).</p>
2	<p>I am writing in connection with the above order a notice of which I have had through the door (19 Sedgwick Road). I am not necessarily against the idea as I realise it would need to be done somewhere on the road to allow buses to pass. My objection is that you have very recently accepted £160.00 from me to paint a white H across my recently installed drop kerb. My neighbour at number ss applied at the same time and was told he could not have it done at present as there may be a need to put double yellows outside his residence and I am left</p>

	wondering why I was not given this information at the same time. if the restriction is put in place then can I expect that I will be refunded the money I needlessly paid to have the H painted.
3	On behalf of Bluestar bus we wish to support this TRO which will improve the ability for buses to pass through this section of highway and in particular maintain journey time reliability. The ability to improve overall journey time reliability and contribute to journey time savings through the Transforming Cities Project.

### Stoke Park Road

1	i am supporting the proposed parking restrictions.As i have found difficulty leaving my property by vehicle as. Parking outside my house obstructs my vision when turning right.
2	Thank you for your recent letter. I just wanted to inform you that we fully support your proposal for parking restrictions. We live at xx Stoke Park Road and as this area is on the bus route always think it is dangerous when cars are parked in this area. We look forward to these restrictions being implemented.
3	<p>I am objecting to part of this proposed TRO - the section on the northern side of Stoke Park Road from part way along 45 Stoke Park Road to the edge of 39 Stoke Park Road. This section of TRO was previously put forward late 2018, and then considered at the LAC of May 15th and a revised recommendation cut back the length of restricted waiting to the length that I am proposing. As was said at that meeting,the junction of Stoke Park Road &amp; Sedgwick Road is wide with only light traffic and excellent visibility. Cars parked on the northern side of Stoke Park Road here do not impede the frequent (4 times per hour) No 2 service at all. I remember that it was suggested cars parked outside 43 Stoke Park Road impeded the school bus which turns west onto Stoke Park Road here. If this is the justification for the TRO, a bus which runs once a day on 169 days per year hardly justifies a 365/24 parking restriction. I would wish to see any complaints from the bus company which are being cited as justification. Or any other complaints from members of the public or EBC Depot related to manoeuvring of the bin lorries. Personally I have never seen the school bus having difficulties at this junction in 25 years of living here. It has also been mentioned that it is against the Highway Code to park opposite a junction. But that does not apply to opposite No 41 Stoke Park Road. And as said earlier this is an exceptionally wide junction with a wide splay on the bell of the junction. Also, in nearly 25 years of examining proposed TROs for the BIFOHH area, I have never seen this section of the Highway code used as a justification of a TRO. If it was regularly used then there would be TROs proposed for sections of Sedgwick Road to assist the passage of the No 2 bus - opposite Escombe Road and East &amp; West Drives; but they aren't. And at the LAC held on June 24th which considered parking restrictions along Underwood Road, mainly to assist the passage of No 2 bus again, no TROs were proposed opposite the junctions along here - East Drive, Cotton Close &amp; Shears Road. So why is a TRO proposed for Stoke Park Road opposite Sedgwick Road. Indeed one of the TRO changes in Order 2021 Amendment 5 is to remove the temporary TRO on Church Road opposite Rose Close.</p> <p>What is missing from the set of TROs for this area of Bishopstoke, if there is a desire to assist passage of the No 2 bus are restrictions for the Stoke Park Road/Colchester Avenue junction which is much tighter than the Sedgwick Road/Stoke Park Road junction. Thank you</p>

### White Road

1&2	have lived at No xx Edward Avenue for 29 years with few problems, it has become a lot quieter since the pub was demolished, so I am objecting to the TRO as it will not preserve or improve the amenities of the area for the following reasons.
-----	--

