



---

# NOTICE OF MEETING

---

## CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

THURSDAY, 10 MARCH 2016 AT 4.00 PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Joanne Wildsmith, Democratic Services Tel: 9283 4057

Email: email: joanne.wildsmith@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

---

## CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

Councillor Ken Ellcome (Conservative)

### Group Spokespersons

Councillor Lynne Stagg, Liberal Democrat

Councillor Stuart Potter, UK Independence Party

Councillor Yahiya Chowdhury, Labour

---

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: [www.portsmouth.gov.uk](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk)

**Deputations by members of the public may be made on any item where a decision is going to be taken. The request should be made in writing to the contact officer (above) by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting, and must include the purpose of the deputation (for example, for or against the recommendations). Email requests are accepted**

### AGENDA

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Declarations of Members' Interests
- 3 **Local Transport Plan (LTP) Implementation Plan 2016/17 and Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme (Pages 1 - 6)**

The report is by the Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support. Following full Council agreement of the capital budget for 2016/17 on 9 February 2016, this report seeks approval for the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Implementation Plan 2016/17. Additionally it details how the approved budget for the LTP3 programme (£353k) and the Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme (£910k) will be apportioned.

**RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member:**

**(1) Approves the LTP3 Implementation Plan and Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme.**

**(2) Delegates authority to the Director for Transport, Environment and Business Support in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation and the Section 151 Officer to agree any minor amendments to the Implementation Plan that may be required to take account of future funding changes and policy announcements.**

**4 Goldsmith Avenue Cycle Lane (Pages 7 - 10)**

The report by the Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support seeks approval to undertake consultation via Traffic Regulation Order on the implementation of a designated cycle lane on Goldsmith Avenue. This follows the referral from the Members' Information Service item by Councillor Hunt (MIS issue 5 on 22 January 2016).

**RECOMMENDED that approval is given to undertake a consultation via a Traffic Regulation Order on the implementation of double yellow lines on the north side of Goldsmith Avenue, adjacent to the railway line opposite Francis Avenue to the pedestrian crossing west of Fratton Way. This will include removing the loading bays and the current unrestricted parking to facilitate the introduction of a mandatory eastbound cycle lane.**

**5 London Road Proposals (North End) (TRO 12/2016) (Pages 11 - 18)**

The report by the Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support is to consider the response to the public consultation on the proposed footway adjustment and reintroduction of Pay & Display, between Chichester Road and Laburnum Grove. When objections are received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders, it is a statutory requirement to consider them at a formal decision meeting.

**RECOMMENDED that approval is given to widen the carriageway on both sides and reinstall Pay & Display parking on the west side.**

**6 Wymering Road and Portchester Road one way - results of public notice (Pages 19 - 22)**

The report by the Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support seeks to consider the response to the public notice regarding the proposals to implement a one-way system within Wymering Road and Portchester Road.

**RECOMMENDED that the proposed one-way scheme is implemented to the proposed Option 2, i.e. Wymering Road to be made one-way eastbound and Portchester Road to be made one-way westbound.**

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

# Agenda Item 3



Portsmouth  
CITY COUNCIL

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Traffic and Transport portfolio
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	10 March 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	Local Transport Plan 3 - Implementation Plan 2016/17 and Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme
<b>Report by:</b>	Director for Transport, Environment and Business Support
<b>Wards affected:</b>	All
<b>Key decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 Following full Council agreement of the capital budget for 2016/17 on 9 February 2016, this report seeks approval for the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Implementation Plan 2016/17. Additionally it details how the approved budget for the LTP3 programme (£353k) and the Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme (£910k) will be apportioned.

## 2. Recommendations

**It is recommended that the Cabinet Member:**

- 2.1 **Approves the LTP3 Implementation Plan and Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme.**
- 2.2 **Delegates authority to the Director for Transport, Environment and Business Support in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation and the Section 151 Officer to agree any minor amendments to the Implementation Plan that may be required to take account of future funding changes and policy announcements.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) Joint South Hampshire Strategy 2011-2031 was approved by Full Council on 25 January 2011 along with the Implementation plan 2011-12, which came into effect on the 1 April 2011. The adoption of a Local Transport Plan is a statutory requirement under the Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008. The amendments to the 2000 Act awarded Local Authorities greater flexibility in the development of their Local Transport Plans, including the opportunity for neighbouring authorities to jointly develop their LTP3, but stipulated that the LTP must include two key elements:

- Strategy (containing a set of policies)
- Implementation Plan (containing the proposals for delivery of the policies outlined within the strategy).

