

HEDGE END, WEST END AND BOTLEY LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

Monday, 27 September 2021

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR VARIOUS ROADS, HEDGE END, WEST END AND BOTLEY

Report of the Technical Services Manager

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that

- (1) Waiting and loading restrictions are introduced as advertised on the following roads:

A334 Broad Oak/Botley High Street, Barrowfields Close, Chalk Hill, Monarch Way (outside No 120), Moorgreen Road, Wellstead Way;**
- (2) “No stopping on entrance markings” restrictions are introduced as advertised on Maunsell Way, Pomeroy Crescent, Wellstead Way;**
- (3) The proposed waiting restrictions in Monarch Way (spur serving Nos 16 – 21) are withdrawn;**
- (4) A decision on the proposed waiting restrictions in Upper Northam Road and Yew Tree Close is deferred until a review of waiting restrictions in the surrounding area is carried out;**
- (5) The principle order is amended to expedite the implementation and removal of disabled persons parking places in the Hedge End, West End and Botley area.**
- (6) The proposed waiting restrictions on Maunsell Way are withdrawn from this traffic order and are subject to consultation via an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order.**

Summary

A proposal to introduce waiting and parking restrictions in various roads in the Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB) Local Area was advertised on 16 April 2021. Representations were received both in support of and objection to the restrictions. This report summarises the comments received and recommends how to proceed.

Statutory Powers

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; Traffic Management Act 2004.

Legal Agreements

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

Strategic Implications

1. This report helps to deliver the Corporate Plan 2015-2025 objective of **an Excellent Environment For All by removing obstructive and inconsiderate parking**. The proposals also improve Health and Wellbeing by improving facilities for disabled people, and the Council's Climate and Environment Emergency by improving facilities for pedestrians.

Introduction

2. Various roads in the Local Area have been investigated in response to reported problems such as obstructive or inconsiderate parking. Site investigations were undertaken to assess the issues being experienced by road users, and to decide on appropriate measures to address the issues.
3. The current process to install disabled parking bays (DPBs) is lengthy. Following a successful application, the applicant then must wait for a traffic order to be made which can extend the process by months. To reduce the inconvenience, it is proposed that the Order is amended in advance to allow for a defined number of bays in a road. This would make the process of installing and removing DPBs much quicker and more flexible than at present. Residents directly affected by proposed DPBs would still be consulted.
4. This report details the comments received during the public consultation period. The Committee is asked to consider the comments received, before making a decision to introduce, amend (within legal tolerance) or withdraw the Traffic Regulation Order.

Detail

5. Consultation was undertaken by means of a Public Notice on the Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) website, published in the Hampshire Independent newspaper, and posted on street furniture in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions. The Public Notice was also posted to properties directly affected by the proposals. Plans showing the proposed restrictions are in Appendix 1, along with amendments recommended in the light of comments or objections received.
6. 27 representations were received, in relation to six sites. Additionally, nine representations were received which are objections relating to the proposal to

introduce up to six Disabled Person's Parking bays as required in various roads within the Local Area.

7. The objections for each site are summarised below, along with the Engineer's response. The full (redacted) text of the representations can be found in Appendix 2

8. **A334 Broad Oak/Botley High Street – proposed peak time loading ban**

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>Three representations were received.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council Passenger Transport Team supports the proposed restrictions, which will assist the movement of buses in the area.</p> <p>One resident objects on the basis that the proposed restriction will increase the speed and volume of traffic through Botley at peak times. The restrictions will also inconvenience deliveries to properties. The solution is to expedite the construction of the Botley bypass.</p> <p>Another resident queried if the proposed restrictions were a way of delaying the Botley bypass, but does not wish to object.</p>	<p>The restriction is intended to reduce the congestion caused by vehicles loading and unloading from the carriageway along the A334 Botley High Street and Broad Oak. At peak times this can lead to long traffic delays, and an increase in air pollution.</p> <p>The Botley bypass is being progressed by Hampshire County Council, as the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Once the Botley bypass is open to traffic, consideration should be given to reviewing the waiting and parking restrictions along the A334 through Botley, to reflect the changed nature of the road as a local road serving the village.</p> <p>It is recommended that the restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p>

9. **Barrowfields Close**

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>One representation was received in support of the proposed restrictions. The resident feels that the proposed restrictions should extend further south on Moorgreen Road.</p>	<p>Additional restrictions would be outside the scope of this report. However, the comments are noted and will be added to the list of sites for further investigation in the future.</p>