	<p>1. On your plan the yellow lines finish <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> along my neighbour's property but measuring 10 metres goes to boundary fence between us. This causes a problem if it passes the fence boundary. My drive fits one medium sized car and one car parked outside my house on the road so I would not want the yellow lines to come up to my property. If I had to move car parked on the road further back this makes it hard for xx across the road to get out of their driveway. I do not want to fall out with either neighbour as both have lived here a lot longer than me. With the houses being built in 1935 the road is narrow, and our driveways and front gardens have not been built for modern cars and are just not big enough. I don't want to concrete over the whole of the front garden of my house due to the soak-a-way for both properties being in my garden. I would like to retain some natural drainage (grass) and if I have to have an electric cars in the future where the charging point going? We also do not have any rear access in our Street.</p> <p>2. I am worried about my neighbour will losing all parking close to their property and the impact it could have on their value of their house as it will be the only house in Edward Avenue without parking on the same side of the road as their house, No xx has not had a drive since I have lived here and they are pensioners now. This in turn may impact the value of my house as we are joined. Another house in the street when put up for sale was viewed to option of it being sold as a HMO, to me Edward Avenue is a family home kind of a street, especially as many are putting in loft conversions now, but families expand and then reduce and when my daughter lived at home we did sometimes have to use White Road for an extra car. The parking problem could get worst in the coming years, so along term solution will be needed.</p> <p>3. I always try to keep to the neighbourly parking etiquette code. White Road provides overflow parking for the great majority of Edward Avenue from the west and down to Drake Road. This will lead to more neighbourly disputes when people have visitors, deliveries and home improvement works. I myself would like the occasional visit from friends and family due to a long term illness which may mean in the future I might need or want more visits and White Road was always a way doing that and not upsetting other residents. Having a parking war with neighbours is not something I look forward to.</p> <p>4. In the 29 years living here, I can only recall one accident on the Edward Avenue / White Road junction, a young street resident didn't look and just drove out this family moved a number of years ago. The road tends to be used by Edward Avenue resident's, occasional white van and bins. However some people have been parking close to the corner, normally the same offenders and the yellow lines would stop this but if as much parking as possible could be retained this would be better and if they could not extend as far up Edward Avenue west so my neighbour is able to park a small car outside their house that would be great. Maybe if the yellow lines did not extend all the way up the west side of White Road would at least give a couple of more spaces as long as access to the garage is kept. A couple of large trucks appear occasionally, but people do have to work, but they are harder to park and take up much more room and are normally the reason why getting up White road can be difficult. However reducing the parking will mean that visitors to Edward Avenue will start to park in Longmead Avenue, leading to more problems. Maybe reducing the pavement width might be an option like in Nelson Road?</p> <p>5. The Left side of White Road pavement is not really used due to the cars but they help to keep it clean as used more as a dog toilet when free at night due to it being the darkest area because of the high fence. I walk at night for exercise and prefer to walk on the road than either of the pavements.</p> <p>6. Notice that yellow lines are also going along the corner of Longmead Avenue and Church Road. The trades from Bishopstoke Park can come as far as White Road. Can see that this problem will just be moved along to other streets and could come all Edward Avenue. Why cannot the trades park on site?</p>
3	I think these restrictions are unnecessary as most of the parking issues have been caused by a recent development on the Bishopstoke Park site. These parking issues are not

	widespread and as soon as the development stops, I expect them to cease. On the other hand, these proposed parking restrictions are permanent and this will have a detrimental affect on my friends and family who regularly visit me and my household as they will have difficulty parking. Moreover, I use the area myself for parking, as do many of my neighbours and all of us will be forced to find alternative parking, likely just to push the perceived problem elsewhere.
4	These proposals should either not be implemented or be TEMPORARY only as congestion is solely due to the building work and contractor traffic/parking from Bishopstoke Park compounded by the Covid-19 crisis requiring everyone to be at home at the same time. Adding white and yellow lines will significantly change the character of the area. Area 7 of the LCA - Bishopstoke is on the urban fringe and therefore should remain a transition from Eastleigh to the rural landscape - adding urbanised lines will hinder not enhance and start to erode the distinctiveness of the area
5	am more than happy for double yellow lines on all the corners of the roads but if you put double yellows on the west side of White road I will not be able to park my car outside my house and there will be nowhere for my daughter and careres to park, and what about delivery drivers? I would be more than happy to turn White road into a "cul-de-sac" and block off one end to stop it becoming a "rat-run" thank you.
6	A TOTAL BAN ON PARKING DOWN THE WEST SIDE OF WHITE ROAD WILL CAUSE HARDSHIP TO THOSE RESIDENTS OF WHITE ROAD AND EDWARD AVE WHO NEED TO PARK IN WHITE ROAD. I FULLY SUPPORT A 10-METRE RESTRICTION ON EACH OF THE FOUR CORNERS, WHERE THE MAIN TRAFFIC PROBLEM EXISTS BY PARKED VEHICLES CAUSING VISIBILITY PROBLEMS FOR OTHERS WHEN EXITING OR ENTERING WHITE ROAD AT EITHER END. THE PROPOSED SCHEME WILL ALSO "DRIVE" THOSE VISITORS WHO HABITUALLY PARK ON THE WEST SIDE TO LEAVE THEIR VEHICLES ON THE EAST SIDE, CAUSING FURTHER PROBLEMS TO THOSE RESIDENTS WHO EITHER HAVE ACCESS POINTS ON TO THE ROAD, OR WHO USE THE EAST SIDE FOR PARKING AT PRESENT. I THINK THAT A MORE PRACTICAL (IF RADICAL) SOLUTION WOULD BE TO PERMANENTLY CUT OFF ACCESS TO WHITE ROAD AT ONE END, WHICH WOULD STOP THE "RAT RUN". FAILING ANY OF THE ABOVE, YOU MIGHT CONSIDER A PERMIT-PARKING SCHEME.
7	The placing of double yellow lines the length of White Road will cause parking chaos as this is the only free space locally to park a second car and has caused no problem to the local residents in the past. As a resident of White Road this will prevent family and friends being able to park out side my house to visit me at ALL times. The environmental damage caused by people having to dig up their front gardens and the cost of drop kerbs is a side issue. Surely spending what ever small resource you have on filling in pot holes and repairing pavement would be a better use of your money. This is a quiet neighbour hood and it has no need for draconian parking restrictions.
8	Thank you for the notice regarding the waiting and parking restrictions in WHITE ROAD BISHOPSTOKE.  The service road for 2/4/6 White road and 45/47 Longmead Avenue plus our driveway at no xx White Road are constantly blocked by neighbours. So whilst we appreciate your actions we need help to stop this action from them.  If we could have H Bar white lines for our driveway at no xx and also across the service road it would help deter this actions of inconsiderate people.  Would be most grateful if you would consider this proposal.
9	I object to double yellow lines extending 10M into Edward AVe. Your proposal will remove any street parking from the front and rear of my property.