- 3.2 A one year Implementation Plan Delivery Programme has been developed for 2016/17, demonstrating how the Council will deliver against the outcomes of the LTP3 Strategy.
- 3.3 Given the level of financial uncertainty and the fact that the LTP Capital Settlement is no longer ring-fenced, it is not considered to be possible to provide a confirmed 3 year Implementation Plan.
- 3.4 A scheme selection prioritisation process has been developed through which schemes are assessed against their contribution to locally agreed priorities (including LTP3 and the PCC Corporate Plan), before being assessed for their deliverability. Professional judgement is used to ensure an appropriate package of schemes is established, ensuring contribution to each of the policy areas, and a balanced geographical spread.
- 3.5 With overall programme approval, consultation will then be undertaken on a scheme by scheme basis as appropriate to ensure that full stakeholder engagement is achieved for the programme.
- 3.6 The Implementation Plan also includes the programme for the delivery of the Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme (TSOP). All schemes will be aligned as much as far as reasonably practicable with the PFI contractor's (Ensign) life cycle replacement programme. This will reduce the cost to the Council and reduce disruption for road users.

#### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

- 4.1 The adoption of the LTP3 by April 2016 is a statutory requirement.

#### **5. Equality impact assessment**

- 5.1 There is a requirement for preliminary EIAs to be undertaken for many of the schemes in the programme as they are brought forward. Consultation will be undertaken as necessary.

#### **6. Legal implications**

- 6.1 The legal basis for the development of the Local Transport Plan is dealt with in the body of the report. As stated the plan is required to show both Strategy and Implementation although clearly the latter will need to reflect the work to be carried out as this does. Therefore the proposal is in accord with the statutory requirements of the relevant legislation.

## **7. Director of Finance's comments**

- 7.1 The Capital Programme 2016/17 sets out the corporate resources to be allocated to the Local Transport Plan for 2016/17 (LTP3) and Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme 2016/17. For the new financial year 2016/17 £353,000 will be allocated to LTP3 and £910,000 (as per Appendix A) will be allocated to the Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme which will drive PCC to deliver those schemes that will benefit the city's residents, workers and visitors.
- 7.2 Appendix A sets out the forecast costs of the schemes. These forecasts will be revised as full project initiation documents (PIDs) are created for each scheme. This may mean that costs are increased or reduced. Potentially some schemes may have to be deleted or amended and likewise there is the possibility for new schemes to be added if costs are reduced. The recommendation as set out in 2.2 will allow decisions to amend, delete or add schemes to be made without recourse to Full Council whilst ensuring that the Director of Transport and Environment and Business Support, the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation and the S151 Officer are satisfied that any changes made meet the requirements of the Local Transport Plan aspirations and remain within the total budget.
- 7.3 All scheme costs estimates are total costs based on a whole life costing basis to ensure that sufficient monies are set aside to meet all internal and external costs in the first instance. The costs also allow for the on-going maintenance costs of the new schemes.

.....  
Signed by:  
Alan Cufley  
Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

**Appendices:**

Appendix A - LTP3 2016/17 Implementation plan and Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by:  
Cllr Ellcome  
Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation



**Appendix A - Local Transport Plan 3 - Implementation Plan 2016/17 and Traffic Signals Optimisation Programme**

Programme	Scheme name	Scheme overview	Ward	Scheme details
LTP3 2016/17	Travel Line	Provision of annual funding (jointly with all Local Transport Authorities) to maintain and enhance comprehensive public transport information facilities through Traveline an online and telephone journey planning service.	All wards	This scheme meets the requirements of the Local Transport Plan (LTP), through the provision of this service. This scheme helps to ensure accurate information is available for individuals to make informed travel choices.
LTP3 2016/17	Rights of Way Signage	PCC has a statutory requirement to sign Rights Of Way (paths which the public have a legally protected right to pass on) across the city and to investigate and resolve all Public Rights Of Way (PROW) claims put forward.	All wards	Investigation and installation of Right of Way including sign posts, online documentation and published documents
LTP3 2016/17	Pedestrian and Cycle facility improvements	Fratton Rd/Arundel St Junction	Charles Dickens	The reconstruction of the Fratton Road/Arundel Street junction to improve traffic flow and improved pedestrian crossing and cycle facilities. Proposal also to include kerb line amendments to support future Bus Rapid Transit route and reduce delays for current services
LTP3 2016/17	Crossing facilities	Copnor Road/Norway Road	Hilsea	The reconstruction of the Copnor Road/Norway Road junction to improve traffic flow and improved pedestrian crossing and cycle facilities. Site top 5 in ADPV2. Proposal also to include bus priority equipment to support future Bus Rapid Transit route
LTP3 2016/17	Safer Routes to School area-wide programme	This allows reactive works on school routes as issues are identified. It can include but is not exclusive to the installation of bollards, barriers, signage and dropped-kerbs.	All wards	Safety schemes to improve safety to vulnerable road users on the journey to school. Schemes will typically involve Zig Zag enhancements, buildouts, designated crossing points, junction enhancements and cycle provision.



Programme	Scheme name	Scheme overview	Ward	Scheme details
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Eastney/Bransbury/Devonshire Junction	Milton	Full refurbishment to Puffin, IP technology and MOVA detection. Current site 22 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Velder Ave/Moorings Way Junction	Baffins	Full refurbishment to include Toucan crossing, IP technology and MOVA upgrade. Current site 15 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Milton Road/St Mary's Hospital Junction	Milton	Pelican to Toucan conversion, IP technology and MOVA upgrade with WiFi linking. Current site 15 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Fratton Rd/New Rd Junction	Fratton	MOVA technology upgrade.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Winston Churchill Avenue / Hampshire Terrace Junction	St Thomas	Installation of smart above ground vehicle sensors and MOVA upgrade. Current site 13 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	A3/A27/M27 Junction	Cosham	Upgrade to MOVA Control and IP technology. Current site 10 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Southwick Hill Road/QA Hospital Junction	Cosham	Full refurbishment to Puffin, IP technology and MOVA control. 15 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Havant Rd/Spur Rd Junction	Cosham	Full refurbishment plus new Puffin crossings, IP technology and MOVA control. 20 years old.
Traffic signals optimisation programme	Traffic signal improvement	Eastern Rd/Burrfields Junction	Copnor	Full refurbishment to include MOVA control and IP technology. 20+ years old.

# Agenda Item 4



Portsmouth  
CITY COUNCIL

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	10 March 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	Goldsmith Avenue Cycle Lane
<b>Report by:</b>	Director of Transport Environment & Business Support
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Central Southsea, Milton
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To seek approval to undertake consultation via Traffic Regulation Order on the implementation of a designated cycle lane on Goldsmith Avenue.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Approval is given to undertake a consultation via a Traffic Regulation Order on the implementation of double yellow lines on the north side of Goldsmith Avenue, adjacent to the railway line opposite Francis Avenue to the pedestrian crossing west of Fratton Way. This will include removing the loading bays and the current unrestricted parking to facilitate the introduction of a mandatory eastbound cycle lane.

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Portsmouth experiences high levels of cycle road casualties with over 80% of those collisions occurring on main 30mph roads such as Goldsmith Avenue.
- 3.2 Provision of continuous, dedicated cycle facilities may assist to improve cycle safety within the area. The addition of cycle lanes and associated signage and road markings on the carriageway can highlight to motorists the need to anticipate cyclists travelling within the shared road space.
- 3.3 By removing the existing parking along the carriageway the available road width is increased to allow room for both cyclists and other vehicles to utilise. This will improve visibility within the area, increasing the awareness of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.
- 3.4 Portsmouth is a flat and compact city and these areas are within 2-3 miles of each other. Therefore, it is ideally suited to encouraging walking and cycling for short journeys. However, if we are to encourage the use of the Western Active

Travel Corridor and Eastern Active Travel Corridor (WATC & EATC) to access the city centre, there are some important missing links that need to be addressed. The improvement and promotion of the WATC & EATC and its connections to the centre will improve accessibility, reduce the pressure on the road network and reduce carbon outputs by enabling and facilitating the use of more sustainable modes of transport to both access the centre and move between the Town Centre, Gunwharf Quay and Southsea. This cycle lane will contribute directly to the adopted aims set out above by improving east to West accessibility for cyclists.

