



NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

THURSDAY, 24 MARCH 2016 AT 4.00 PM

THE EXECUTIVE MEETING ROOM - THIRD FLOOR, THE GUILDHALL

Telephone enquiries to Joanne Wildsmith Tel: 9283 4057

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

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
- 2 Declarations of Members' Interests
- 3 Local Transport Plan (LTP) Implementation Plan 2016/17 (including traffic signal optimisation programme) (Pages 1 - 6)

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.

(This item was deferred from the Traffic & Transportation decision meeting of 10 March 2016.)

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 Path (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 item was deferred from the Traffic & Transportation decision meeting of 10 March 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 designated eastbound cycle lane.

5 TRO 23 2016 Netley Road One Way (Pages 11 - 28)

A report will follow by the Director of Transport, Environment & Business to consider the responses to the public consultation on proposals under TRO 23/2016: Netley Road. When objections are received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders, it is a statutory requirement to consider them at a formal decision meeting.

Public consultation on TRO 23/2016 is scheduled between 2 - 23 March 2016. A report detailing the responses to the consultation will be published following the close of the consultation.

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

Title of meeting:	Traffic and Transport portfolio
Date of meeting:	24 March 2016 (deferred from 10 March 2016)
Subject:	Local Transport Plan 3 - Implementation Plan 2016/17 and Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme
Report by:	Director for Transport, Environment and Business Support
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	Yes
Full Council decision:	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

Title of meeting:	Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation
Date of meeting:	24 March 2016
Subject:	Goldsmith Avenue Cycle Lane
Report by:	Director of Transport Environment & Business Support
Wards affected:	Central Southsea, Milton
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	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 designated 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



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Title of meeting: Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

Date of meeting: 24 March 2016

Subject: Netley Road proposed one-way northbound
TRO 23/2016

Report by: Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

Wards affected: St Jude

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

To consider the responses to the public consultation on proposals under TRO 23/2016: Netley Road. 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 proposals (page 5)

Appendix B: Full residents', businesses' and public services' responses to the proposals (pages 6-13)

2. Recommendation

That the proposed one-way northbound in Netley Road and 'no entry' from Osborne Road is not implemented.

3. Background

3.1 A report was taken to the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation's decision meeting in February 2016 to consider the public consultation responses to experimental traffic schemes operating in Palmerston Road area (ETRO 10/2014) and Villiers Road (ETRO 2/2015).

3.2 The report also recommended public consultation take place via a new permanent TRO to implement a ban on left hand turns from Auckland Road West into Palmerston Road (to include engineering measures designed to discourage use of Netley Road and Auckland Road West by vehicles wishing to access Palmerston Road (south)).

3.3 The reasons for that recommendation were set out in detail in the February 2016 Traffic and Transportation report. In summary, some residents of Netley Road and Auckland Road West were concerned that the northbound direction of travel on Palmerston Road had led to an increase in vehicles using Netley Road to access Palmerston Road (south). A CCTV survey of the area was undertaken in June 2015 to establish trends in overnight vehicular use of Netley Road on a Friday and Saturday.

3.4 In response to deputations made during the Traffic and Transportation meeting in February 2016, the recommendation to ban turning left from Auckland Road West was rejected by the Portfolio Holder. Instead, the decision was made to consult on a new permanent TRO for the purpose of implementing a one-way northbound on Netley Road, preventing entry via Osborne Road.

4. Reasons for recommendation

4.1 Public consultation on TRO 23/2016 took place 2 - 23 March 2016. During the 21-day consultation period 27 responses were received:

9 in favour of the proposals, 18 against.

4.2 The responses to the public consultation are recorded in full at Appendix B, and contribute to the recommendation. Residents and businesses are largely concerned that the proposal may create further, more significant, issues than it addresses.

4.3 In addition to the consultation responses, the following should also be considered:

- The impact on the highway network in the vicinity. Closing off southbound access via Netley Road is likely to increase traffic volumes on The Vale, Maple Road, Lennox Road South and Villiers Road. When Palmerston Road was fully closed to traffic, Lennox Road South and Villiers Road experienced increased traffic flows, which prompted use of the local highway network to be reviewed. Lennox Road South would be the most likely alternative for traffic heading southwards, and already experiences difficulties with two-way traffic using the single lane available.
- The CCTV survey carried out on a Friday and Saturday in June 2015 showed 74 vehicles entering Netley Road on Friday between 22:00 and 03:00 (of which, 66% were taxis), and 68 vehicles (49% taxis) on Saturday. These vehicles would be likely to use the remaining southbound routes as alternatives, increasing traffic flows there.
- The above CCTV survey also showed 33 vehicles exiting Netley Road on Friday and 41 vehicles exiting on Saturday. These vehicles already travel northbound, and numbers are likely to increase should all traffic be required to travel northbound on Netley Road.

- All vehicular traffic being required to access Netley Road and Netley Terrace via Auckland Road West would have to negotiate the 90' bend by the Apsley House public house. This entry, via Clarence Parade, is narrow and less suitable for larger vehicles such as refuse collection, fire engines, household removal vehicles etc.
- Regular deliveries to the 2 public houses and waste collections will mean all traffic will be held up whilst these take place, as there is no room to pass, causing congestion on Clarence Parade whilst vehicles wait to turn into Auckland Road West.
- Should the narrowness of the road become an issue for the larger vehicles, and with no alternative access available, it may become necessary to remove the parking bay in Auckland Road West, just north of Clarence Parade, with the loss of 5 parking spaces. This would require a new Traffic Order and consultation.
- Vehicle speeds in Netley Road may increase as vehicles would no longer encounter opposing traffic flow.

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 a full 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 its road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to its 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 considers 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 include provisions prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles. A TRO may also make a provision 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.

6.5 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period (21 days) 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 Comments

7.1 There are no financial implications as a result of the approval of this recommendation.

.....
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
26 emails, 1 letter	Transport Planning, 4 th floor, Civic Offices

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: TRO 23/2016 public consultation notice

2 March 2016

THE PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (NETLEY ROAD) (ONE WAY TRAFFIC) (NO.23) ORDER 2016

Notice is hereby given that Portsmouth City Council is consulting the public on proposals within the above Order under Sections 1-4 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The effect would be as detailed below:

A) NO ENTRY (EXCEPT CYCLES)

1. From Osborne Road into Netley Road

B) ONE-WAY TRAFFIC (EXCEPT CYCLES)

1. Netley Road

In a northbound direction between Auckland Road West and Osborne Road

CITY COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE ORDER

To prevent the use of Netley Road as an alternative route to Palmerston Road (also one-way northbound).

A copy of this Public Notice and draft order can be viewed on Portsmouth City Council's website, visit www.portsmouth.gov.uk and search 'traffic regulation orders 2016'. The notice and a plan can be viewed at the Main Reception, Civic Offices.

Persons wishing either to object to or support these proposals may do so by sending their representations via email to **engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk** or in writing to Nikki Musson, Transport Planning, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth PO1 2NE, quoting ref **TRO 23/2016** by **23 March 2016** - providing name, address and stating the grounds of objection/support.

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

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

Appendix B: Public response to the proposals

1. Objections

Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service

I would like to record our concern about the proposed one way access. This will provide difficulty for the aerial ladder platform to gain access to the said road which could have political ramifications if we could not access the road due to the dog-log in an emergency.

Having looked at the location, the ALP crew said that whilst they *should* still be able to get an appliance through Netley Rd from that end, it would however be tight and of course it depends on the position of parked cars. If necessary then we would have to reverse out and access Netley Rd through Osborne Rd.

Could the council road engineering department design an alternative road scheme to ideally accommodate both requests?

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

We require access to our parking in front of our house from both directions, due to the very limited space when parking our cars – going in and out. It would require us to turn our cars around somewhere in the road or reverse up when parking. Consequently, we OBJECT to both proposals.

Resident, Auckland Road West

I strongly object to the implementation of one way only traffic along Netley Road. At the moment we routinely use Netley Road to access Ashby Place due to the issues we have driving up Palmerston Road and Osborne Road.

Osborne Road is hazardous to say the least to drive down and we generally avoid it due to the double parking, parking on double yellow, buses incorrectly pulling into bus stops and hence blocking the road, lorries constantly unloading throughout the day - I have lived here for 4 years and not a day has gone by where I have been able to drive down the road without obstruction. There are constantly cars parked outside the newsagents blocking to the road, cars on both sides on double yellow, cars, vans outside the estate agents. This, coupled with the delivery lorries for the pubs/restaurants, make it a daily trauma to even get down the road.

Shutting Netley Place - no doubt asked for by a few residents - will only exacerbate the Osborne Road problem and make getting to my drive even more of a problem. Hence, I STRONGLY object to the proposal to make it one way.

Resident, Auckland Road West

Living at the western end of Auckland Road West I wonder if you realise how narrow the access from the seafront is, or that there is a right-angled bend outside the Apsley House pub? Firstly this route for all vehicles, including the residents of Netley Road, is unsuitable and secondly we don't want this amount of traffic - it'll be a nightmare.

Resident, Auckland Road West

Objection: Concerns that there will be no access to Auckland Road West when the main road is shut off for events such as the great south run. How will I gain access by car to my house? It also means that if we can't find parking that we will have to drive to the end of Osborne road and then come back via Clarendon Road, back into Auckland Road West.

Resident, Netley Terrace

Pressure on parking commonly obliges us to drop off and pick up people or large items before going to park in the echelon parking by the Common. Currently we are able leave via Auckland Road West and walk back. The proposal as it stands would require us to drive to Osborne Road, drive to the Queen's Hotel and turn left along the Clarence Parade. The echelon parking which is often all that is available is difficult to park in while heading east and I can see us returning to Auckland Road West in order to turn round and approach from the easier westward direction. If this proposal remains as published I wish to oppose it.

Rather than generate this traffic and inconvenience I would like to suggest that the one way section be limited to that part of Netley Road in front of Richmond Terrace ie. between Osborne Road and the Kingston Hotel. This would still prevent the rat run from Osborne Road which I understand is the problem being addressed and allow us a sensible route to our usual parking spaces. Were this amendment made I would support it.

Resident, Netley Terrace

It seems like a draconian measure to curtail my ability to reach and exit my home in Netley Terrace. No data was produced to support this proposal. When was the route surveyed to determine how much traffic used this route? What interviews have there been with residents & retailers to gauge the impact of the plans?

I would support my neighbour's alternative proposal which has the merits of cutting down the traffic entering Auckland Rd West via Osborne Rd. He suggests limiting the no entry /one way arrangement to Richmond Terrace only. So residents like us, who live in Netley Terrace would enjoy the freedom to use both Auckland Road and Richmond Terrace as exits from home.

If such a move is indeed necessary then I would support this alternative as it meets the stated primary objectives of the change whilst minimising the impact on existing residents. However, I use this route virtually everyday and I have never once been delayed by heavy lorries using the route, so remain unconvinced of the need for and consequences of the proposal.

Resident, Auckland Road West

We - and the majority of our street - is strongly opposed to the proposed changes of making Netley Road a one way street.

Delivery vehicles will find it very hard to manoeuvre around (it's already tight as it is).

Much more importantly for us, is that fact that when the seafront is hosting events - which happen regularly and often throughout the year, then we the residents of Auckland Road West, will be locked-in and will not be able to drive our vehicles back into our homes

because the only access (the seafront) will be shut to vehicular traffic. This is not an option for us! We don't understand the changes and are strongly against them.

There is absolutely no need to keep changing streets around and messing them up. We all know of the failure of the 'pedestrianisation' of Palmerston north. The end result is nothing has changed... cars still pass by but a lot of money has been spent unnecessarily which delivered a useless space... and a lot more drunk and disorderly conduct in the area because they huddle around in groups in the weekends. A lot of elderly neighbours feel unsafe as a result.

Now, this change to Netley Road seems completely pointless and will damage the residents of Auckland Road West immensely. We kindly ask you to reconsider this proposed change. If you really need to spend money on streets, maybe covering potholes or actually cleaning them once in a while (come have a look... they are filthy!) would be a much better use of our taxes.

Business, Osborne Road

We would like the following objections to be noted;

1. Netley Road / Terrace and Auckland Road provide valuable parking for residents and businesses with permits. Making the roads a no entry from Osborne Road will mean vehicles entering from Auckland Road instead of Palmerston Road and down. This will not alleviate the flow of traffic or the use of the area for parking.

2. The parking provided in Netley Road is of great value to the clients and customers who use the small businesses in this area and the entry point from Osborne Road is the most convenient. In making this a one way entry from Palmerston Road / Auckland Road it forces cars to travel further around the block than they would normally need to travel and could encourage visitors to park on the double yellow lines outside the businesses in Osborne Road, rather than travel further than required in order to make a quick stop which in turn will block the thoroughfare in Osborne Road and cause congestion to a major road.

We don't consider the proposal to be of any benefit to the people who use the area and would be a waste of public money to reverse an entry route which already works perfectly well.

Business, Osborne Road

As the owner of a local business based on Osborne Road, I am extremely concerned to read of the traffic changes which are being proposed to Netley Road.

We are a local family business that has been based on Osborne Road for over 27 years and like many other small businesses, in recent years we have experienced first-hand the many challenges of operating an independent hospitality or retail business within a UK high street. The ever-changing retail landscape and consumer habits, as well as the constant pricing pressure from national chains have made high street trading in these uncertain times more demanding than ever. Nevertheless, we have strived to stay afloat and maintain our reputation as a respected local establishment. Furthermore, at the beginning of this year we embarked upon a complete revamp of our premises, our first in 27 years, in a final attempt to attract new business and secure the future of the company. As I am sure you will appreciate the level of investment we have made is a huge risk in

these uncertain times, which so far has been well received, however I fear your recent proposals could be catastrophic for our future.

In recent years the undeniable demise of the UK's high streets is well documented and with the recent Portas Review, a highly publicised issue. As a result, it is my understanding that the government and local councils are in support of encouraging local high street trade given the benefits they bring to the local community and economy. It is for this reason that I am confused by the current proposal given that it appears to be a direct contradiction to this pledge.

I have listed below some of the many reasons why I, like many other local businesses in the Palmerston Road area, are deeply opposed to these changes:

- First and foremost, I am very surprised that the proposed changes to the traffic system are feasible or even possible. As with a large number of the commercial units on Osborne Road, our premises has a rear alleyway which leads to the rear entrance of the shop where all our deliveries are received, on a daily basis. These deliveries are transported in large lorries, often arctic lorries, for which access is a major consideration. Furthermore, this same alley is also the location for all the commercial refuse bins (wheelie bins) for the majority of retailers in our vicinity of Osborne Road which are collected several times a week by a large refuse lorry. The proposal suggests that the only access to Netley Road will be via Auckland Road West via Clarence Parade. This road is extremely narrow and also at a right angle outside the Apsley Arms public house. I am convinced that none of the aforementioned vehicles could therefore access Netley Road via this route which would result in refuse and delivery vehicles being forced to double park on Osborne Road, which is already a very busy road and would create a hazard for pedestrians. Subsequently, please could you provide me with further details of how the current proposal has accounted for this?
- In recent years we have witnessed numerous changes to the road traffic system surrounding Palmerston Road precinct that have made it increasingly difficult for local residents and visitors to the area to access our shop, these have included the various one way systems which have been introduced and the reduction in street parking spaces. We understood that these changes would be countered by the introduction of the Park & Ride Service to the precinct, although this no longer appears to stop in Southsea. The parking on Netley Road, although limited, is of huge benefit to local residents looking to make a quick stop at the local shops. In addition, the area benefits from a strong and regular presence of traffic wardens that patrol the area regularly, which I agree with, and which will undoubtedly control parking issues for local residents. However, if Netley Road were to become inaccessible via Osborne Road I fear many local residents and visitors would be deterred from visiting our shop and those of other traders on Osborne Road.
- I understand that the current proposal has been raised by residents on Netley Road as they feel this will improve the traffic situation in the area. However, the traffic on Netley Road has been a two-way system for many years, long before any of these residents moved to their properties. Therefore I am unclear as to why they would feel it justified to propose changes which will undeniably have such a negative impact on local small businesses. Unfortunately, any resident who chooses to reside within 20 metres of a

local town centre and retail high street must understand that whilst there are numerous positives, such as being walking distance to local amenities, there is also unavoidably higher levels of road traffic than in less commercial areas.

I do hope you will consider the issues outlined above, together with the hugely negative impact this will have on supporting local businesses in the area.

Resident, Osborne Road

I object to the above order as I often park in Netley Road in one of the 1 hour bays and would find it more inconvenient to have to go around the back way to these parking bays, also I think it would make access for delivery vehicles more awkward as these back roads are quite narrow. Finally I think it would have an impact on some of the businesses in Osborne Road as some of their customers use the 1 hour bays in Netley Road. If this road has to be one way it would be better if it was from Osborne Road to Auckland Road.

Resident, Auckland Road West

Making Netley Road one-way northbound will stop the vehicle traffic rat run in Netley and Auckland Road West. There are however other factors which need to be considered. The only access to Auckland Road West and Netley Road will be from Clarence Parade.

- The northbound length of Auckland Road West from Clarence Parade is very narrow, with a very narrow pavement. I believe HGV's, including refuse, brewery and delivery lorries, which are delivering/collecting from these roads, will have difficulty negotiating this narrow road.
- When Clarence Parade is closed to traffic (Great South Run etc) there will be no legal access for vehicles to Auckland Road West and Netley Road.

Business, Osborne Road

I am writing in order to object to Portsmouth City Council's planned proposal of turning Netley Road into a one-way road heading northbound. Whilst myself and the rest of our staff do not object to turning it into a one-way road, per say, we do not understand why it would face northbound when Palmerston road already faces in this direction. Parking for businesses is already difficult enough on Osborne Road and we rely heavily on parking our vehicles on Netley road when turning in from Osborne Road. Having two roads in close proximity both limited to the same direction seems to make very little sense and if a one-way system were to be implemented then we don't understand why it would not be done so as to be a southbound one-way system. This seems to be a much more logical approach. If the road is to be turned into a one-way then we were also wondering whether additional parking spaces would be added to the other side of the road as there would be less need for the amount of space that is currently in existence. This would also help to alleviate the parking problem that people here currently face.

Resident, Bellevue Terrace, and business owner

If access to Netley Road from Osborne Road was prohibited it would cause difficulties for emergency vehicles and it would add yet another unnecessary deterrent to those visiting businesses in the Osborne Road and Palmerston Road area.

If the Council truly wishes to encourage and support small to medium size businesses (SMEs) in the City, it should avoid adding further unnecessary parking restrictions in the area.

The stated justification for the proposed Traffic Order is "To prevent the use of Netley Road as an alternative route to Palmerston Road". This is disturbing because one would have thought the Council would wish to positively encourage (rather than discourage) ease of access to the area. Even if this stated reason (objective) made sense in overall policy terms, it could in any event be achieved by other means, for example by introducing one-way traffic to the section of Auckland Road West that leads into Palmerston Road.

Resident, Auckland Road West

I strongly object to the planned reorganisation pertaining to Netley Road, Netley Place and Auckland Road West.

- 1 Netley Road "north" is much wider than Auckland Road West
- 2 Keep Netley Road "north" to where it joins Netley Place two way
- 3 Make from Netley Place into Netley Road going south to adjoin Auckland Road West no entry
- 4 Auckland Road West from Clarence Parade is often busy with Refuse Collections, deliveries to both Public Houses and if this is the only way to access Netley Place and Netley Road "north" increased traffic will, I am sure, cause problems.

Waste collections (commercial)

This will increase the amount of large vehicles going round the tight corners at the beginning of Auckland Road West into Netley Road, due to businesses on Osborne Road who get their deliveries from the rear. We raised concerns about one way systems on parallel roads going in the same direction causing more traffic flow problems a year or two ago and was informed that it wouldn't happen again such as Munster Road and the next couple of the roads all flowing west to east. Given that this traffic is north bound and Palmerston Road is the same it is not going to help the traffic flow around the area.

Waste collections (domestic)

The normal collection crews would have to access / drive round twice rather than once. The crews collect from the terraced houses in Netley Road and then would need to go around again to enter again from Clarence Parade to service Auckland Road West and the rear of the properties on Clarence Parade.

Public house landlord, Auckland Road West

Regarding the barring of access to Netley Road and Auckland Road West, from Osborne Road.

My concern is that should the entry to Auckland Road West from Clarence Parade be closed (as when the Great South Run is on) or for any other reason then there would be no vehicle access to Auckland Road West or Netley Road and therefore no access to our business. We would be able to drive out but not return. This would also mean that no Taxis or emergency vehicles would have access either.

I can understand the reason for your plans but would like to just point out my concerns and

that living here I have not noticed an increase in traffic cutting through, maybe it would be better to return Palmerston Road to two-way Traffic.

2. Support

Resident, Netley Terrace

I fully support this proposal. Using Netley Rd southbound to gain access to Palmerston Rd is used by a huge number of cabs, when Clarence Parade is by far the better route.

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

We wish to support the proposal to trial making Netley Road a one-way street. Because of the changes to traffic in Palmerston Road, the street is being used as a short cut by drivers, particularly taxi drivers who pass around the bend in the road very fast. They present a threat to people crossing the street and particularly to children and elderly people living in or walking through the area. If the traffic is only moving one way, this should reduce the danger. It is certainly worth trying a one-way system to see if it improves the situation.

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

I am writing to support the proposed one way northbound for Netley Road. This is a residential area, not suited to large volumes of fast moving traffic. Since Palmerston Road was reopened northbound, Netley Road has become a dangerous rat run.

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

We wish to support these proposals as they would help cut down the number of vehicles using our road as a rat run or the constant use of our road for making 3 point turns to return back to Osborne Road. This happens on a regular basis and we have even seen people backing into the Victorian lamp posts on numerous occasions to turn around or use the resident's drives to do so which resulted in one front bay window being demolished.

Resident, Netley Terrace

The constant stream of taxi cabs using Netley Road as a rat run to access Palmerston Road via Auckland Road West during the early hours of the morning has often disturbed my sleep. I believe the proposed change to make Netley Road into a No Entry from Osborne Road would solve this problem.

I would also support the proposed amendment to the order, to start the one-way north of Netley Terrace, to help ease access to residents' parking.

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

As a resident of Richmond Terrace on Netley Road we are constantly barraged by vehicles of all shapes and sizes coming from Osborne road that are purely there to gain quicker access to Palmerston road. I would estimate more than 90% of all traffic is from non-residents purely for this purpose and consists mainly of large vehicles and taxis some of which are quite unsuited to the residential nature and size of this road

This is a particular nuisance given the preservation orders in force on the street that limits our ability to deaden the sounds of the traffic coming through the windows so any decrease would be of benefit. We also tend to get people pulling up across the access to our house which this order would also diminish which is another benefit.

Resident, Richmond Terrace (Netley Road)

The proposal would see benefit to the residents of Netley Road, Netley Terrace, Richmond Terrace and surrounding roads and residential area:

- Significantly reduce the number of taxis taking the short circular route from Palmerston Road, Osborne Rd, Netley Rd, Auckland Road West back to Palmerston Rd.
- Significantly reduce the number of trade vehicles, lorries and HGVs taking the short circular route from Osborne Road, Netley Road, Auckland Road West to Palmerston Road.
- Significantly reduce the number of Cosgroves Estate Agents and Steki Greek Taverna and other Osborne Road based businesses utilizing Netley Road as a car park for all their business vehicles. This is supposed to be a residential area and as such businesses should be parking their vehicles away from Netley Road and using the much more spacious Clarence Parade.
- Significantly reduce the number of illegally parked vehicles at the end of the Netley Road/Osborne Road junction for vehicle owners quickly parking to do whatever they feel they need to do. This creates a dangerous obstruction to vehicles joining Osborne Road from Netley Road that has caused many accidents and near misses. Children, parents and other pedestrians regularly use this junction to cross and there is a continuous stream of near misses for pedestrians because of the inconsiderate parking of all vehicle owners in this area severely restricting visibility.

Residents, Auckland Road West

The proposal is welcome if it reduces the amount of traffic, for both safety and noise reasons, which increased when Palmerston Road South was altered. Lorry wheels have to go up on the pavement on the south side of Auckland Road West. Regular deliveries to the 2 pubs are an obvious necessity, as are dustbin lorries and any home deliveries to these roads, but volumes of other heavy lorries and taxis have increased. Would it be enforced? The 20mph speed limit is already regularly exceeded.

Resident, Netley Terrace

We live in Netley Terrace, off Netley Road. In addition to the reason for the proposal, we regularly have parking outside our flat, sometimes over the entrance to our off road parking, by people who park for half an hour or sometimes less, to buy sandwiches etc. This is an additional pressure on the road and would be cut out almost completely if the road became one way, barring entrance from Osborne Road. It would also help to reduce traffic down Netley Road and Netley Terrace. Therefore we are in favour of this proposal.

(End of Report)

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment

Preliminary assessment form v5 / 2013

www.portsmouth.gov.uk

The preliminary impact assessment is a quick and easy screening process. It should:

- identify those policies, projects, services, functions or strategies which require a full EIA by looking at:
 - negative, positive or no impact on any of the equality groups
 - opportunity to promote equality for the equality groups
 - data / feedback
- prioritise if and when a full EIA should be completed
- justify reasons for why a full EIA is not going to be completed

Directorate:

Director of Transport, environment & business support

**Function e.g. HR,
IS, carers:**

Traffic & Network management

Title of policy, service, function, project or strategy (new or old) :

Proposal to make Netley Road and one-way road in a northbound direction.

Type of policy, service, function, project or strategy:

- Existing
- New / proposed
- Changed

Q1 - What is the aim of your policy, service, function, project or strategy?

To reduce the amount of through traffic travelling along Netley Road and Auckland Road West.

Q2 - Who is this policy, service, function, project or strategy going to benefit or have a detrimental effect on and how?

The implementation of one-way traffic is intended to address the concerns raised by residents regarding the use of Netley Road and Auckland Road West as a rat run, and improve quality of life through reducing vehicle numbers and in turn noise, air & light pollution. It may however have a detrimental effect on businesses situated on Osborne Road as the short stay parking located on Netley Road and often used by customers will be more inconvenient to access.

Q3 - Thinking about each group below, does, or could the policy, service, function, project or strategy have a negative impact on members of the equality groups below?

Group	Negative	Positive / no impact	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other excluded groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer is "negative" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q4 - Does, or could the policy, service, function, project or strategy help to promote equality for members of the equality groups?

Group	Yes	No	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy or maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other excluded groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer is "no" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q5 - Do you have any feedback data from the equality groups that influences, affects or shapes this policy, service, function, project or strategy?

Group	Yes	No	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pregnancy and maternity

Other excluded groups

If the answer is "no" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q6 - Using the assessments in questions 3, 4 and 5 should a full assessment be carried out on this policy, service, function or strategy?

yes

No

Q7 - How have you come to this decision?

Whilst the street becoming one-way does not promote any improvements specific to equality groups, neither is it to their detriment.

If you have to complete a full EIA please contact the Equalities and diversity team if you require help
Tel: 023 9283 4789 or email:equalities@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Q8 - Who was involved in the EIA?

Steven Flynn

This EIA has been approved by: Pam Turton

Contact number:

ext 4614

Date:

23/03/2016

Please email a copy of your completed EIA to the Equality and diversity team. We will contact you with any comments or queries about your preliminary EIA.

Telephone: 023 9283 4789

Email: equalities@portsmouthcc.gov.uk