## Sandy Lane/Winifred Close

1	<p>Hello, As a confused relatively new resident of Sandy Lane, and a Driver. I am struggling to understand your proposed plan for no waiting / parking area north of the corner of Winifred Close up to Inglewood Gardens! Apart from deliveries, nobody parks there!</p> <p>Whilst I agree with no parking on the corners of the roads - 30 feet either side of the corners of, and into Winifred Close. Especially out the front of my and my neighbours properties, which is often difficult to pass and gain access to the main road from Winifred Close.</p> <p>I would like to point out that although my address is Sandy Lane, I have no access to my property other than Winifred Close, where I park as do my neighbours.</p> <p>The bigger problem which you seem to have ignored - is directly opposite the entrance to Winifred Close. This is an area that vehicles are parked causing an obstruction on Sandy Lane, especially to Buses, when these properties with driveways (normally unused) choose to leave there vehicles parked on a slight bend in the Road.</p> <p>I appreciate that there are always going to be issues with safe parking, but feel that the proposal needs looking at again to address the real safety problems on Sandy Lane.</p> <p>Also the displacement of parked vehicles on Sandy -especially outside 103 and 105 Will force them onto the bend on the other side of the road, causing further dangerous obstructions, or into Winifred Close, adding to the already existing parking issues.</p>
2	<p>Just looking at the proposed TROs and glad to see that there is to be one in Sandy Lane. It would be improved however if the order could extend the yellow line further up the road to include number 117 at least.</p> <p>Having on many occasions been unable to exit Inglewood Gardens because of large vehicles obstructing the view to the east. I am unashamedly requesting that you ask for that to be done.</p>
3	<p>I am writing to you as a resident of Sandy Lane in Fair Oak.</p> <p>I read with surprise and great interest your proposal to implement waiting and parking restrictions outside of our property. Having looked at the reasons behind this decision, I have learned that the following are applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road; Facilitating the passage of vehicular access on the road; and Preserving or improving the amenities of an area.</li></ul> <p>Could you please let me know what problems have been brought to your attention which have resulted in these plans? Also, I would very much welcome further information with regard to how implementing these restrictions on this side/area of Sandy Lane will address the problem?</p> <p>As a resident of Sandy Lane since 2008, I have regularly witnessed the difficulties caused to buses/other vehicles caused by parked vehicles. The difficulties I have observed outside of my property relate to vehicles owned by other residents with driveway access but who do not fully utilise their available space to park their vehicles. In addition, some properties have a high number of vehicles and regularly park on the public highway as there is insufficient space to park on their property. However, this either relates to other properties slightly outside of the proposed waiting and restriction area or those on the opposite side of the road to my property. With respect to myself and our immediate neighbour we do not park our vehicles on Sandy Lane.</p>