- 3.5 As part of the proposed Tesco Development within Fratton Way, the Highways Engineer considered the scope to which a package of off-site highway and transport improvements could mitigate the impacts of the development. These included the provision of on road cycle lanes from Fratton Way to link with the existing facilities to the west on Goldsmith Avenue in the vicinity of Talbot Road and the provision of off road cycleway across site frontage to link with Toucan crossing to south on Fratton Way.
- 3.6 Goldsmith Avenue is a classified road which experiences large volumes of traffic. During the five year period 1st November 2010 to 31st October 2015 there have been a total of 14 cycle collisions (1 serious injury) along this identified section of Goldsmith Avenue.

#### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

- 4.1 In 2015 a large Tesco superstore was constructed in Fratton Way (off Goldsmith Avenue). During the planning process, concerns were raised (regarding the safety of cyclists, due to the potential increase in traffic that the new store will bring. As part of the section 106 agreement with Tesco, funding has been identified to fund the installation of the cycle lane.
- 4.2 Planning Policy PCS7 states that all developments within the City will be designed to be pedestrian and cycle friendly. Links to Fratton Railway Station must be improved for these identified users. The link towards the station from the site is along Goldsmith Avenue which has had many cyclist casualties. Although this road does have existing advisory cycle lanes along a major part of the route, the existing section where parking is currently permitted results in the loss of a cycle lane.
- 4.3 There are 9 schools in the immediate area, this combined with Portsmouth's current high child pedestrian and cycling road casualties on 30mph roads underline the need for safety schemes on such roads.

#### **5. Equality impact assessment**

- 5.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. None of the parking bays that are being taken away are accessible bays for disabled people but also a high majority of older people that use the buses will not be affected as the bus stops they are not being affected.

## **6. Legal implications**

6.1 It is the duty of a local authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:

(a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and

(b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority."

6.2 Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.

6.3 Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of such danger arising, for preventing damage to the road or any building on or near the road, for facilitating the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians) or preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

6.4 A TRO may make provisions for identifying any part of the road to which any provision of the TRO is to apply by means of a traffic sign.

6.5 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.

## **7. Director of Finance's comments**

This scheme is to be funded from Section 106 - Developers contributions, with a budget of £40,000.

.....  
Signed by: Alan Cufley  
Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

**Appendices:**

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by: Councillor Ellcome  
Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation

# Agenda Item 5

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	10 March 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	London Road proposals: TRO 12/2016
<b>Report by:</b>	Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Nelson
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To consider the response to the public consultation on the proposed footway adjustment and reintroduction of Pay & Display, between Chichester Road and Laburnum Grove. When objections are received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders, it is a statutory requirement to consider them at a formal decision meeting.

Appendix A: Public notice detailing the proposal  
Appendix B: Summary of public consultation responses

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That approval is given to widen the carriageway on both sides and reinstall Pay & Display parking on the west side.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 In response to concerns regarding road safety and accidents on London Road and the management of traffic flow through the city, funding was sought from LTP in 2009 to look into road safety improvements and the options associated with possible regeneration.
- 3.2 As part of the project a Steering Group was created that included representation from the Business Association, local church, Neighbourhood Forum and Nelson Ward Councillors, in addition to members from local transport and freight networks. As a result of this process, a scheme to improve the environment for pedestrians, but retain the same level of access to the area for other modes of transport was put forward, but ultimately rejected due concerns from local residents and issues of the physical implementation.

- 3.3 Based on this information a scheme was developed to provide additional footway and also identified improvements that could be made to the pedestrian crossings. It also detailed the application of materials to provide an enhanced footway finish.
- 3.4 In 2012 a scheme was constructed within London Road between the junctions of Chichester Road and Laburnum Grove/Derby Road which consisted of removing the existing on-street parking facilities to enable widening of the footways to improve pedestrian access through the area.
- 3.5 Following a request from the Leader of the Council in late 2015, Portsmouth City Council canvassed residents' views regarding the reduction of footway width and re-introduction of on-street parking within London Road. This consultation was prompted by the perceived issues of businesses within the area that the loss of on-street parking facilities has led to the loss of trade.

#### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

- 4.1 The comments received in response to the formal consultation on the proposals (Appendix B) have been taken into consideration.
- 4.2 Increasing the level of parking is designed to encourage visitors and residents of the City to visit the existing businesses within London Road, and to provide easy access for those vulnerable residents who are currently unable to easily access the facilities within London Road.