10. **Chalk Hill – proposed “No waiting at any time on footway” restrictions**

Comment	Engineer’s response
<p>Eight representations were received.</p> <p>Two residents object, the first feels that the restrictions are unnecessary, and the occasional times that cars obstruct the footway can be dealt with individually. He fears that forcing cars to park wholly on the carriageway will be used as an excuse to put in unsightly yellow lines which will present severe restrictions on visitors to all the houses in Chalk Hill. It also seems excessive for the restriction to apply at all times, rather than just the working day.</p> <p>The second objector suggests that a better solution would be to prevent through traffic using Chalk Hill. As a minor C class road it has all classes and weight of vehicles using it at speed. Yellow lines will not solve the problem.</p> <p>Another resident broadly supports the proposed restrictions but would like a parking bay marked partly on the footway outside the two houses with no off-road parking, to enable the two residents in question to be able to park safely, as has been done further down the hill.</p> <p>Four residents are in full support of the proposed restrictions. Two would like speed humps or other traffic calming measures to be installed in Chalk Hill, another resident would like to see double yellow lines introduced outside Nos 42-56 as shown on the plan. Another is concerned that vehicles may now choose to park on the verge, potentially causing damage.</p> <p>One resident agrees with the proposal, but is concerned that</p>	<p>The reason for the proposed restriction is to enable the footway to be used by pedestrians. Complaints had been received that pedestrians, including parents with prams and pushchairs are regularly being forced to walk in the carriageway because the footway is obstructed by parked cars. Legislation only allows for prohibition of waiting on the footway at any time, there is no permitted variant to allow for a part time restriction of this nature. There are no plans currently to introduce further yellow line waiting restrictions in Chalk Hill at this time.</p> <p>As a C class road, Chalk Hill is part of the highway network and as such has the function of carrying local traffic to and from the A27. HGVs over 7.5 tonnes are already prohibited from using Chalk Hill and other nearby roads except for loading and unloading. A Speed limit reminder device is deployed on Chalk Hill from time to time; enforcement of speed limits is a matter for the Police.</p> <p>The footway is too narrow for any vehicle to be parked without obstructing the passage of pedestrians; motorists can park fully on carriageway provided they do not cause obstruction. A layby has been provided further down the hill, which enables cars to be parked away from the running carriageway without obstructing the footway.</p> <p>The additional yellow line restrictions were shown on the plan in error and have since been corrected. The plan can be found in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Engineers will continue to monitor the situation, and if parking on the verge</p>

<p>people may now park on the verge, causing damage and making it harder for people leaving their homes to view the road.</p> <p>Another resident would like to see the restriction extended a few metres into Coopers Close. Another resident has requested confirmation that the proposed restrictions apply only to the footway and not the carriageway.</p>	<p>occurs, further restrictions can be considered in the future.</p> <p>The restrictions extend to the back of the highway at side road junctions. Observations have shown that vehicles parked in Coopers Close are usually parked away from its junction with Chalk Hill, and the associated pedestrian dropped kerb.</p> <p>Traffic calming such as speed humps are outside the scope of this report.</p> <p>The proposed restriction would apply only to footways, not the carriageway.</p> <p>It is recommended that the prohibition of waiting on the footway on Chalk Hill is introduced as advertised.</p>
---	--

11. **Monarch Way – proposed “No waiting at any time” restrictions**

Comment	Engineer’s response
<p>Four representations were received, two of which are objections and two in support.</p> <p>The first objection is to the proposed restriction on the turning head outside Nos 22 and 23. The objector relies on being able to park two cars in the turning head, and feels that if the restrictions are introduced, he will be forced to park outside neighbouring houses, potentially causing disputes.</p> <p>The second objection is from a resident who feels that the proposed restriction outside No 120 will restrict his ability to park when there appear to be no problems with parking there. there are already restrictions close by. 24/7 restrictions feel excessive, when the problem times are at school</p>	<p>Whilst we would usually recommend that turning heads are kept clear, to enable vehicles to turn around, the turning head at the end of the spur serving No 16-29 Monarch Way is unusually wide, and Waste Management services have not raised this site as one where they have problems accessing. It is therefore recommended that the proposed waiting restriction outside Nos 21 and 22 Monarch Way is not introduced at this time.</p> <p>Cars parked outside No 120 Monarch Way are very close to the exit road of St James school car park, and obstruct the visibility of oncoming traffic. It is therefore recommended that the waiting restrictions outside No 120 Monarch Way are introduced as</p>

<p>start and finish times.</p> <p>The supporting emails are from residents who support the proposed restrictions, because of the congestion caused by parked cars at school start and finish times. One of the supporting letters feels that the restrictions should extend further.</p>	<p>advertised.</p>
--	--------------------