	<p>I'm very much interested to further understand the rationale behind your proposal. Yes, I would like my original note and this email tone considers as an objection to the proposals.</p> <p>I must admit, I remain a little confused and uncertain as to the basis of the reports made to your ward councillors and about how these proposed restrictions will address the issues and whether the proposals are appropriate.</p> <p>For vehicles turning out of Winifred Close, I would suggest that the problem lies to the left of the junction as you turn out of the Close (by 105/103 Sandy Lane). Vehicles do not normally park on Sandy Lane as you turn right out of Winifred Close (same side as 107/109 where your waiting restrictions are also proposed). However, vehicles do sometimes park opposite the Winifred Close turning (the opposite side of the road to the proposed restrictions).</p> <p>With regard to vehicles parked on the same side of Sandy Lane as our property (109) between Pilchards Avenue and Winifred Close, I would suggest that this only happens occasionally and is when deliveries are being made (and is also therefore a very temporary obstruction). Vehicles occasionally pull up on the same side of the road as our property due to other residents (who live on the opposite side to the proposed restrictions) using the public highway to park their vehicles on rather than their private driveway.</p> <p>I feel that the proposals are not going to remedy the problems being reported to you as they are not appropriately placed. I strongly believe they will only contribute to shifting the problem elsewhere. There are too many vehicles currently attempting to use Winifred Close to park in. If these restrictions are imposed, this will also exacerbate this problem. People will also be unable to park near their homes which may cause further grievances in addition to the ones that have already been raised directly with you.</p> <p>As Sandy Lane is a public highway/bus route, is it possible for the Council to encourage people to use their driveways to their full capacity if they have them?</p>
--	---

**Disabled persons' parking bays – various roads**

	<p>Firstly I would like to commend the council for considering the provision of less Able people in our community. However the plans in schedule 5 for disabled parking do not seem to take into account the size of the road or the number of dwellings. Could the council consider doing this in a more proportionate way.</p> <p>I would also like to comment on the fact there seems to be an error in article 35 which refers to schedule 5 and not 6. Please can you clarify and if there is an obvious error other than this a simple typo reissue the order.</p>
	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I have just seen the sign regarding the installation of disabled parking bays . I live at xx Scotland close Fair oak and according to the diagram there is to be 2 disabled bays put in . There are 6 bays and 2 are already disabled parking so does that mean 4 out of 6 will be disabled parking ? We also have a problem with a resident from Mortimers lane using the parking bays ( he has 3 vehicles) .One of the residents has asked him nicely not to park here as we ( the residents of scotland close ) sometimes cannot get a space , his answer was that he pays his car tax so he can park where he likes ! If there is to be 4 out of 6</p>

	disabled bays how will it be monitored as he has no disabled badge
	<p>I refer to the notice concerning the proposed disabled parking bays in Stag Close. As a long standing resident I wish to object to this proposal on the grounds that there are currently no disabled residents in this street who are car owners. This implementation would effectively take out two parking spaces which other drivers could be using.</p> <p>The resident who used one of the bays passed away last year and the flat is now occupied by a non driver who is not in any way disabled. The other bay has been used by a neighbour who is also in no way disabled for a number of years now. There is a 'disabled' bay in inlayby which is also used by non disabled drivers. If it is essential to have a disabled bay I would suggest you keep the one in the layby and free up the other two spaces for other drivers to use.</p> <p>If you want to improve the parking in the road further I would suggest you put yellow lines down the east side of the road so that drivers can only park on the west side. Currently drivers park on both sides and sometimes it is difficult to squeeze through the gap and I only have a small car, larger vehicles would not be able to get through. I hope this information is helpful to you.</p>
	<p>Of the two disabled parking bays provided in Fox Close, only one is in use by someone with a disability on a regular basis. The other space either lies empty, or is used by one other car which does not display a blue badge. No other vehicles use this space, likely for two main reasons. Firstly, there is no demand for it from residents/disabled persons, and there are other parking spaces available on street. Secondly, the space is defended aggressively by the person using it, even though they do not have a blue badge concession. The person in question seems to think that they own the street and have a preferential claim over other taxpayers!</p> <p>The Eastleigh Council website specifies that disabled parking bays will only be provided if there is an on-street parking problem close to your home. This is currently not the case on Fox Close - parking spaces are available when required. However, the allocation of up to 6 disabled parking bays will certainly create a parking problem for other residents. In cases such as this, one has to ask where the council expects residents to park if they have been barred from a significant number of spaces.</p> <p>It would be far better to maintain one disabled bay for the resident in need of this, properly enforcing the disabled parking bay status against abuse by a single person, rather than creating new local problems.</p> <p>The Council website <a href="https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/parking-travel-and-roads/parking/disabled-parking-bays">https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/parking-travel-and-roads/parking/disabled-parking-bays</a> also makes clear that bays can be removed where there is no longer a need for a disabled bay. There is clearly no need for more than 1 disabled bay on Fox Close, and an investigation by the Council would have made this plain.</p> <p>I also note that the proposed TRO also does not explain the grounds on which the council reached the decision to allocate up to 6 parking bays in the mentioned streets.</p> <p>Considering all of this, I urge the council to review its decision, and focus on meeting the needs of the whole community and acting against violation of existing regulations.</p>