

**Title of meeting:** Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation Decision Meeting

**Date of meeting:** 25<sup>th</sup> January 2018

**Subject:** Slingsby Close double yellow lines (TRO 115b/2017)

**Report by:** Tristan Samuels, Director of Regeneration

**Wards affected:** St Thomas

**Key decision:** No

**Full Council decision:** No

---

## **1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1.** To consider residents' responses to the proposed double yellow lines in Slingsby Close; a cul-de-sac within Pembroke Park.

Appendix A: Objections are published on pages 5-6.

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1.** That the double yellow lines are not installed at this time, primarily due to the objections from residents but also the lack of evidence to show Slingsby Close experiences exceptional congestion issues due to on-street parking.
- 2.2.** That further proposals for additional double yellow lines on one side of Slingsby Close are not progressed given the response to the current proposal under TRO 115/2017.

## **3. Background**

- 3.1** One resident of Slingsby Close feels that parking at the dead end of Slingsby Close is unacceptable, and approached the Council to consider the introduction of parking restrictions.
- 3.2** Parking congestion is experienced across the city, and as residents generally manage the parking themselves within residential cul-de-sacs, the Council will only intervene if requested either by residents or by emergency, public or delivery services, or both.
- 3.3** In the case of Slingsby Close, whilst no issues have been reported by outside bodies, the photographs and strong concerns of the resident prompted a proposal to be put forward for consultation, to gauge the level of support for double yellow lines.

## **4. Reasons for the recommendation**

### **4.1** 4 objections were received to the proposal on the grounds that:

- There is already minimal on-street parking in Slingsby Close, and parking for residents and their visitors will be affected;
- Knock-on effect will cause more vehicles to park on both sides of Slingsby Close and in other parts of Pembroke Park, increasing congestion difficulties there;
- The logic behind the proposal is unclear as a parking prohibition appears unnecessary;
- No sight-lines or traffic issues;
- The negative impact on the property at the end of the close would be significant compared to any improvements to general use of the road.

### **4.2.1** Slingsby Close is not part of the strategic highway network, and the Council would not usually intervene unless an issue was highlighted by a number of residents and/or the emergency, public or delivery services, or accident data indicated a problem needed to be addressed. Parking restrictions are considered for the purposes of road safety and managing traffic, for the benefit of all motorists.

### **4.2.2** The above ensures that funding and resources, including enforcement, are focused where they are most needed. In this case, funding would need to be identified for future maintenance as the road is owned and maintained by the local authority and is therefore not automatically covered by the PFI contract in place with Colas.

### **4.3** The photographs showing parked vehicles at the dead end of the cul-de-sac, particularly in the evenings, would not automatically be cause for concern to the local authority in terms of road safety or traffic management.

### **4.4** With regard to putting forward a proposal for further double yellow lines on one side of Slingsby Close, the grounds for objecting to the current proposal are likely to be reiterated by residents. However, any further concerns will be recorded and if access is prevented on a regular basis residents may be asked if they would support restrictions on one side.

### **4.5** In Slingsby Close, the vehicles in most cases belong to residents and their visitors, who would be the most affected by parking restrictions. Non-residents, such as those travelling to the Isle of Wight, would be likely to seek out the remaining unrestricted parking places and cause additional issues, as feared by some residents. Pembroke Park is on the Residents' Parking Programme to be surveyed in 2019, which may or may not show support for permit parking in the future.

## **5. Equality Impact Assessment**

### **5.1** A full equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation not have a negative impact on any of the remaining protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010. These include Age, Race, Gender, Sexual orientation, Religion or belief, the relationships between these groups, and other socially excluded groups.

## **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** A proposed TRO must be advertised and the statutory consultees notified and given a 3- week period (21 days) in which to register any support or objections. Members of the public also have a right to object during that period. 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 any comments received from the public and/or the statutory consultees during the consultation period.

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

- 7.1** The implementation costs relating to TRO 115/2017 as per the recommendation will be £0. Should the recommendation not be approved, and the proposal be implemented, the cost is estimated to be around £450. This figure would be met by the Parking Revenue budget and includes £300 towards future maintenance of the restriction, which is not covered by the PFI contract with Colas as Slingsby Close is not part of the public highway network (land is owned by Portsmouth City Council).

.....  
Signed by:  
Tristan Samuels  
Director of Regeneration

**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:

<b>Title of document</b>	<b>Location</b>
10 emails	Transport Planning team (engineers inbox)

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

.....  
Signed by:  
Councillor Simon Boshier  
Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

## **Appendix A: Public response to the proposal**

### **OBJECTIONS**

#### **1. Residents, Slingsby Close**

We received your notification regarding putting double yellow lines to the eastern dead end of Slingsby Close. We absolutely oppose this as parking in Slingsby Close is minimal already. The extra few spaces are definitely needed. We cannot understand the logic of this request.