12. **Yew Tree Close/Upper Northam Road**

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>Seven representations were received from residents of Yew Tree Close and Upper Northam Road. Five residents object to the proposals and two are in support.</p> <p>The objections are from residents on the basis that they or their visitors (including frail elderly people) rely on being able to park on the road, and alternative kerbside parking is too far away.</p> <p>The nearest alternative unrestricted kerbside parking is in Wheatsheaf Court; an influx of parked cars here could cause unnecessary tensions between neighbours.</p> <p>A solution to the problem could be to widen the carriageway of Upper Northam Road service road (by reducing the width of the island) and close the narrow north-eastern access into the service road</p> <p>One of the residents, although largely in support of the proposed restrictions wishes to keep one parking space outside 1 Yew Tree Close, as this is useful for visitors.</p>	<p>Since extensive waiting restrictions were introduced on Upper Northam Road last year, more vehicles have been parked in Yew Tree Close/Upper Northam Road service road. Both these roads are narrow; Yew Tree Close in particular is insufficiently wide to allow a vehicle to park fully on the carriageway without obstructing the passage of other vehicles. Vehicles that park in both of these roads are usually partly on the footway.</p> <p>Any works to widen the carriageway or close one end of Upper Northam Road service road would be outside the scope of this report.</p> <p>Given the objections from residents who would be disadvantaged if the proposed restrictions were introduced, it is recommended that a decision is deferred and a review of waiting restrictions in the surrounding area is carried out. It should be noted that the current proposals will expire on 15 April 2023.</p>

13. **Disabled Persons' Parking bays (various roads)**

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>Nine comments were received objecting to the imposition of up to 6 Disabled Persons Parking bays on their roads.</p>	<p>There are no current proposals within this scheme to install any new Disabled Persons' Parking Bays (DPBs). The proposal in question is to amend the existing TRO in such a way so as to enable the Council to install up to six DPBs in a road, as required for disabled residents, without having to go through a TRO process each time. This would make the process of installing and removing DPBs much quicker and more flexible than at present. Residents directly affected by proposed DPBs would still be consulted. It is recommended that the committee approves this proposal as advertised.</p>

14. No representations were received in respect of proposed restrictions on Wellstead Way and Pomeroy Crescent. It is therefore recommended that the committee approves these proposals.
15. The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Maunsell Way attracted four objections, three from local residents and one from Hampshire Constabulary. The proposal has been withdrawn from the Order under consideration (The Borough of Eastleigh (Hedge End, West End and Botley)(Amendment No 13) Order) This restriction will now be considered via an experimental TRO and objections received will be considered via that statutory consultation.

Financial Implications

16. The costs of the TRO and associated road markings are funded from the core TRO Programme budget as part of the "Various roads" allocations, at a cost of approximately £4000.

Risk Assessment

17. If the proposals are not implemented, it is likely that the issues associated with obstructive parking would continue. This also applies to Upper Northam Road service road and Yew Tree Close, but given the nature of the objections, it is recommended that a review of waiting restrictions in the vicinity is undertaken before a decision is made on whether to implement the restrictions.
18. If the proposals relating to DPBs are not implemented, the implementation of DPBs will not be as efficient as possible.

Equality and Diversity Implications

19. The Equality Act is relevant to the decision and an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out and attached as Appendix 3 to the report. In summary the EqIA shows that:
 - (a) There is a positive impact to disabled road users by increasing the speed and flexibility with which Disabled persons' parking bays can be implemented or removed
 - (b) There is a positive impact for pedestrians particularly wheelchair and pushchair users on Chalk Hill by enabling pedestrians to use the footway which had previously been occupied by parked cars
 - (c) There are positive impacts to road users by prohibiting waiting at junctions, which improves visibility between road users (including pedestrians particularly wheelchair and pushchair users) at potential conflict points
 - (d) There are minor positive impacts for pedestrians, particularly wheelchair and pushchair users by prohibiting waiting at the kerbside, thereby discouraging drivers from obstructing footways, driveways and other accesses.

Climate Change and Environmental Implications

20. The proposals are not expected to increase Greenhouse Gas/CO₂, or damage ecology or the environment.
21. The proposed loading restriction may have a positive impact on air quality along the A334 High Street and Broad Oak Botley, by preventing queues of traffic caused by vehicles loading and unloading from the carriageway at peak times.
22. The proposals have the effect of improving amenity and infrastructure for people using a more sustainable mode of travel i.e. walking.

Conclusion

23. The proposals have due regard to the requirement of Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, by securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on the highway. The proposed waiting restrictions attracted objections, comments and expressions of support. This report takes into consideration all the representations received and recommends that the committee approves the introduction of the restrictions as advertised, with the exception of the proposed waiting restrictions in the spur serving Nos 16-29 Monarch Way which it is recommended are withdrawn; and Upper Northam Road and Yew Tree Close

which it is recommended are deferred; and Maunsell Way, where the restrictions are being considered as an Experimental Order.

BARBARA THOMAS
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ENGINEER

Date: 18 May 2021
Contact Officer: Barbara Thomas
Tel No: 023 80688231
e-mail: barbara.thomas@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 3

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