#### **5. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

- 5.1 A Preliminary Equality Impact Assessment has been completed for this scheme. From this it has been determined that an equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation does not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

#### **6. Legal Services Comments**

- 6.1 It is the duty of a local authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:
- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
  - (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority."
- 6.2 Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.

- 6.3 Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of such danger arising, for preventing damage to the road or any building on or near the road, for facilitating the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians) or preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
- 6.4 A TRO may make provisions for identifying any part of the road to which any provision of the TRO is to apply by means of a traffic sign.
- 6.5 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.
- 6.6 Where a TRO is made the local authority must within 14 days publish a notice that the order has been made in a local newspaper. The notice must include amongst other things, where and when the order is available for inspection and that within six weeks following the making of the order that an application can be made to the High Court to question the validity of the order or any its provisions.
- 6.7 The local authority must take appropriate steps to ensure that adequate publicity about the order is given and must notify any person who has objected to the order (where such objection has not been withdrawn) that the order has been made. The notice of making the order must include the reasons why the objection was rejected.
- 6.8 In selecting a contractor to carry out the works, the Council is required to undertake a procurement process in accordance with the City Council's Contract Procedure Rules, at Part 3A of the constitution. The Council is also required to comply with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and applicable EU law.

## **7. Director of Finance Comments**

- 7.1 This scheme is to be funded from the both revenue and capital contributions from the PRED portfolio and has been approved by the PRED Cabinet holder with a current budget of £160k.

.....

Signed by:  
Alan Cufley  
Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....

Signed by:  
Councillor Ken Ellcome, Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation

## Appendix A: Proposal notice for TRO 12/2016

26 January 2016

### **THE PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (LONDON ROAD, NORTH END) (AMENDMENTS TO FOOTWAY AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS) (NO.12) ORDER 2016**

Notice is hereby given that Portsmouth City Council is consulting the public on proposals within the above Order under Sections 1 – 4, 32, 35, 36, 37, 45, 46 and 47 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The effect would be as detailed below.

This Order supersedes the recently-advertised TRO 89/2015.

#### **A) FOOTWAY NARROWING AND CHANGE FROM NO WAITING AND NO LOADING TO: PAY & DISPLAY MONDAY-SATURDAY 8AM-6PM**

**1. London Road** West side, a maximum 80-metre length between the pedestrian crossing by Superdrug and the pedestrian crossing by the former Co-op store.

Pay & Display charges:	Up to 30 minutes 60p	Up to 1 hour £1.10
Up to 2 hours £2.00	Up to 3 hours £3.00	
Up to 4 hours £4.00	Up to 6 hours £6.20	
Up to 8 hours 8.20	All day £10.00	

#### **B) FOOTWAY NARROWING**

**1. London Road** East side, a similar length opposite the proposal at Part A) above to provide increased road width (by reducing the footway width)

#### **REASONS FOR ORDER**

To provide short-term parking in the locality to support local shops and businesses by improving access for customers arriving by vehicle. To ensure the remaining road width suitably accommodates cyclists.

Persons wishing either to object to or support these proposals may do so by sending their representations **IN WRITING** via email to [engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk](mailto:engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk) or by letter to Nikki Musson, Transport Planning, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth, PO1 2NE, quoting ref: **TRO 12/2016**, stating the grounds of objection or support by **16 February 2016**.

Under the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, any letters of representation that are received may be open to inspection by members of the public.

A copy of this Public Notice can be viewed on Portsmouth City Council's website - visit [www.portsmouth.gov](http://www.portsmouth.gov) and search 'traffic regulation orders 2016'. A copy of the proposal notice and plan may be examined at the Main Reception, Civic Offices, Guildhall Square, Portsmouth during normal office hours.

