

Title of meeting: Traffic and Transportation

Date of meeting: 23rd October 2014

Subject: Lidiard Gardens / Lower Drayton Lane (parking restriction proposals)

Report by: Head of Transport and Environment

Wards affected: Eastney and Craneswater, Drayton and Farlington

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

To consider the responses to the public consultation on the proposals, which is a statutory requirement of the Traffic Regulation Order process.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the proposed double yellow lines on the south side of the bend in Lidiard Gardens is reduced by 10 metres, to retain 2 parking spaces;

2.2 That the proposed extension to the double yellow lines at the junction of Manor Mews is installed as advertised, as per residents' original requests.

3. Background

3.1 Lidiard Gardens: Ward Councillors, acting on behalf of residents, requested that double yellow lines be considered on the bends at the eastern and western ends of the road. Concerns were raised over the reduced visibility of oncoming traffic on the bends, caused by parked vehicles, and affecting road safety for motorists and pedestrians.

3.2 Lower Drayton Lane: Residents raised concerns over visibility of oncoming traffic when exiting Manor Mews onto Lower Drayton Lane, requesting an extension of the double yellow lines to reduce the potential for accidents.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1** Lidiard Gardens: The recommendation is made after taking into account the responses from residents to the original proposals. Consideration is given to the on-street parking requirements highlighted, in terms of access to property associated with Henderson Road.

See Appendix for summary of consultation comments.

- 4.2** Lower Drayton Lane: The recommendation is made after taking into account the need to balance residents' concerns over road safety with the on-street parking needs of customers and employees of nearby Havant Road.

See Appendix for summary of consultation comments.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

This report has undergone a preliminary equality impact assessment and there are no equality issues arising from this report.

6. City Solicitor's Comments

- 6.1** Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road, 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.
- 6.2** A TRO may include provisions prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles. A TRO may also make provisions prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic of a particular class specified in the order subject to such exceptions as may be so specified or determined, either at all times or at times, on days or during periods so specified.
- 6.3** A proposed TRO must be advertised, the appropriate bodies notified 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. Finance Comments

7.1 The advertising and changes to parking restrictions contained within this order were to be funded from the existing on street parking revenue budget.

The cost includes advertising proposals in The News, On-street line marking and On-street line removal.

Total £419

7.2 There will be no additional on-going enforcement costs as result of the changes in this Traffic Regulation Order

.....
Signed by:
Head of Transport & Environment Service

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
Public Notice of proposals	PCC website: search "traffic regulation orders 2014" and select No.40
Public responses	Transport Planning, 4 th floor, Civic Offices

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

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

APPENDIX: Responses to public consultation (summary)

A. Lidiard Gardens

Support

1. We totally support the proposed double yellow lines in Lidiard Gardens. The current situation is dangerous but implementing these proposals will make the road a much safer place to drive in.
2. An interesting proposal; I always thought the blind corner was a danger and take it very carefully.
3. Double yellow lines are necessary on the flint wall side of the road, where the parking currently causes the bend to be so dangerous. The problem will reappear on the other side of the road, so it is necessary for double yellow lines on that side too. When cars park on both sides it causes a very tight and dangerous slalom to negotiate.
4. I agree with the double yellow lines. Please also consider double yellow lines at the access to Nos. 34-39 to improve safety.
5. Every night 1 or 2 cars park on this bend and sometimes all day as well. This represents a danger to residents and could affect emergency vehicle access.
6. Letter of support, signed by 19 residents - strong support for the extension to the double yellow lines as described. There is a real need to restrict parking at these points, to prevent current inconsiderate parking, which impedes road safety and leaves little room to access the estate. We would also welcome additional double yellow lines between the parking area after No. 49 and the walkway at the side of No.56 for the same reasons.

Objections

1. Don't extend the double yellow lines on the houses side; just put them on the wall side of the bend. I've never seen any problems caused by that.
2. I object to the overuse of double yellow lines. There have not been any incidents in this road in 17 years caused by over-parking. Motorists should be exercising caution when driving in residential roads in a heavily populated city. Double yellow lines just push parking further along the road, decreasing parking opportunities overall. Yellow lines at the eastern end is not necessary, but on one side it may regulate the area for parking, as it is of sufficient width.
3. The access to the rear of our property is in Lidiard Gardens, and we often park there to gain access. Double yellow lines could deny that and disadvantage us. Parking in this area is responsible and there is enough off-road parking available. Double yellow lines on both sides of the road is excessive, ideally it should be left as it is, but on one side if necessary. This proposal is an example of poor traffic management.

B. Lower Drayton Lane

Support

1. The double yellow lines should be extended both north and south on Lower Drayton Lane to provide sight lines when exiting Manor Mews. Currently, when vans are parked close to the corner, one cannot see whether or not there is any traffic on Lower Drayton Lane until one's vehicle is in the trafficked route.
2. We like you to extend the double yellow lines by approximately 9ft either side of Lower Drayton Lane at the entrance to Manor Mews. The reason for this is that the line of sight for vehicles exiting Manor Mews is very limited.

Objection

1. The residents of Manor News should be more careful. Losing a parking space does not consider Lower Drayton Lane residents' needs. We are already inundated by cars associated with the businesses on Havant Road, all day and sometimes longer.