To clarify, we oppose these lines due to not enough parking in the road already!! Especially when visitors come.

#### **2. Residents, Slingsby Close**

The provision of 37 metres of double yellow lines is not necessary. 22 metres of which are across the drives of house numbers 7, 9, and 8, cars do not park across these driveways anyway.

The provision of yellow lines outside number 8 will affect the access of carers.

The provision of yellow lines at the end of the Close will result in the increase of double parking, outside house numbers 5,7,6,4 & 2 with vehicles that are not Slingsby Close residents and in some cases Isle of Wight cars, which avoid paying parking charges. Cars parked either side of the road, which will reduce the access of service and emergency vehicles. The money would be better spent on maintaining the foot paths which are in a sorry state.

#### **3. Residents, Slingsby Close**

Thank you for the opportunity to object to the proposal to paint double yellow lines in the area at the end of Slingsby Close.

We are the residents most affected by this proposal as we own and live in Number 8 Slingsby Close (last house on right hand side), our family home since 1999, and see absolutely no reason for this proposal. In over 18 years of living here we have never had any serious parking issues in the area indicated, and have never had to deal with a vehicle blocking access or similar. We do very occasionally suffer from non-resident parking, but these rare events are at the very most mildly annoying; never has it occurred to us that a total prohibition would be the correct outcome.

I am unsure why PCC has come to the conclusion that a prohibition is the correct outcome, or indeed who has made such a suggestion and who has been consulted. Should any other neighbour claim to have been speaking on behalf of all the residents of Slingsby Close please be absolutely clear that this is categorically not the case. I feel sure that you will receive objections from other neighbours who also do not see the need for this proposal, which will confirm our contention that the proposal emanates from one or two vociferous individuals who wish their views on all matters to prevail.

In January 2017 we moved my mother into our house, having made suitable alterations to our house to satisfy her complex care needs whilst preserving both her and our privacy. She

is an old lady of 90 years of age who suffers from Alzheimer's Disease. She requires regular daily visits by carers to look after her essential care needs (we both work). Whilst we always try and ensure that we leave space for visiting carers and professionals to park, occasionally they have to park on the road during their short stay. They always do so in as responsible a manner as possible. Should you decide to go ahead with your proposed scheme to turn the area next to our home into a 'no parking' zone, there is a very real danger that carers would be put off by the danger of incurring parking fines, and so would decide not to provide care for my mother. This for us would be a catastrophe, as we have worked very hard to find dedicated carers who we can trust and who she likes and gets on with (all carers incidentally are paid for by the family). We are working really hard to provide a homecare solution for my mother; should carers become unwilling to visit we would be forced to seek residential adult care for her, putting more stress on this sector and resulting in an outcome that my mother most certainly does not want. She would be devastated if she could no longer live with us.

In summary, the proposal is without doubt not required. Should it be taken forward it would have a dramatically deleterious impact on the care of a vulnerable adult with a significant disability. The 'no parking at any time' solution is totally out of proportion to any perceived parking issues.

I also feel that you should be aware of the context of the suggestion that this area should be made 'no parking'. This is simply the latest stage of a campaign against us as a family since we made the alterations to our house so that we could look after my mother. From the moment when a neighbour trespassed on our property (gaining unauthorised access to the property whilst we were at work to 'inspect' the work underway), we have been subject to a sustained campaign of constant objections.

I trust that we have provided sufficient information, but should you need further details, particularly of the sustained campaign against us, then we would be happy to provide more detail.

We sincerely appeal to you to heed our most strenuous objection to this proposal and to cancel this amendment.

#### **4. Residents, Chadderton Gardens (cul-de-sac just north of Slingsby Close)**

It has come to our attention that there is a proposal to place double yellow lines at the end of Slingsby Close.

We are concerned that, given the limited parking spaces in Pembroke Park as a whole, any further reduction in one part of the development will inevitably have a knock-on effect further down Slingsby Close, which in turn will have an impact beyond the Close in the area generally.

It is not clear as to what might be gained from such a proposed change: there are no traffic or sight-lines issues at that end, and it is an area that has properties with their own drives, thus freeing the space for visitors. If there are reasons for changes, we are concerned that there might be more personal aspects to such a proposal, and it would be disappointing, if such were the case, if the Council were to support said proposal.

*(End of report)*