Alan Cufley, Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support  
Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Guildhall Square, Portsmouth PO1 2NE

## **Appendix B: Summary of the responses to the public consultation**

### **1. Resident, Battenburg Avenue**

Objecting to the proposals. Would like to see the MP's, traders and Council use every opportunity at their disposal to make further improvements on behalf of residents. The improvements must favour actual shoppers over private motorists. Shopping centres regularly have new businesses that arrive then fail and ultimately close. The forms of trading are now changing faster than ever but at North End in particular we enjoy a majority of successful businesses all of whom could thrive if greater attention is paid to what the shoppers and the would-be shoppers want themselves. Please stop pandering so much to motorists for the motorists who call out for roadside parking here are the very so-called shoppers who put the fast food franchises out of business because they do not have their own adjacent car park or drive-thru facility. It is all too easy for inappropriate or inadequate businesses to blame the lack of footfall on any removal of roadside parking. Their customers, if they ever had many, are no longer available to ask for the reason for their absence. Less footfall is certainly because shoppers are voting with their feet and shopping elsewhere. If the shop ensures it is sufficiently attractive then any lack of roadside parking shouldn't really be sufficient disincentive to keep shoppers away.

It is important to recognise that shoppers at North End are fundamentally pedestrians no matter if we arrive on foot or on wheels of some kind. It is more important how shoppers spent their time here as pedestrians and not so much to consider how they get here. During the latter part of the last century the shopping experience here was increasingly made difficult and unpleasant by too much of London Road remaining more accommodating for ever increasing volumes of through traffic and all at the expense of safe and comfortable provision for pedestrians. The more successful shopping centres today provide greater provision for pedestrians to enjoy their visit, for example, Gunwharf Quays, Palmerston Road, Commercial Road, etc. Please give far greater preference to pedestrians here.

### **2. Resident and cyclist, Stubbington Avenue**

Has concerns regarding the proposals. Will the proposals leave enough space for the traffic to as smoothly as it is now and will there be sufficient space for cyclists and motorcyclists, as this road is frequently used for local journeys and by commuters? Has this been investigated by the Road Safety section? Assomeone who has cycled through the area I am a little concerned that north bound cyclists will hold up traffic when passing parked cars. You cannot ride close to parked cars as you can to the kerb line. The current width seems mainly to be sufficient. If there is a real need for accessible parking would it not be a better and much cheaper alternative to enlarge Derby Road entrance to the car park behind the former Co-Op? The recycling bins could be relocated in the now underused car park. This would enable shoppers to exit the car park to both north and south and greatly improve usage. Also adding a 30 minute charge of 20p would encourage usage by those making a quick stop. Clear road signs and information in the News, Flagship, etc would publicise this.

### **3. Bus Company**

Objecting to the proposals. Took part in the North End Regeneration Project Steering Group in 2010 with the aim of enhancing the local environment and encouraging more footfall to the North End shopping area. Key parts of the plan were the removal of the parking bays on the west side of London Road and, with the agreement of the bus companies, the bus lane on the eastern side. This allowed the introduction of wider pavements. This also assisted with the free flow of traffic which no longer was subject to hold-ups caused by motorists reversing in and out of parking bays. The scheme resulted in improvements in reliability with bus services encountering fewer delays. The widening of the east side footway also addressed the concerns raised by bus drivers regarding pedestrians suddenly stepping out into the road to avoid push-chairs or mobility scooters.

At the time local traders supported the scheme. To now revert to the previous arrangement is a retrograde step and takes no account of the reasons behind the introduction of the present layout in North End. Plenty of alternative off-street parking exists nearby.

#### **4. Resident, Childe Square**

Objecting to the proposals. The current layout has been in place since 2012. The result was a much more pleasant environment for the shopper, pedestrians and mobility scooters. The proposals would see a return to the previous layout consisting of narrow pavements to accommodate parking bays. Motorists crawled along in hope to find a vacant parking spot causing congestion. This contributed to the high levels of air pollution in this location. I cannot see how the City Council can justify spending such a large sum whilst making cuts to essential services because of lack of funding.

Off-street parking exists off Stubbington Avenue and Derby Road and I have never known either of these car parks to be full to capacity. Creating 14(?) more spaces is hardly likely to enhance the turnover of the remaining traders in North End. Consider landscaping, part of the original regeneration plan, would be more beneficial in increasing footfall. My wife and I regularly shop in North End and would not wish to see a return to the previous arrangement.

