

Title of meeting: Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

Date of meeting: 29th September 2016

Subject: Goldsmith Avenue Cycle Lane (TRO 11/2016)

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

Wards affected: Central Southsea, Milton

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to review comments received in response to the TRO 11/2016. This order proposed 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. Removing the loading bays and the current unrestricted parking is also included in order to facilitate the introduction of a dedicated eastbound cycle lane

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation:
approves the Goldsmith Avenue cycle lane as set out in TRO 11/2016.

3. Background

- 3.1 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 provided towards the installation of the cycle lane.
- 3.2 Cycle casualty data shows Goldsmith Avenue has experienced 14 cycle road casualties in the period 2010 - 2015.
- 3.3 A report regarding Goldsmith Avenue cycle lane was taken to the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation in March 2016. Approval was given to undertake a consultation via a Traffic Regulation Order for the change from unrestricted parking and marked loading bays to: Advisory cycle lane and no

waiting at any time (double yellow lines). This 21 day consultation closed on 30 June 2016.

4. Consultation

4.1 The TRO was advertised for a 21 day period via yellow on-street notices displayed in Goldsmith Avenue (the affected location) and also in Francis Avenue, and a copy was published on Portsmouth City Council's website. These measures are in addition to the statutory requirement to publish a proposal notice in a local newspaper (The News). Users of the parking bays were provided with ample opportunities to comment.

4.2 A total of three responses were received in response to the consultation as shown in Table 1 below.

Respondent	In support	Against	Comments	Officer comments
Local business		X	I am emailing with reference to the above TRO 11/2016, we object because there are already plans to build flats with inadequate parking for them, and now you are proposing to add to the parking issues in the area. We are a business in this area, and there is already inadequate parking, we are in need of more parking, not more cycle lanes. This will affect us directly, as the proposed plans are directly outside our premises, on our side of the road. Please supply further information on what you are proposing.	Officers consider that the safety and accessibility benefits greatly outweigh the loss of non-residential parking.
The committee of Portsmouth Cycle Forum	X		The committee of Portsmouth Cycle Forum has asked me to comment on the above Traffic Regulation Order. We fully support the reallocation of road space on this busy thoroughfare to give greater priority to	Officers note Portsmouth's Cycle Forum request regarding the design of the cycle lane. Any cycle lane implemented will be compliant with design guidance and the

			<p>travelling by bicycle. The use of a section of a major and congested A-Road for long-term vehicle parking has always been questionable and the arrival of Tesco Extra on Fratton Way has had notable impact on the local highways with much increased motor vehicle, pedestrian and cycle movements.</p> <p>We request that the width of the cycle lane should be at least 1.5 metres and preferably 2.0 metres. This should be easy to accommodate since the road space is currently used for long term vehicle parking, most of which occupy 2 - 2.5 metres of the carriageway.</p> <p>There is an omission from the plan and that is the section of Goldsmith Avenue between Fratton Way and Priory Crescent. Portsmouth Cycle Forum's vision "A City to Share" highlights the importance of East-West links and the lack of provision for them. We ask that the scheme is extended to include this section of highway.</p>	<p>specific details will be fully considered during the design stage.</p>
Resident		X	<p>I wish to object to TRO 11/2016 as currently advertised.</p> <p>The loss of parking on the north side of Goldsmith Avenue will have a huge detrimental impact on residents in the streets in the surrounding area, particularly overnight when</p>	<p>Officers consider that the safety and accessibility benefits greatly outweigh the loss of non-residential parking.</p> <p>The southern side footway is not suitable for a shared cycle path due to the</p>

		<p>finding a space is practically impossible (I note that surveys have not been done late in the evening or through the night when the vast majority of people are home)</p> <p>There is however a simple way of adding a cycle lane to the north side of Goldsmith Avenue without losing the parking in the process.</p> <p>The pavement on the south side of Goldsmith Avenue is incredibly wide (much of it is between 3 and 4 metres wide) and could easily be 'split' for pedestrians and a cycle lane. By moving the cycle lane on the south side onto the pavement (as in other areas of the city) the road would be wide enough for 2 way traffic, a cycle lane (north side) and parking (north side by the pavement)</p> <p>As you can see, this would not reduce the width of any lane as the road is already split into 2 way traffic, a cycle lane (south side) and parking (north side by the pavement) but would avoid the backlash from a reduction in parking in the area.</p>	<p>number of crossover points, width for majority of the length and bus shelters.</p> <p>Current funding identified is through a planning agreement which specifies the exact location of the cycle lane; no additional funding is currently available.</p>
--	--	--	---

Table 1

4.3 Two of the respondents objected to the proposals, both on the grounds of loss of car parking.

- 4.4 One of the respondents supported the proposal and commented that the proposed cycle lane should be of sufficient width and should be further extended.
- 4.5 It is considered by officers that the benefits of safety and accessibility greatly outweigh the impact of the loss of non-residential parking.
- 4.6 The cycle lane will be designed to be compliant with relevant guidance.
- 4.7 The funding identified for this scheme is a planning agreement which specifies the exact location of the cycle lane.

5. Reasons for recommendations

- 5.1 Planning Policy PCS7 states that all developments within the City will be designed to be pedestrian and cycle friendly. 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.
- 5.2 The link to Fratton Railway Station has a high number of cycle casualties.
- 5.3 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.
- 5.4 Officers consider that the safety and accessibility benefits greatly outweigh the impact of the loss of non-residential parking.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is not required for this scheme as there is no negative impact on any equality groups as described in the Equality Act 2010.

7. Legal implications

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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.

- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 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.
- 7.5 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, as here, 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.

8. Director of Finance's comments

- 8.1 This scheme is to be funded from Section 106 - Developers contributions, and is anticipated to be delivered from within with the budget of £40,000.

.....
Signed by:
Alan Cufley
Director of Transport, Environment and 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
17 th March June 2016 Traffic and Transportation Report	PCC website/Democratic Services
TRO 11/2016	PCC website/Democratic Services

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

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