

**BURSLEDON, HAMBLE-LE-RICE AND HOUND LOCAL AREA
COMMITTEE**

Thursday, 1 December 2022

TRO, VARIOUS ROADS BURSLEDON, HAMBLE & HOUND AREA

Report of the Traffic Management Engineer

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that

- (1) A Traffic Regulation Order is made, the effects of which are to introduce waiting restrictions in:
- a) Beaulieu Road,
 - b) Coach Road and Coach Road (Crescent shaped spur),
 - c) Deanfield Close,
 - d) Flowers Close,
 - e) Friarscroft,
 - f) Lowford Hill,
 - g) Norbury Gardens,
 - h) Oakwood Way,
 - i) Satchell Lane,
 - j) Sedgemead,
 - k) Station Road,
 - l) Sydney Avenue and Sydney Avenue (Crescent shaped spur) and
 - m) Westwood Road.
- (2) introduce waiting and parking restrictions in:
- a) Coach Road
 - b) Grantham Avenue

Summary

A proposal to introduce waiting and parking restrictions in various roads in Bursledon, Hamble and Hound was advertised on 2nd September 2022. 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

Note

The above agency agreement with Hampshire County Council will be terminated on 31st March 2023.

Strategic Implications

1. Creating an excellent environment for all by removing obstructive and inconsiderate parking, and by providing time-limited parking places outside local shops and residential premises.

Introduction

2. Various roads in the Local Area have been investigated in response to reported problems such as obstructive parking. Site investigations were undertaken to assess the issues being experienced by road users, and to decide on appropriate measures to mitigate the issues.
3. 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 or withdraw the Traffic Regulation Order.

Detail

4. Consultation was undertaken by means of a Public Notice on the Eastleigh Borough Council website, published in the Hampshire Independent newspaper, and posted on street furniture in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions. Plans showing the proposed restrictions are in Appendix 1.
5. Twenty-one representations were received, six in relation to Flowers Close, two in relation to Sydney Avenue, five in relation to Sedgemoor, one in relation to Deanfield Close, five in relation to Station Road, two in relation to Beaulieu Road, one in relation to Coach Road, and one in relation to Oakwood Way. The representations are summarised below, along with the Engineer's response. The full (redacted) text of the representations can be found in Appendix 2.
- 6.

Comment	Engineer's response
<p>One resident supports Double Yellow Lines (DYL) at junction of Flowers Close with Sydney Avenue but objects to DYL further in Flowers Close. Requests more restrictions in Beaulieu Road and asks for an extension to the DYL at the junction of Sydney Avenue at Hamble Road junction.</p>	<p>The proposal for DYL further into Flowers Close results from complaints of pavement parking. Previously proposed restrictions to prevent parking on the verge/footway were objected to and therefore Councillors chose not to introduce the restriction.</p> <p>Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads would need to be considered by HCC.</p>
<p>Another resident supports the DYL at the junction of Flowers Close with Sydney Avenue, but objects to DYL further along Flowers Close, requests residents permit parking and asks, 'has there been an environmental assessment for the proposals?'</p>	<p>The proposal for DYL further into Flowers Close results from complaints of pavement parking. Previously proposed restrictions to prevent parking on the verge/footway were objected to and therefore Councillors chose not to introduce the restriction.</p> <p>Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads would need to be considered by HCC.</p> <p>As stated in item 10 below, the proposals should not increase Greenhouse Gas/CO2, or damage the ecology or the environment.</p>
<p>Another resident supports DYL at the junction of Flowers Close with Sydney Avenue, but objects to DYL further along Flowers Close from No 1.</p> <p>The resident requests additional restrictions needed in Beaulieu Road</p>	<p>The proposal for DYL further into Flowers Close results from complaints of pavement parking. Previously proposed restrictions to prevent parking on the verge/footway were objected to and therefore Councillors chose not to introduce the restriction.</p> <p>Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads would need to be considered by HCC.</p>

<p>A further two separate residents support the DYL at the junction of Flowers Close with Sydney Avenue, but object to DYL further along Flowers Close.</p>	<p>The proposal for DYL further into Flowers Close results from complaints of pavement parking. Previously proposed restrictions to prevent parking on the verge/footway were objected to and therefore Councillors chose not to introduce the restriction.</p>
<p>Another resident objects to the DYL in Flowers Close as a result of concerns over loss of street parking.</p>	<p>The proposal for DYL further into Flowers Close results from complaints of pavement parking. Previously proposed restrictions to prevent parking on the verge/footway were objected to and therefore Councillors chose not to introduce the restriction</p>
<p>Four residents of Sedgemoor support the restrictions as advertised. Three requested, in addition, limited waiting time restriction for the parking on gravel in Victoria Road near the RVCP entrance. One of these requests Sign "NO access to RVCP" at entrance to Sedgemoor.</p>	<p>The gravel parking area is not Public Highway, but restrictions can be proposed with the landowner's agreement.</p> <p>Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads/areas of land, would need to be considered by HCC.</p> <p>The provision of a "No Access" sign is out of the scope of this TRO but can be considered by the LAC.</p>
<p>One resident of Sedgemoor objects to the proposals citing lack of street parking for visitors.</p>	<p>There appears to be ample room to allow visitor parking within the property curtilages of those premises likely to be affected by the proposals.</p>
<p>A resident of Deanfield Close objects to the removal of existing restrictions.</p>	<p>The resident had misunderstood the proposals. It was thought that the existing lines were being permanently removed. We have explained about having to legally revoke existing restrictions in order to replace them with a longer length. Therefore the objection is resolved.</p>
<p>Five residents object to the proposals in Station Road on only one side as this may lead to increased speeds. One of these</p>	<p>The double yellow lines are proposed as a result of complaints of obstruction to the bus service, caused by parked cars on both sides</p>

also requested traffic calming, one requested staggered parking on both sides, and one resident requested a double yellow line outside no 58 near bend.	of the road. The speed of traffic can be monitored and, if necessary, request that measures be considered to address any road safety issues that result. The parking outside no. 58 is not considered a road safety issue as this section is on a straight section of the road.
One resident requested additional restrictions in Beaulieu Road near Hamble Lane	Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads/areas of land, would need to be considered by HCC.
One resident requested that instead of restricting parking in Coach Road, Norbury gardens and Grantham Avenue, the green areas in these streets be used for residents to park.	Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads/areas of land, would need to be considered by HCC.
One resident in Sydney Avenue requests consideration of a residents parking scheme.	Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads/areas of land, would need to be considered by HCC.
One resident in Oakwood Way requests extending the proposals to no 70 Oakwood Way	Following the termination of the Agency Agreement, any requests for additional restrictions in other roads/areas of land, would need to be considered by HCC.

Financial Implications

- 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 £5000.

Risk Assessment

- If the proposals are not implemented, it is likely that the issues with obstructive parking will continue in these roads. Due to the termination of the Agency Agreement, these schemes will now be evaluated alongside other competing Countywide priorities, any intervention is likely to take longer.

Equality and Diversity Implications

9. The Equality Act is relevant to the decision and an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been carried out. In summary the EqIA shows that:
 - (a) There are minor positive impacts in these roads by prohibiting waiting at the kerbside, thereby discouraging drivers from obstructing junctions, footways and driveways

Climate Change and Environmental Implications

10. The proposals should not increase Greenhouse Gas/CO2, or damage ecology or the environment.

Conclusion

11. The proposals have due regard to the requirement of S122 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 amended following advertising.

ANDREW PLEDGE
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ENGINEER

Date: 22nd November 2022
Contact Officer: Andrew Pledge
Tel No: 07764 882193
e-mail: andy.pledge@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 2

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