#### **5. Cycle Forum**

Objecting to the proposals. The pavements in London Road were widened in order to improve the public realm and increase pedestrian safety. The proposals will help to return London Road to its previous, pedestrian-unfriendly state. It sends all the wrong messages regarding active travel for, once again, personal motorised transport will take precedence over sustainable travel. Portsmouth City Council is undertaking a series of improvements to reduce cycle accident rates to the north and south of the site. Adding more car parking will not assist with reducing casualties as there will be new hazards such as vehicles pulling out and car doors opening into the carriageway. We suggest initiatives including free car parking in off-street car parks, better signage for motorists and pedestrians, provide limited waiting to the shops in London Road from the access road to the rear, an in-depth study into the shopping needs of the population living within the locality and a planned set of improvements to the public realm. We urge you to reject the proposal.

*(End of Report)*

**This page is intentionally left blank**

# Agenda Item 6



Portsmouth  
CITY COUNCIL

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	10 March 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	Wymering Road & Portchester Road One-Way - Results of Public Notice
<b>Report by:</b>	Director of Transport Environment & Business Support
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Copnor Ward
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To consider the response to the public notice regarding the proposals to implement a one-way system within Wymering Road and Portchester Road.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the proposed one-way scheme is implemented to the proposed Option 2, i.e., Wymering Road to be made one-way eastbound and Portchester Road to be made one-way westbound.

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Following the Traffic and Transportation Meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015 it was agreed by the Portfolio Holder that a Public Notice would be raised and advertised to seek comments from residents within the City regarding the one-way proposals;
- 3.2 A Public notice detailing the resident's preferred option was advertised in the local press on 12 January 2016 and with on-street notices attached to lamp columns in the identified streets. The closing date for letters of objection and support was 02<sup>nd</sup> February 2016;
- 3.3 In response to the Public notice, one letter of named representation was received during the statutory consultation period. The table below summaries the response in relation to the advertised Public Notice:-

<b>Originator</b>	<b>Objection/Support</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
Resident of Farlington Road	<p>Objects to the scheme and raises the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not agree with cycles being exempt from the order. One-way means one-way;</li> <li>- Does not support the scheme if this means there will be a loss of on-street parking spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The City Council look to implement contraflow cycling measures within all one-way systems considered for implementation. One-way streets result in journeys by cycle becoming longer and more hazardous, increasing the number of junctions to negotiate. Introducing contraflow cycling allows cyclists to travel in both directions. The advisory cycle lanes highlight to motorists the need to anticipate cyclists travelling in the contraflow direction;</li> <li>- The on-street parking will be retained and there will be no loss or reduction of spaces in the area. Where the existing parking restrictions are currently located at both the eastern and western ends of the roads, advisory cycle lanes will be provided to indicate cyclists are permitted to travel in either direction within the area.</li> </ul>

#### 4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1 Providing a one-way scheme within the area satisfies 86% of residents who voted in favour of a change during the postal consultation undertaken within the area during December 2014;
- 4.2 The one-way proposals aim to meet the requirements of the Local Transport Plan by seeking to improve Road Safety, Air Quality and Quality of Life;
- 4.3 The combination of a 20mph speed limit and the use of one-way roads will seek to increase road safety through reduced speeds and better traffic flow with the

removal of vehicle conflict. In turn this will improve the habitability of the area for residents and provide a safer environment for all road users.

## **5. Equality impact assessment**

- 5.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation does not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

## **6. Legal implications**

- 6.1 It is the duty of a local authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:

(a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and  
(b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority."

- 6.2 Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.

- 6.3 Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of such danger arising, for preventing damage to the road or any building on or near the road, for facilitating the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians) or preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

- 6.4 A TRO may make provisions for identifying any part of the road to which any provision of the TRO is to apply by means of a traffic sign.

- 6.5 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.

- 6.6 Where a TRO is made the local authority must within 14 days publish a notice that the order has been made in a local newspaper. The notice must include amongst other things, where and when the order is available for inspection and that within six weeks following the making of the order that an application can be made to the High Court to question the validity of the order or any its provisions.

6.7 The local authority must take appropriate steps to ensure that adequate publicity about the order is given and must notify any person who has objected to the order (where such objection has not been withdrawn) that the order has been made. The notice of making the order must include the reasons why the objection was rejected.

**7. Director of Finance's comments**

7.1 The proposed Wymering Road and Portchester Road One Way traffic scheme will cost in the region of £52,000, which includes the on-going maintenance cost. The source of funding will be corporate resources set aside for the delivery of the Local Transport Plan as per the capital programme.

.....  
Signed by: Alan Cufley  
Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

**Appendices:**

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by: **Councillor Ellcome**  
**Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation**