

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

Date of meeting: 24 January 2019

Subject: Electric vehicle On-street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS): parking proposals under TRO 120/2018

Report by: Tristan Samuels, Director of Regeneration

Wards affected: Baffins,
Central Southsea,
Copnor,
Drayton & Farlington,
Eastney & Craneswater,
Fratton,
Hilsea,
Milton,
Nelson,
St Jude,
St Thomas.

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1.** To consider the public responses to proposed electric vehicle parking bays in 41 locations across 33 roads. Objections were received to proposals within TRO 120/2018, and therefore a report to the Cabinet Member is required, for decision to be made at a public meeting.

Appendix A: The public proposal notice and plans for TRO 120/2018

Appendix B: Public views submitted

2. Recommendations

- 2.1.** It is recommended that TRO 120/2018 is taken forward with the following exceptions;

- a)** Outside 50 Laburnum Grove does not proceed.
- b)** Outside 30 Priory Crescent does not proceed.
- c)** Outside 80 St Ronans Road does not proceed.

3. Background

- 3.1.** The provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure is a part of a local and national strategy for the improvement of air quality issues.
- 3.2.** In July 2018 the government published the Road to Zero Strategy. This strategy outlined the ambition to end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040, and by 2030 at least 50% and as many as 70% of new car sales and up to 40% of new van sales being ultra-low emission.
- 3.3.** Over recent years there has been a rise in the number of electric vehicles in Portsmouth and with government's ambition the rate of increase is expected to increase;
- Of 102.2k cars and 17.5k light goods vehicles licensed in Portsmouth at the end of 2017, 1,033 of which were plug-in cars, LGVs and quadricycles - this is an increase from 602 at the end of 2016, and 347 at the end of 2015.
 - The comparative figure for 2018 has not been released at the time of writing this report but at the end of quarter 3 2018, it was 1,561, an increase of 407% from quarter 3 in 2015.
 - By comparison Southampton had 231 plug-in cars, LGVs and quadricycles licensed at the end of quarter 3, 2018 (of a total of 96.4k cars and 10.5k vans end of 2017).
- 3.4.** To meet and facilitate the expected growth of plug-in vehicles in Portsmouth charging infrastructure is required. As a densely populated island city with narrow streets and terraced housing many areas of Portsmouth do not benefit from off-street parking and suffer subsequent parking congestion posing a real challenge in providing electric vehicle charging infrastructure for residents.
- 3.5.** The Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) released funding to enable local authorities to provide chargepoints specifically for residential areas which do not benefit from off-street parking so residents can charge at home overnight. Portsmouth City Council bid to this fund and were successful in receiving £100k towards 75% of the costs for installation and infrastructure for these chargepoints. The chargepoints are required to remain in place for a period of three years. This grant must be spent by 31 March 2019. These timescales do not allow for new locations to be considered in this funding round. Chargepoints not delivered through this phase will be added to phase 2 of the project for which further funding will need to be sought.
- 3.6.** Off-street chargepoints in PCC owned locations which attract visitors for a significant period of time are being considered in a separate scheme. PCC has no control over privately owned off-street car parks.
- 3.7.** The locations in the bid were identified based on;

- Previous ad-hoc resident requests for on-street chargepoints
- Identifying residential areas with terraced housing and no off-street parking and mapping this against demographics of residents likely to purchase electric vehicles but not likely to have off-street parking
- Officer local knowledge

3.8. The technical solution being taken forward which best meets the needs of the city is lamp column chargepoints. This solution sees the chargepoint retrofitted directly into the lamp column where it is located next to the kerb. In cases where the lamp column is at the back of the pavement a slim line (approx. 18.5cm diameter), self-righting satellite bollard will be installed at the front of pavement. The electricity supply from the lamp column to the bollard will be fed under the pavement to prevent any trailing cables across the pavement. The satellite chargepoints do not need to be located directly adjacent to the lamp column, nor do chargepoints need to be central to the parking bay (the charging point on each car varies by make/model). Installation will follow best practice ensuring the gap between the lamp column or satellite bollard and the kerb edge is minimal to reduce any tripping hazard of charging cables. During the charging process, the cable is locked into both the vehicle and the socket, and thus, it is not possible to remove the cable without unlocking the vehicle and ending the charging process. The chargepoints will require planned maintenance annually.



Examples of chargepoints retrofitted into existing lamp columns



Example of satellite bollard using a Smart Cable (the bollard can also be used with a standard cable)

3.9. The benefits of this solution include:

- Lower purchase and installation costs than free standing charge points
- Minimal street clutter and more aesthetically pleasing than other solutions
- No noise emission from the chargepoint
- Lamp column charge points are easily removed and relocated, should the demand change within the existing area.
- Lamp column retrofits can be completed within the hour and bollards within 2 hours.

3.10. The spare capacity within the lamp column electricity supply allows for the chargepoints to provide approximately 5.5kwh of electricity for which an average charge cycle for a battery electric vehicle could be expected in six hours (compared to three to four hours for fast or 30 minutes for rapid chargers). Charging times for plugin hybrid vehicles will be less, as the battery size is smaller. With this lower power output the chargepoints are ideal for residential overnight charging.

3.11. The lamp column solution with a lower power output and its current amperage only allows for single chargepoints. It is not currently possible for two vehicles to be plugged in at any one time and dynamic or distribution of charging to be applied.

3.12. ubitricity was selected as the supplier for this project through a competitive tender process, and the company has successfully delivered schemes elsewhere in the UK and abroad.

- 3.13.** ubitricity will be offering residents several tariff options for the payment of electricity. The chargepoints will be accessible via both 'Pay As You Go' or using a SmartCable which can purchased in advance. The SmartCable enables the user to benefit from preferential electricity rates via a contract with various tariff options. Alternatively, the PayG option is accessed with a standard charging cable by scanning a QR code on a smartphone or other device. A discreet sign with the QR code and user instructions will be attached to the chargepoint.



Example of QR code access

- 3.14.** During development the proposed scheme was planned not to mark designated electric vehicle charging bays for the chargepoints, but due to feedback received regarding accessing the chargepoints in areas of parking congestion the provision of designated bays was approved by the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transport at the meeting of 23 November 2017.
- 3.15.** The proposed bays will not be subject to any time restrictions and will be enforceable by the council's Civil Enforcement Officers for use only by any vehicle which is plugged in and charging. Marked bays can also drive the cost of electricity down for the user as they are more attractive to the supplier through guaranteed accessibility.
- 3.16.** Signage for the electric vehicle parking bays will where possible be located on existing lamp columns or other street furniture to minimise the need for any additional posts.

- 3.17.** The locations proposed are based on requests from residents who already own an electric vehicle or they require the charging infrastructure to be in place to enable them to convert to an electric vehicle. In most instances this involves the chargepoint being located in the vicinity of the nearest suitable lamp column to the resident's address. The locations are based on known interest, reducing impact on parking congestion as the space would be used by residents currently parking in the area i.e. not an additional burden on capacity.
- 3.18.** The final position of the chargepoints has been considered alongside many other factors including suitability of lamp columns (not all lamp columns are able to serve electric vehicle chargepoints), pavement widths, and conservation areas.
- 3.19.** If in the future a resident who has an electric vehicle charging bay outside of their property requests a disabled parking bay it will be considered following the usual procedure. This is to site it in the nearest suitable space (this is not always outside the requesting property) to best meet the resident's needs whilst enabling access to the chargepoint.
- 3.20.** There are a number of reasons that some roads originally proposed are not now being taken forward in Phase 1 of the electric vehicle chargepoint roll out including:
- No longer interest from existing residents
 - Investigations ascertaining that requesting resident benefits from off-street parking
 - No suitable lamp column available within the area
- 3.21.** Those sites which have been requested by residents and are eligible for a chargepoint but have not been able to be delivered in the timescales for Phase 1 will be carried forward to Phase 2. This future phase will look to deliver all outstanding resident requests for chargepoints overcoming any issues which prevented delivery in Phase 1.

4. Engagement and Consultation

- 4.1.** In August 2018 letters were delivered to 37 roads where residents had expressed an interest (or neighbouring roads if it was determined a chargepoint could not be provided in the requesting road). These letters asked residents to register confirmation of interest to ensure that previous interest was still held and to understand any additional interest in these roads.
- 4.2.** Following this resident engagement a list of identified locations was taken forward for further site surveys and investigations to finalise the chargepoint locations for proposal.
- 4.3.** In December 2018 the proposed list of sites for designated electric vehicle parking bays was finalised ready for formal consultation via Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). A

letter drop coincided with this consultation to all residents in roads with chargepoints proposed, those roads with requesting residents but the chargepoint was located in a neighbouring road, and to those roads where a chargepoint was previously requested but was no longer being taken forward at this stage.

- 4.4.** The TRO consultation was for 41 electric vehicle parking bays across 33 roads as shown in Appendix A. It was advertised for a period of 26 days from 11 December 2018 to 6 January 2019, allowing five extra days for people to respond due to the time of year.
- 4.5.** In addition to these sites two further chargepoints are proposed outside 60 Glencoe Road and 57 Warren Avenue. These were not included in the TRO consultation as there is no requirement for an electric vehicle parking bay due to the requesting resident having a disabled parking bay outside their property. These affected roads were notified of the chargepoints via the letter drop. These chargepoints will be positioned so that non-blue badge holders can access the chargepoint from the adjacent parking space.
- 4.6.** As summarised in Table 1, 42 objections were received to the formal TRO consultation across 16 roads and three responses in support of proposals were received. Appendix B shows all anonymised responses received.

Proposed EV Charge point	Support	Objections
2. ADAMES ROAD - East side, outside No.51	1	1
5. CLARENCE PARADE - (a) North-east side, outside No.12		12
5. CLARENCE PARADE - (c) South side, opposite Stacey Court		1
9. FORDINGBRIDGE ROAD - West side, outside No.1		1
10. HARTLEY ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.68 - (b) North side, outside No.82		2
10. HARTLEY ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.68		1
14. HIGH STREET, OLD PORTSMOUTH - South-east side, outside No.25 (Crown Court)		1
16. KENSINGTON ROAD - East side, outside No. 74		3
17. LABURNUM GROVE - (a) North side, outside No.183		2

17. LABURNUM GROVE - (b) South side, outside No.50		2
18. ORIEL ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.66 - (b) North side, outside No. 102		4
21. PRETORIA ROAD - North side, outside No.83		4
22. PRIORY CRESCENT - (a) North side, outside No.30		1
23. RACTON AVENUE - South side, opposite Lordington Close		1
25. ST RONAN'S ROAD - East side, outside No.80		1
27. SHADWELL ROAD - (a) South side, outside No.39 - (b) South side, outside No.93		1
30. VICTORIA ROAD NORTH - East side, outside No.48	1	
31. WARREN AVENUE - South-east side, outside North Lodge (opposite industrial estate) (and outside no.57 not included in TRO)	1	2
33. WIMBLEDON PARK ROAD - South side, opposite No. 23 Wimbledon Park Road		1
Other - Glencoe Road		1

Table 1: No of responses received to TRO consultation

5. Reasons for the recommendations

- 5.1.** Portsmouth is subject to a Ministerial Directive to deliver a citywide air quality local plan to bring forward compliance for nitrogen dioxide emissions in the shortest possible timescales. A targeted feasibility study identified a combination of measures which would bring forward compliance, one of which was the rollout of electric vehicle charging points.
- 5.2.** The information and concerns received from residents, along with the preliminary EIA, have informed the recommendations. All responses are reproduced at Appendix B.

50 Laburnum Grove. An application for a dropped kerb has been received at this address and therefore the installation of an electric vehicle charging bay in this location would prevent this application.

30 Priory Crescent. An application for a disabled parking bay has been received from this address and an electric vehicle charging bay in this location would prevent this application.

80 St Ronans Road. The only requesting resident in this road has notified us they no longer require the chargepoint as they are able to charge their vehicle at work.

12 Clarence Parade. It is noted that the 12 objections largely related to the side of the road proposed for the chargepoint and residents feel it should be located adjacent to the common. However, the chargepoint is proposed for a resident and the resident's vehicle, and properties are on the north side. Therefore the requesting resident would have to cross the road on a daily basis to access the chargepoint. The proposed location has been identified as the most suitable for its intended residential purpose.

64 Kensington Road. It is noted that two objections propose an alternative location on Heathcote Road. This location has undergone electrical site surveys which determined this lamp column was not suitable to have a chargepoint added to it.

Racton Avenue -opposite Lordington Close. It is noted that a resident has an application for a dropped kerb. The electric vehicle charging bay will be located adjacent to the proposed dropped kerb location and will therefore have no impact.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1** A full EIA is not required as the proposals do not have a disproportionate negative impact on the specific protected characteristics described in the Equality Act 2010.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1.** 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 objective of securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network;
- 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. 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.

- 7.4. 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.
- 7.5. The dimensions for bay markings have been relaxed, apart from those for disabled badge holders. Whilst a minimum width of 1.8 m is specified, there is no longer a maximum width, nor a minimum or maximum length. The intention is to allow traffic authorities flexibility in determining the bay or parking space size appropriate both for the intended vehicle type and the surrounding street environment.
- 7.6. Bay markings and parking spaces should be of sufficient length and width to fully accommodate the vehicles for which they are intended. In cases where larger vehicles, for example 4x4 type vehicles, cannot fit fully within the marking, it is recommended that traffic authorities use discretion over enforcement.
- 7.7. In addition to relaxing the permitted dimensions, traffic authorities now have the freedom to use alternative methods to create bays and spaces on the carriageway. This may include either colour-contrasting surfacing, or paving in a different pattern or appearance, to distinguish parking areas from the surrounding carriageway. No legend is required to be included in these markings. The markings may be used in conjunction with upright signs as currently prescribed.
- 7.8. Any new signs indicating parking places and areas subject to parking controls must be in accordance with the new regulations.
- 7.9. Please note that the order only relates to the implementation of the parking restrictions and does not specifically authorise the installation of the satellite bollards

8. Director of Finance's comments

- 8.1 The costs of this project will be met from within the approved capital budget.

.....
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:

Title of document	Location
Road to Zero Strategy	Government website; https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/739460/road-to-zero.pdf
Vehicle licensing statistics	Government website: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/all-vehicles-veh01
Traffic and Transportation Committee report 23 November 2017	Portsmouth City Council website: https://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=176&MIId=3766&Ver=4
Consultation response emails	Transport Planning team, PCC

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

.....

Signed by:

Councillor Lynne Stagg, Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

Appendix A: The public proposal notice for TRO 120/2018

THE PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS) (ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING PARKING PLACES) (NO.120) ORDER 2018

11 December 2018: Notice is hereby given that Portsmouth City Council proposes to make the above Order under section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended, and in accordance with part III of schedule 9 to the 1984 Act, to effect:

A) ELECTRIC VEHICLE PARKING BAYS (MINIMUM 5 METRE LENGTH)

Parking bays, signage and electricity supply point (adjacent lamppost or unit) - these would not be installed until the applicants have an electric vehicle

1. ADAIR ROAD West side, outside No.53	18. ORIEL ROAD (a) North side, outside No.66 (b) North side, outside No. 102
2. ADAMES ROAD East side, outside No.51	19. OXFORD ROAD West side, outside No.75
3. ASTLEY STREET West side, 16 metres north of King Street	20. POSBROOKE ROAD South side, outside No.36
4. BALFOUR ROAD East side, alongside No.56 Kirby Road	21. PRETORIA ROAD North side, outside No.83
5. CLARENCE PARADE (a) North-east side, outside No.12 (b) West side, opposite No.1 Lennox Mansions (c) South side, opposite Stacey Court	22. PRIORY CRESCENT (a) North side, outside No.30 (b) North side, outside No. 28a
6. EASTFIELD ROAD North side, alongside No.92 Winter Road	23. RACTON AVENUE South side, opposite Lordington Close
7. ESSEX ROAD South-west side, outside No.131	24. ST CATHERINE STREET North side, opposite No.2
8. FLORENCE ROAD East side, outside No.16	25. ST RONAN'S ROAD East side, outside No.80
9. FORDINGBRIDGE ROAD West side, outside No.1	26. SELSEY AVENUE North side, outside No.7
10. HARTLEY ROAD (a) North side, outside No.68 (b) North side, outside No.82	27. SHADWELL ROAD (a) South side, outside No.39 (b) South side, outside No.93
11. HAVANT ROAD West side, alongside No.15 Chichester Road	28. SOUTH PARADE South side, opposite Fastnet House
12. HEATHCOTE ROAD South side, outside No.32	29. TASWELL ROAD South side, opposite Wimbledon Park sports centre car park entrance

13. HENDERSON ROAD (a) South side, outside No.112 (b) West side, opposite Cockleshell Community Centre	30. VICTORIA ROAD NORTH East side, outside No.48
14. HIGH STREET, OLD PORTSMOUTH South-east side, outside No.25 (Crown Court)	31. WARREN AVENUE South-east side, outside North Lodge (opposite industrial estate)
15. HUNTER ROAD South side, alongside No.29 Hatfield Road	32. WESTBOURNE ROAD East side, alongside No.268 Chichester Road
16. KENSINGTON ROAD East side, outside No. 74	33. WIMBLEDON PARK ROAD South side, opposite No. 23 Wimbledon Park Road
17. LABURNUM GROVE (a) North side, outside No.183 (b) South side, outside No.50	

To view this public notice on Portsmouth City Council's website www.portsmouth.gov.uk search 'traffic regulation orders 2018'. A copy of the draft order including a statement of reasons is available for inspection at the main reception, Civic Offices, during normal office hours.

Persons wishing to object to these proposals may do so by sending their representations via email to engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk or by letter to Nikki Musson, Transport Planning, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth PO1 2NE, quoting ref: **TRO 120/2018** by **6 January 2019** stating the grounds of objection.

Under the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, any written representations that are received may be open to inspection by members of the public. If the proposals require approval at a public decision meeting, representations are included in the associated published report but are anonymised.

To view this public notice on Portsmouth City Council's website www.portsmouth.gov.uk search 'traffic regulation orders 2018'. The draft order and a statement of reasons are available for inspection at the main reception, Civic Offices, during normal opening hours.

Persons wishing to object to these proposals may do so by sending their representations via email to **engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk** or by post to *Nikki Musson, Transport Planning, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth PO1 2NE*, quoting ref **TRO 78/2018** by **30 August 2018** stating the grounds of objection, and name and address details.

Under the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, any written representations that are received may be open to inspection by members of the public. If the proposals require approval at a public decision meeting, representations are included in the associated published report but are anonymised.

Pam Turton, Assistant Director of Regeneration (Transport)
Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Guildhall Square, Portsmouth PO1 2NE

Appendix B: Public views received

2. ADAMES ROAD - East side, outside No.51	<p>I have an EV and my husband wants to buy one. I and my husband fully support your wish to place a charging point in the lamp post outside of 51 Adames road. This means the charging point of my car can be on the pavement side which is ideal. Thank you for considering this option as it will mean I can safely charge my car.</p> <p>---</p> <p>I'm a resident in adames road I have received a letter telling me that you are considering putting in a electric charging point for cars outside number 51 I object to this there's no parking as it is down this road I can never find a place to park and have to pay for a permit yearly to park in my road and your thinking of adding this in effect taking another parking space away from the street no one even has an electric car down here from what I'm aware of put a communal recycling bin at the end of the road if you want to do something good for the environment as we don't have places to store recycling bins in this street so there's hardly any recycling done it gets black bagged up and chucked out do something productive and not something that's going to cause more problems</p>
5. CLARENCE PARADE - (a) North-east side, outside No.12	<p>Ref TRO 120/2018</p> <p>I object to having the charge bays on the North East side of Clarence Parade. This side of the road is used by local residents and more pedestrians . It would be better to be positioned on the quieter Common side. I think the wires crossing the pavement would be a hazard causing accidents.</p> <p>---</p> <p>I understand that there is a proposal to install street charging bays for electric vehicles in various locations in the City.</p> <p>Where existing lampposts cannot be used, as they are not located on the kerb side, satellite charging bollards are proposed on the kerb side. Such bollards add to the obstruction of the pavement by street furniture for all pedestrians, in particular the</p>

	<p>visually impaired. The connecting cables could also present a tripping hazard to pedestrians if they are not responsibly coiled off the pavement.</p> <p>More suitable alternative locations should be sought in such cases, particularly where there is a less busy pavement area nearby.</p> <p>There is a proposal for a charging bay with a bollard on the North side of Clarence Parade near #12. In this location the parking is parallel to the kerb and would require a satellite charging bollard. It would make far more sense if the charging bay was located on the South side, adjacent to Southsea Common, where there is chevron parking. A single bollard could then serve two chevron parking bays. The pavement on the South side is little used, as most pedestrians use the two pavements on the Common, including Ladies Mile, instead. Chevron charging bays would also be far safer for the driver as the charging point on the car would not require them to walk into the roadway.</p> <p>I am registered blind and use a white cane. Greater care needs to be taken in the selecting of locations for any sign poles and satellite charging bollards to minimise the obstruction of footpaths to all pedestrians.</p> <p>---</p> <p>I am just writing to you to voice my concern that the above proposal is being considered on the Houses side as opposed to the safer Common side. We are the only part of Clarence Pde being considered for the House Side when it would be obviously safer and less obtrusive to have this on the Common Side. I therefore object to this proposal.</p> <p>---</p> <p>I wish to lodge an objection to the EV bays being on the houses side of Clarence Parade for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. Vehicles driving along the common side would need to cross the oncoming traffic and manoeuvre their vehicle to access the EV charger, most commonly on the drivers side/filler cap side.</p>
--	--

2. With the chevron parking on the common side the EV chargers would be so much easier and safer to access.

3. EV bays on the houses side would be more of an inconvenience to existing residents, including visitors, especially older ones when it would be less likely they would need to cross the road, and visitors to the care home of which there are many.

4. It would be consistent to have them on the common side as are the plans for those further along Clarence Parade near the Jolly Sailor and on South Parade, and drivers would be clearer about where to look for them. It doesn't seem to make sense having them on the houses side for the section between Palmeston Road and Park house.

5. The spaces on the houses side are more in demand not only for residents with parking permits but also for tradesmen and deliveries to the houses.

I strongly object to the lack of consultation and the proposed placement of an EV charging bay outside of 12 Clarence Parade. Please remove this from your proposal. I ask that you register my name to give a deputation at the planning meeting; please inform me of date and time.

a) Better Options: There are numerous important reasons to locate this charging point on the Common side of Clarence Parade, in line with other Clarence and South Parade locations, and further west opposite 9 Clarence Parade that is not a crossing point. Another location – one that would not involve loss of a regular parking place and income – is at the most southerly part of Palmerston Road west side, currently with many underused places for 15 free minutes that is not overlooked by any residential windows.

b) Popular Street Crossing Point: outside 12 Clarence Parade is a popular street crossing point as it is a straight projection from the path to/from the seafront, is where the Common wall ends, and is by a popular family picnic area protected by a 'No Ball Games' sign. This is a constant pedestrian road crossing right beside the Common's parking area, especially during summer weekends, charity and other events, and used by thousands during the 3-

	<p>day Victorious Festival as the main entrance is opposite 12 Clarence Parade. It really helps all road crossers that parking spaces on both sides are usually empty, and it would be dangerous for charging cables to be laying around the pavement.</p> <p>c) An unnecessary danger with selecting parallel parking on the houses side of Clarence Parade is that vehicles travelling on the other side of the road would cross traffic to secure a parallel charging space that they see available. This is because most vehicles have their charging cables from the filler cap on the right side of vehicles. Echelon parking on Clarence Parade would be safe for EV parking.</p> <p>d) Less-Busy Common-Side Pavement: The wider pavement on the Common side of Clarence Parade is not used much at all, so the new charging structure would not block pedestrians, wheelchairs, buggies, prams, disability vehicles, visually impaired people, or make it harder to walk - as it absolutely would if placed on the busy pavement outside houses. The disability charity, Transport For All, has had success in London and elsewhere in working with Councils to select less-busy pavements for charging points. Please make contact.</p> <p>e) Less-Busy Common-Side Parking: the parking spaces outside houses are used during the day by residents, tradesman's vans (as they don't want to cross the busy road with tools and materials), shoppers and delivery vans. It would be wrong to unnecessarily take away a parking space on the busier side of the road when the Common-side spaces are usually empty.</p> <p>f) Future Dual Charging: The echelon parking on the Common side of Clarence Parade is safer for the likely future DUAL charging bays. I refer to dual echelon charging in the attached photo from Amsterdam; please note a loose cable, and both cables from right side of cars</p> <p>g) Workday Deliveries: I run a small business and the courier vehicles including HGV's that deliver heavy boxes during workday mornings and collect them during afternoons, almost always find available parking - so they do not have to double park on this busy through-way. I attach a photo of an example</p>
--	---

	<p>when no parking is available; the EV bay would render one space unavailable to delivery vehicles so double parking would prevail.</p> <p>h) Unnecessary Loss of Amenity: The bollards and signs and on-going activity will impact our fair enjoyment of our home. Bollards and signs will detract from the views of our historic house and any future bays from this historic row of houses.</p> <p>Since Clarence Parade is fortunate to have a quiet and safer Common side, please consider these inputs as part of my objection to and deputation against the proposed charge bay in front of 12 Clarence Parade. I attach supporting photographs.</p> <p>---</p> <p>I strongly object to the EV charging location outside 12 Clarence Parade.</p> <p>Clarence Parade either side of The Jolly Sailor has sensible proposals for charging bays on the quiet Common Side, not the Houses Side of the road. South Parade is the same – on the Common Side. Only the section of Clarence Parade between Palmerston Road and Park House is proposed for the Houses Side. We ask for this to be withdrawn, and later put on the Common Side, for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) General-purpose parking spaces on the Houses Side are more in demand, for residents and also for shoppers (some disabled), tradesmen and deliveries. In future, lamp posts will most-probably have two charging bays so these should be on the quieter Common Side so that the Houses Side does not lose 12 general-purpose spaces outside of houses (possible 2 per lamp post).</p> <p>b) The new bollards and charging cables are more of a hazard on the busier Houses pavement, as they can impede and trip pedestrians, wheelchairs, buggies, prams, disability vehicles, visually impaired people, or make unnecessary obstacles to walking. The charity Transport For All has had success in London and elsewhere in working with Councils to select less-busy pavements for EV charging bays. There are numerous elderly and disabled who live in the stretch between Park House and the corner of Palmerston Road as well as a Residential Care</p>
--	---

Home. Consequently the pavement is used by people with wide walking frames and motorised scooters. The Common Side pavement is less-busy by far.

c) An unnecessary danger with selecting the Houses Side of Clarence Parade is that vehicles travelling on the other side of the road would cross traffic to secure an available charging bay. This is because charging wires most-often come from the fuel filler cap on drivers-sides of vehicles. EV's taking off from the Houses Side would also need to cross busy oncoming traffic. Echelon parking on the Common side of Clarence Parade has much safer access for EV charging bays.

d) New Signs will be less intrusive on the Common Side of Clarence Parade. These will be large because they need to provide operational and payment instructions.

e) Consistency, so that EV drivers know to look to the same quiet and safe Common Side for charging bays, all along South and Clarence Parades.

f) The pavement on the Common side is wider and therefore safer from obstacles of new bollards - 120 inches compared to 101 inches.. The echelon parking will be safer for charging cables.

We object to the proposed Electric Vehicle charging bay outside 12 Clarence Parade.

We ask you to withdraw this from the current proposal and put it on the Common side, just like the others on Clarence and South Parades. We pass 12 Clarence Parade most days and one of us uses a walking stick aid so we do not want more obstacles on this busy pavement.

--

I would like to comment on the proposal to site one of the electric charging points opposite to 12 Clarence Parade.

Whilst I fully support the Council in developing EV charging bays, the position of the one in Clarence Parade seems to be in the wrong position. I am concerned that it is in a place which has more pedestrians than other areas as it is a route off the Common and into the town centre of Southsea. Moving it slightly towards the end of Palmerston Road as well as onto the other side of the road would seem less intrusive for pedestrians. The parking area nearest to Palmerston Road on the Avenue de Caen might also be a better alternative.

I hope that you will consider these ideas when you are making your final decision about siting the EV charging bays along Clarence Parade.

--

We strongly object to the proposed Electric Vehicle Charging bay proposed for outside 12 Clarence Parade, Southsea. It would be much better placed on the opposite side of the road (nearest the Common) as has been proposed for other parts of Clarence Parade and South Parade. This charging bay should not be located outside this stretch of privately owned houses – which pay the highest rates!!

--

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED ELECTRICAL VEHICLE PARKING BAY OUTSIDE 12 CLARENCE PARADE

I strongly object to the above proposed placement, on the houses side of Clarence Parade with a busier pavement and parking utilisation than opposite, and right at a well-known pedestrian crossing point. I adamantly believe that this is location is dropped from the current proposal. The proposed placement breaks almost all of the guidelines of the experienced Transport for London. I attach a synopsis of these guidelines and I would highlight the following:
Future Bollard Communications: these will utilize a Local Area Network (LAN) and maximum reliable distance is 100 metres, so future bollards will be placed on the same side of a road as the first one.
Visual Impact: with regards to the context of surroundings, as new bollards and large signs will

	<p>detract from the historic buildings at the proposed site and houses side of the road.</p> <p>Street Clutter: Bollards and Signs (that must contain operating and payment instructions) will add clutter that is noticed daily by house residents, pedestrians and passing cars.</p> <p>Footfall: the houses side of Clarence Parade has far greater footfall than the Common side.</p> <p>Existing Parking Use: the general use parallel parking by the houses side of Clarence Parade has far greater utilization than the echelon parking on the Common side.</p> <p>Pedestrian Crossing Activity: 12 Clarence Parade is not a place for pavement charging cables or constant parking as it is a much-used crossing point for pedestrians because it extends from the seafront path, the wall between the pavement and Common ends and it is a picnic area. It is also across from the Common parking area that attracts many hundreds of cars during summer weekends and events; it is the main road crossing by thousands to get to/from/exit intervals directly at the Victorious Festival 's main gate. It is also busy during Common events including charity days.</p> <p>Unnecessary Disruption: from the sizeable excavation that takes 'from four weeks to several months' across this residential pavement.</p> <p>Displacement of an existing parking bay with Unnecessary Loss of Revenue: whereas around the corner from the proposed location on the South West Side of Palmerston Road (one of the free 15 minutes parking spaces and is not outside any property windows), would be available to shoppers by day and residents overnight – without the loss of any revenue from an existing parking bay.</p> <p>Regular Maintenance, Collections and Testing: will add to the unnecessary detraction of house holders in their right to enjoy residential peace.</p> <p>Lack of Consultation with Residents and the General Public: there seems to have been no site audit that would include a comparison to optional placements, no consultation with affected parties, no consultation with the general public, no measure of impact whether it adds or detracts from adjacent historic buildings, no sharing of the size and design of the bollards, and no sharing of the size, colour and placement of signs.</p> <p>--</p>
--	--

	<p>Thank you for listening to me when I called this afternoon. Also, thank you for making very clear the letter that was delivered today and the electric charge points FAQ's. I am an electrical engineer and I appreciate this opportunity to object to the proposed location.</p> <p>There are a number of important reasons to locate this charging point on the Common side of Clarence Parade and further west, in line with the good plans for all of the other charging points on Clarence Parade and South Parade.</p> <p>a) outside 12 Clarence Parade is a popular street crossing point, as it is a straight projection from the path to/from the seafront and because the Common wall ends opposite our house. It is also a popular place for pushchairs to cross because this part of the Common is popular for family picnics and is protected for this by a No Ball Games sign opposite 12 Clarence Parade. It really helps all road crossers that parking spaces on both sides are usually empty.</p> <p>b) The pavement on the Common side of Clarence Parade is not used much at all, so the new charging structure would not block pedestrians, wheelchairs, buggies, prams, disability vehicles, visually impaired people, or make it harder to walk - as it absolutely would if placed on the busy pavement outside houses. The charity, Transport For All, has had success in London and elsewhere in working with Councils to select less-busy pavements for charging points.</p> <p>c) Please consider placing the charging point by the lamppost on the Common side opposite the Clarence Parade entrance to Auckland Road West, as this is spaced a better distance away from the charging point at Stacey Court, and would be closer for the numerous apartments at Park House and Home Heights, and those leading from Auckland Road West and also for the Queens Hotel.</p> <p>d) The echelon parking on the Common side of Clarence Parade offers the opportunity - now or in the future - to have convenient DUAL parking spaces. Please look at the dual echelon charging in the following photo from Amsterdam:</p>
--	---

	<p>https://pbs.twimg.com/media/DKleuBJXUAIEIol.jpg:large</p> <p>As I understand it, typical overnight parking here is for 13+ hours and two 30kW batteries could be charged with the 5.5kW available (if one battery takes 6 hours). Dual overnight charging bays would be more efficient in that it would allow two cars to charge overnight and serve the community better in the move to reduce emissions. A sign can indicate longer charge time for a dual bay. Electric car owners will appreciate the efficiency and increased opportunity. Vehicles will charge during daytime also. Vehicles currently using echelon parking face forward and also reverse in, and this would suit different charging points on vehicles in future.</p> <p>e) I run a small business and the courier vehicles, including HGV's, that deliver during mornings and collect during afternoon on all workdays almost always find available parking - so they do not have to double park on this busy through-way. Also, the parking spaces outside the houses are used during the day by tradesman's vans as they don't want to cross the busy road with tools and materials. It would be wrong to unnecessarily take away a parking space on the busier side of the road when the Common side spaces are usually empty.</p> <p>f) An unnecessary danger with selecting the houses side of Clarence Parade is that vehicles travelling on the other side of the road would cross traffic to drive towards a charging space that they see as available. For echelon parking on Clarence Parade, cars heading east set their right indicators and all other traffic can pass on the inside until it is safe for them to park. West bound vehicles will just go straight into the charging bay(s).</p> <p>g) The houses side of Clarence Parade is busy with road cyclists, whereas on the Common side the cyclists usually ride on the empty pavements and paths like Ladies Mile. Cyclists are vulnerable when parked cars pull away, and especially where cars would pull over from the opposite side of the road travel to 'nab' a charging point that is becoming available.</p> <p>Please consider these initial inputs as part of my objection to the proposed charge bay in front of 12</p>
--	---

	<p>and 11 Clarence Parade. Many of the points herein support the other well-chosen proposed locations in Clarence Parade and South Parade, so thanks for that. Let's utilise the quiet and safe side of Clarence Parade's road/pavement and give us the best chance of efficient dual parking, whether now or in the future.</p> <p>Please give a positive response soon as the deadline is close and so that I know if I have to consult other organisations and people. Is there a planning committee meeting over these proposed locations? If so, please tell me how objectors can register to speak there.</p>
5. CLARENCE PARADE - (c) South side, opposite Stacey Court	<p>Whilst we understand the desire to take steps to improve air quality in the town we find your proposal incredible. In your letter you say "Once we have been informed that a resident in Clarence Parade owns an electric vehicle, and therefore requires access to a charge point, we will be marking the parking space." Can it be true that with all the other costs the Council has to bear and the services that can no longer be provided that you will go to this trouble for one person. It amounts to providing them with a personal charge point and parking space. Will they be subject to any charge for this?</p> <p>It also begs the question that if we all buy an electric car whether the council will then supply an equivalent service to everyone. Even if your scheme attracts 46 users we wonder what the effect on air pollution will actually be.</p>
9. FORDINGBRIDGE ROAD - West side, outside No.1	
	<p>Further to your letter re: Electric vehicle charge in Fordingbridge Road, we are writing to object to your proposal to install the charge point at 1 Fordingbridge Road.</p> <p>We object for the following reasons; firstly, we do not own an electric vehicle and are unlikely to buy one in the near future.</p> <p>There is an alternative point further up the road which leads onto Henderson Road where there is space for four or five cars which is not outside any of the properties. We do not want to lose the parking space outside our property or have the charge point imposing on our garden particularly because we</p>

	<p>enjoy our front garden and it would not be aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>It will also make unloading shopping and removing garden waste more difficult and an unnecessary inconvenience. My husband is currently undergoing physiotherapy for a bad arm and suffers with a bad knee from a previous road accident.</p> <p>We have also spoken to our local MP, Matthew Winnington regarding this matter whom we have included in this email.</p> <p>We would be most grateful if you would consider our objection to your proposal.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Myself and my husband would like to object to the proposal to 12 charging bays on Clarence Parade.</p> <p>Our objections:</p> <p>The charging bays are to be located on the building side of the road instead of the common side. This would take away parking spaces that we use on our flat side of the road. It would mean that any tradesmen / delivery men who visit any property on this side of Clarence Parade who struggle to park safely, if at all. Surely it would be more sensible to have the charging bays on the common side of the road? I am also concerned about the wires and bollards that may be on the building side of the road. If the other side of Clarence Parade, and also South Parade, are having charging bays on the common side of the road, surely it is more consistent to have all of the charging bays on the same side.</p> <p>I sincerely hope you reconsider placing the charging bays on the building side of the road.</p>
10. HARTLEY ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.68 - (b) North side, outside No.82	
	<p>I would like to object to the above planning application for the creation of electric car charging bays in Hartley Road.</p> <p>Parking is already a contentious issue in Hartley Road with people already parking on double yellow lines on blind corners as there is no where else to park, or leaving 'notes' on other cars when they find</p>

	<p>they are unable to park as close to their house as they would like.</p> <p>Removal of parking spaces for a dedicated charging point will make an already tricky situation even worse.</p> <p>Will the owners of electric cars treat these spaces as their own dedicated parking spot outside their house?</p> <p>What happens when the car is fully charged - will they have to move it or will they still be able to park there?</p> <p>If so what happens when someone else comes along and wishes to charge their car but cannot as a cars has been left their?</p> <p>And of course - who is going to police this? As I have already said, people already continually park on double yellow lines along Hartley Road and no one does anything about that? (I have seen approximately 2 cars with tickets in the last 5 years).</p> <p>--</p> <p>I would like to object to the proposed parking bay outside 68 and 82 Hartley Road. Parking is already very difficult in this road and we can not afford to lose 2 more parking spaces. The people who have applied will just see this as there own personal parking bay so it will not be available for anyone else to use.</p> <p>These charging points should be put - for example, in the car park of the Mountbatten Centre where it is available for anyone to use and only a very short walk from Hartley Road.</p>
10. HARTLEY ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.68	<p>I would like to object to the instillation of a electric charging bay at 68 Hartley Road PO29HX on the hounds that i would not be able to park my non electric vehicle, and this would also reduce the value of my property.</p>
14. HIGH STREET, OLD PORTSMOUTH - South-east side, outside No.25 (Crown Court)	
	<p>You must be having a laugh, there is not enough parking spaces for paying residents as it is. I am not steadiest on my feet and I very seldom can park near my home .if you wish a charging point may I suggest by that monstrosity America's cup building.you say it</p>

	is to help with clean air I think sorting out traffic problems first would be a good idea.
16. KENSINGTON ROAD - East side, outside No. 74	
	<p>I quite shocked a week ago when a sign was posted on the lamppost located between 74 & 76 Kensington road, saying that it was a proposed location for an electric car charging point. I also received a letter on the 17/12/2018, which gives details and indicates details given out in August this was not the case in this location.</p> <p>Further to this there is a more suitable location in Heathcote road, this location is not in front of any residents properties and the lamppost is kerbside, which will make installation easier.</p> <p>I appreciate the need for progress, but with more consideration for the residents, I have spoken with my neighbours and they agree that Heathcote is a better location.</p> <p>I would draw your attention to only No 74 being mentioned on your notice it should be 74/76, which would mean the parking bay being between the two properties.</p> <p>My wife and myself are retired with some mobility problems and worry in case we should require a disabled space in the future.</p> <p>Could you please consider the points I have raised and consider a site visit.</p> <p>--</p> <p>(from above)</p> <p>Further to my previous e mail I have remembered other matters I wish to draw your attention to, parking problems, and the fact that Kensington can be a busy through road where as Heathcote is not, I would also suggest a set charging time e.g. 0800hours to 2000hours which would save disturbing residents and consider allowing parking in this period which would aid parking congestion.</p> <p>--</p> <p>(from above)</p>

	<p>I do not understand why one lamppost wiring is different from another, surely they must comply to electrical regulations or you would be not be complying to Health and Safety regulations. With regard to your comment about to late to changes location of charging point why waste time putting up a notice and sending a letter, and why has the sign been r moved when the deadline for comments is the 06/01/19.I still would draw your attention to the lamppost being between 74/76 in which case the bay for charging should be between the two properties. I do feel there was never intention to deviate from your secret planning in this matter.</p> <p>--</p> <p>(from above)</p> <p>I am now sure that apart from a sink hole appearing in the road the electric car charge point is going near my property, I am convinced that although a notice was put up a couple of weeks before Christmas and a letter arriving a few days later asking for a reaction before 06/01/2018 this matter was already decided and set in stone. I worked for my last employer which involved me writing a lot of documentation and issuing it throughout the company which employed several Service Engineers throughout the UK. The contents of this documentation was open for comments and discussion which involved having to go to there areas of operation it could not be resolved by me sitting in an office and in a lot of instances I had to rethink and reissue documentation. The nature of our product involved high and low voltage electricity wiring which involved adapting to circumstances on site, which leaves me amazed that a lamppost cannot be adapted for usage with a car charging point I worry about the skill level of personnel involved. I would like to know where I can the results of the survey of my area as I believe is possible under the1918Data Protection Act, I would also like terms of usage of charging points which hopefully includes time of usage to avoid overnight usage to avoid disturbing residents whilst sleeping.</p> <p>--</p>
--	---

	<p>Please accept this as objection to the proposed electrical parking space outside no. 74 Kensington Road.</p> <p>The lamppost for this is in the middle of 74 & 76 Kensington Road. So effects 2 households rather than one.</p> <p>Neither household has raised any interest in having an electric vehicle.</p> <p>We are aware that one of the residents has difficulty walking far, so by removing the ability to park near their house it could limit their quality of life</p> <p>We need access to the dropped kerb outside no. 76 & 78. By losing the space near our house, there is an increased likelihood that we will be able to have access to the drop kerb, due to the reduced parking in the road.</p> <p>There is a space that is more acceptable in Heathcote road, where there is a lamppost which is not outside anyone's house and therefore not disrupting any resident.</p> <p>Below is a screenshot from google maps – showing the lamppost not outside a residence, so not impacting.</p> <p>--</p> <p>I am writing in response to the above planning application for the installation of electric charging points outside 183 Laburnum Grove and 74 Kensington Road.</p> <p>My husband and I live in Laburnum Grove and during that time the parking situation has become untenable. Over the years most of the houses have been divided into flats or houses of multiple occupation, therefore, most of the properties have multiple vehicles !!</p> <p>The parking problem is exacerbated by the huge amount of commercial vehicles which are brought home from work at the end of the day; most of these are much bigger than a normal cars. In fact, there are often two, sometimes three car rescue pickups which take up two car spaces each parked in Kensington Road, around the corner from where</p>
--	---

	<p>we live. The proliferation of vehicles together with the double yellow lines, the extremely bad parking of some motorists, the numerous disabled spaces and off road parking spaces on forecourts, already leads of extremely tense and stressful situations.</p> <p>If my husband and I are not at home four thirty p.m. it is impossible to park in our road and if we are out until ten thirty p.m. there is absolutely nowhere to park, and we end up parking in Battensburg Avenue, St. Swithun's Road or Domum Road and then we have to walk home to Laburnum Grove. This is hugely inconvenient and unpleasant, especially as we are in our late seventies.</p> <p>This situation will be made even worse, if the proposal for charging points each taking up almost eighteen feet of space is allowed to proceed. The charging points outside 183 Laburnum Grove and the one outside 74 Kensington Road will have a profound effect on people in our area as we live between the proposed locations.</p> <p>I feel that parking has now become such a issue that it will eventually reduce the value properties in this area.</p> <p>The pressure that the installation of charging points will put on an already impossible situation is profound and therefore, I strongly urge you to rethink this proposal and refuse permission for the installation of these two charging points to go ahead.</p>
<p>17. LABURNUM GROVE - (a) North side, outside No.183</p>	<p>I am writing in response to the above planning application for the installation of electric charging points outside 183 Laburnum Grove and 74 Kensington Road.</p> <p>My husband and I live in Laburnum Grove and during that time the parking situation has become untenable. Over the years most of the houses have been divided into flats or houses of multiple occupation, therefore, most of the properties have multiple vehicles !!</p> <p>The parking problem is exacerbated by the huge amount of commercial vehicles which are brought home from work at the end of the day; most of these are much bigger than than a normal cars. In fact,</p>

there are often two, sometimes three car rescue pickups which take up two car spaces each parked in Kensington Road, around the corner from where we live. The proliferation of vehicles together with the double yellow lines, the extremely bad parking of some motorists, the numerous disabled spaces and off road parking spaces on forecourts, already leads of extremely tense and stressful situations.

If my husband and I are not at home four thirty p.m. it is impossible to park in our road and if we are out until ten thirty p.m. there is absolutely nowhere to park, and we end up parking in Battensburg Avenue, St. Swithun's Road or Domum Road and then we have to walk home to Laburnum Grove. This is hugely inconvenient and unpleasant, especially as we are in our late seventies.

This situation will be made even worse, if the proposal for charging points each taking up almost eighteen feet of space is allowed to proceed. The charging points outside 183 Laburnum Grove and the one outside 74 Kensington Road will have a profound effect on people in our area as we live between the proposed locations.

I feel that parking has now become such a issue that it will eventually reduce the value properties in this area.

The pressure that the installation of charging points will put on an already impossible situation is profound and therefore, I strongly urge you to rethink this proposal and refuse permission for the installation of these two charging points to go ahead.

--

I am writing with reference to the proposal to place a charge point for electric cars outside 183 Laburnum Grove

I am objecting to this proposal as in the vicinity for this proposal there is a major shortage of parking spaces, and at the time of writing this, it is not possible to obtain off road parking in the immediate area, therefore causing further issues to the nightmare that already is parking in this street..

	<p>We do not have homes with garages as a majority appear to in the likes of Stubbington Avenue and other roads, so I believe this should be taken into account and charging points should be located in areas which will not affect the residents of roads in which there are no alternatives to park or in locations where it is set outside a shop for instance</p> <p>I do hope you will reconsider this charge point and look to see if there may be an alternative positioning of it</p>
<p>17. LABURNUM GROVE - (b) South side, outside No.50</p>	<p>Ref: TRO 120/2018 Electric Vehicle Charging Point adjacent to 50 Laburnum Grove</p> <p>As per letter sent to us 11th December 2018 inviting comments regarding the placement of an electric vehicle charging point (EVCP) at 50 Laburnum Grove, PO2 0EP, please find below our points of objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Ammenity: Your letter states that off street parking is not an option for many residents, but for us it is. By the positioning of a dedicated parking space for an EVCP here, this precludes our address from implementing off road parking by means of a dropped kerb. You also state that this is a trial and that no one in Laburnum actually owns an EV at the moment so us losing the option of a dropped kerb is all on 'assumptions' at the moment.</p> <p>After receiving the initial letter in regard to the possibility of an EVCP in our street last August an email was sent to PCC enquiring about which houses were being looked at as we intended to have a dropped kerb outside of our property. No reply was received, Following a conversation with PCC it was confirmed they had indeed received our email but no one had responded to it, even though this would be in direct conflict to your intentions of providing a space for EVCP. This delayed us in submitting our application which I can confirm has been sent to Colas together with the relevant fee. Moreover, there is a chance we may wish to have an EVCP placed on our Off-Road Parking. This will help achieve the environmental targets.</p> <p>Lamp Post position vs traffic direction: Position of the lamppost proposed for the EVCP is sited between #50 and #52 Laburnum Grove, on the</p>

south side of the street. The observed majority of traffic parked in the road is performed along the side of the highway congruent with good visibility to on-coming traffic when leaving the space: almost all cars are right hand drive and most cars choose to park driver side off-side.

However, most EVs have charge point on the front and /or near side of the vehicle. Because #52 has a dropped kerb, the EVCP on this lamp post makes more difficult this sensible choice of parking. If the EV was to park with drivers side off-side then the rear of the car is nearest the lamppost and so requires longer trails of loose, vulnerable cable.

This is North End, Portsmouth.....:

Car vandalism. Bad enough at the moment, as the North End section of Laburnum Grove (where #50 is), is a major thoroughfare for North End pub-goers and scallywags.

We as a household do not relish the likely occasions when some EV owners come knocking on our door asking if we saw anyone disconnecting or damaging their charging cables, or who is parking there as they need a charge...

Worse still, have the charging points vandalised and put out of action (Cadbury's Creme Eggs seem effective according to recent media reports!).

Because it's an EV allocated parking space, this precludes non-EVs from using it for the weeks it will take to repair: a double whammy. Every available parking space matters around here.

Suggestion:

Notwithstanding vandalism risks, a more suitable EVCP location would be at the ends of the one-way streets running North/South between Stubbington Ave and Chichester Rd, at the North End end of Laburnum Grove. These one-way streets have paved and bollarded areas at both ends of the highway, and on both sides of the road. These locations already have power for street signage and so a chance to fit EVCPs on both sides of the road. Because these streets are one way, this greatly mitigates the concerns regarding visibility of on-coming traffic when leaving the parking space. Moreover, because these areas are along the side aspects of existing homes, off-road /drop kerb parking directly adjacent is not possible. Note, most of these homes have garages and treat spaces

	<p>outside their garage entrance as an allocated parking space already.</p> <p>Another idea is to site the EVCP in the under-utilised Public Car Parks behind Cornerstone House / Timothy Whites and Clarence Public house, accessed and signposted via Stubbington Ave. These are fee free overnight and local to the plethora of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) and shared occupancy homes in Stubbington. Seems eminently sensible to use these available Car Parks, having no impact on existing resident parking.</p> <p>As you are aware the parking situation in Portsmouth is dire, with a very disjointed approach across Wards: homes with multiple vehicles, displacement parking and commercial vehicles all abusing the permit-free parking situation around Laburnum Grove.</p> <p>We are a single vehicle family and do not believe the EVCP should be implemented without a full and comprehensive implementation of measures to improve the overall parking situation, and certainly not at the expense of denying us the right to apply for off-road parking.</p> <p>--</p> <p>I write to lodge my appeal to the setting up of an electric car charging point here in Laburnum Grove. This is one of the busiest streets in North End and due to the close proximity to North End shopping centre, parking at the best of times is a nightmare and to take away another valuable space seems incredulous . I sent an email at the end of August stating we wanted to drop our kerb and asked what streets and house numbers were being looked at in regard to the electric car spaces being made available in the city . We had no reply and yesterday when I spoke to someone at the council offices we were told yes they had received our email but no one had responded to it. Now I find a notice board outside my house stating you are looking to allocate one of these parking spaces on the kerb outside. We live near to a multi occupancy house and a three car family so we took the decision that we would need to drop our kerb to allow us to have a parking space as my husband works long hours and most nights spends up to 20 minutes looking for a space to park. We strongly object to the allocated</p>
--	--

	<p>space for an electric car outside our property for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We emailed and asked in regard to a dropped kerb and had no reply. (If we had we could have submitted our request sooner). I am beginning to think that no reply was forthcoming as you had already decided to pinpoint this space. 2 .Unable to access Colas website for the last week or so as its says its an insecure site so could not lodge a request for dropped kerb.. 3. We live near the north end shops so parking is always a nightmare with daily shoppers and people working in North End using the area instead of pay and display in our EMPTY car parks . 4. We have two children and if we dare take the car out after 5 oclock we have to park several streets away which isn't ideal especially at night 5. We live near to a HMO which has 7 rooms and thus take up more than one parking space. 6. Commercial vans such as Iceland are always taking up spaces again due to the close proximity of the shops. <p>There are many lamp posts in Laburnum Grove not so close to the shopping area that could have been considered with properties too small at the front to accommodate a dropped kerbs so this would not impact them as much.</p> <p>I would like to know the reasoning behind this being considered and why we were not spoken to directly and why our email was not replied to . We asked for residential parking and this was rejected even though everyone I have spoken to would have welcomed it. We apposed the nearby HMO but was told this would not impact us in any way (not true) . We requested information regarding a dropped kerb and was not replied to. You are taking away our opportunity for a dropped kerb.</p>
18. ORIEL ROAD - (a) North side, outside No.66	<p>With the amount of cars in the roads and vans that are not electric surely it does not need these points taking up parking spaces which are being fought over every day of the week. Taking out spaces which could remain empty day and night is mad. Electric cars may be the future but there not enough of them yet. The people with the points outside their houses did they ask for them, [so they have their own parking space] or is it pot luck where they are?,</p>

	<p>if so where do they park? why do this scheme where there is the most parking is needed . Please inform</p> <p>--</p> <p>I am writing to express and notify you of my objections to the proposed installation of designated bays for electric vehicles.</p> <p>Parking in North End, particularly Oriel Road, is incredibly difficult and makes residents reluctant to use their cars during peak parking times. Every day the road is filled with a significant number of lorries and vans, plus as the road is designated as one way from London Road to Gladys Avenue it is a speed 'rat run' making to dangerous to pedestrians and other drivers and people using the local businesses also add to the parking congestion.</p> <p>Allocating parking will further reduce available parking for residents, causing greater difficulty throughout the day.</p> <p>A way to overcome the issue to some extent would be to introduce residents parking. I would welcome this wholeheartedly and I am sure a number of fellow residents would also agree.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your response.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Can I write objecting to the introduction of electric charging specifically in Oriel Road where I live. I know there no point objecting because this is a box ticking exercise on some eco drive but I had to at least try.</p> <p>But my main objection is that this doesn't form part of any strategy to improve parking which is repeatably raised by residence. It specifically benefits a few household with expensive new cars over the general residency. Any charging scheme should be in public car parks until such time as the technology stablises and the maximum stay should be limited.</p> <p>I also think the eco credtional are being overplayed they are not zero omission they just shift where the</p>
--	--

	<p>CO2 is made, battery technology is still an eco disaster and there is no</p> <p>I suspect this is some stupid government grant initiative so if it really is going to happen the space shouldn't be like the disabled spaces where only blue badge holders in North End own estate cars they should be for city cars. And the point should not be installed for hybrid cars as they all use there engines at speed.</p> <p>--</p> <p>I am stating my objection to electric vehicle parking bays in Oriel Road numbers 66 and 102. North End is saturated with cars, worse in particular are the one way streets especially Oriel Road. On a daily basis we have up to 12 work vans, at least 6-8 work vehicles for the care home at the bottom. The vet on London Uses Oriel Road. I rarely park outside my house now and quite often not even in the street.</p> <p>This road should be permit parking at the very least. Disabled parking is a priority but this should be highly scrutinised and investigating before any more given.</p>
21. PRETORIA ROAD - North side, outside No.83	
	<p>We are not all happy with the proposal of the lamp post here being used as an electric point for cars.</p> <p>No one in Pretoria Road has an Electric car we have checked.</p> <p>Parking is diabolical round here anyway. There are three disabled parking spaces very close to this lamp post and others in this road. We have many multiple occupancy houses with more than one car. There are people at least two who live close by who have cars that do not move them day in day out. The people who live in Winter Road park in this road as they have no where to park.</p> <p>We are very close to Fratton park so match days you can't go out because it's impossible to park.</p> <p>I finish work at 5pm so when I come home I'm driving around for ages trying to park. Sometimes i have to park at least 5 roads away. As I am a type one</p>

	<p>diabetic driving up and down roads trying to find somewhere to park is not ideal.</p> <p>We have also done some research on these power points which they have in London and they make alot of noise. My husband works nights and this will keep him awake. We are one of the few people that own our own house and we feel that this will de-value our house and we would have trouble selling it.</p> <p>If we can make a suggestion if it has to go in this road then there is a lamp post on the same side outside the house at the end of the road opposite Pretoria news as the occupant has a garage. Or B and Q car park as this is always empty.</p> <p>--</p> <p>My attention has been brought to a proposed electric vehicle charge point outside 83 Pretoria Road - this road already has very limited parking availability for residents, as well as 3 Disabled parking bays within a few meters of 83 Pretoria Road. Adding yet another parking-restriction bay in this area is totally unsuitable, and will add to an even more difficult situation for local residents.</p> <p>Please rethink the location of this proposed electric vehicle charge point.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Ref TRO 120/2018</p> <p>I am writing this to you to WHOLE HEARTEDLY OBJECT to having an electric car charging point near my house.</p> <p>Proposed Charging Bay No 21. PRETORIA ROAD NORTH SIDE OUTSIDE NO 83</p> <p>We are WINTER ROAD END of PRETORIA ROAD and have to put up with WINTER ROAD residents parking in our road. And since WESTFIELD ROAD became ONE WAY towards our road all overflow residents from that road park in our road.</p>
--	---

	<p>We have a DOUBLE DISABLED PARKING BAY opposite covering houses No's 98 and 100.</p> <p>We have a SINGLE DISABLED PARKING BAY at No 93. This road has a lot of problems on busy days in particular at the weekends and evenings where some times residents from Pretoria road have to try to find a space two /three roads away.</p> <p>Cars just come out of Westfield and park as close to this end of the road as possible.</p> <p>Also cars from Winter Road use our road as it is restricted parking most frequently. Some cars are left in the road for long lengths of time to without moving. Surely the other half of Pretoria Road would be more suitable as it seems less chockablock at different times of the day.</p> <p>I am sure no one has bothered to visit this road when assessing where the charging bay should be. Even the two lampposts nearer the Pretoria News Shop would be more suitable as there is only one DISABLED PARKING BAY outside No 56. There are no more disabled bays at that end of Pretoria Road, Haslemere Road end.</p> <p>Also there have been reports that the charging does cause a noise/buzzing and cars have to be charged overnight.</p> <p>Are there rules about people being in the cars for a long lengths of time?</p> <p>What do the people do while the cars are charging do they have to get taxi's to take them away and then come back to their car? Or do the cars have to be attended while charging?</p> <p>I for one DO NOT WANT people near my house at all hours eating and drinking and leaving their rubbish behind, making a noise and talking on mobile phones outside at night while waiting for taxis or lifts etc... Also playing music and talking loudly in the cars with the speakers on and basically just being a nuisance outside at night.</p> <p>We had to put up with a lot of students in the past and now it is a reasonably quiet road at night.</p> <p>Ambulances use it as a way through on emergencies to the old peoples homes in Haslemere Road so more comings and goings in the street will be hampering them. I am referring to extra taxis and traffic in general at night.</p>
--	---

	<p>It seems NO ONE has given a thought to the residents near these charging bays. My windows are not the best and I cannot afford to replace them at this time so I would like to OBJECT and say a BIG NO to the proposal at this time.</p> <p>--</p> <p>I am writing to express concerns about the chosen location for the electric car charging point outside 83 Pretoria Road for two reasons.</p> <p>Parking is already extremely congested - after 3 or 4 o'clock it is very difficult to park at this end of the road, while the other section of Pretoria Road (between Haselmere and St Augustine) is generally quieter (partially due to number of cars resident in the road, but also because Westfield Road is one-way and so when people cannot park there, they drive into Pretoria). There are also 3 disabled bays between Winter Road and the proposed site. For this reason, I believe it would make more sense to place the charging point in the section of Pretoria Road between Haslemere Road and St Augustine Road, unless somebody in our run of houses has informed you that they plan to buy an electric car in the near future.</p> <p>As a disabled person with difficulties walking this already poses problems for me and I avoid going out in the evenings as I am unable to walk far and cannot park. Having seen an orthopaedic consultant on 2nd January, I have been advised to apply for a blue badge myself and submitted an application on Friday - if successful, I am concerned about causing further congestion in the street.</p> <p>While we support the initiative to encourage electric ownership, we cannot afford to replace our car at this time and feel that by moving the charging point slightly it would cause less disruption to residents.</p>
22. PRIORY CRESCENT - (a) North side, outside No.30	<p>The proposed Electric Vehicle Charge Point outside 30 Priory Crescent will seriously hamper my parking reasonably close to my home for my disabled wife. I am presently applying for a disabled parking space so would want you to delay the installation until that has been dealt with, as they both concern the same</p>

	<p>area. This can take 3 – 6 months. The proposed charging area would make it impossible to obtain the disabled parking space.</p> <p>It would make it much easier for residents on the built-up side of Priory if it was sited on the park side anyway, so no conflict is caused, so I would ask you to seriously consider this option.</p> <p>It would help because there is now a serious problem finding a parking space in Priory Cr or adjacent Maylands Ave, particularly outside working hours or at weekends. All the surrounding streets have residents only parking protection so anyone who has a second vehicle or commercial vehicle just uses Priory or Maylands. Builders lorries, minibuses and camper vans are a particular nuisance as they take up much space and often do not move for several days. There is a car parked here which hasn't moved for some time. Last weekend a builder had three lorries parked here all weekend, one of which was two car lengths! I am sure many of these vehicles should be attracting a second vehicle charge in the owners area so the council is losing money as well. You mention that site investigations have been carried out, I would suggest you come again to this area outside working hours to appreciate the problem.</p> <p>Something that would really help the situation now that the new Rodney rd/ Velder ave junction is in place is for the blockage at the Vernon Ave/Priory to be removed. It was done to prevent traffic taking a short cut, but now you can't go from Vernon Ave onto Velder Ave but are forced back up Rodney Rd it is not needed. The block of new houses Nos 28a, b, c, and d were built with integral garages at the rear, and parking spaces as well, but that Vernon rd blockage prevented their access. They have to filter through the roads between them and Goldsmith Ave. Removing the blockage to renew their access would make it much easier for them, and free up the space on Priory. I think the road surface is still there under the paviors so it would be a simple job but of great benefit to Priory Crescent/Maylands. Also frees up access to Fratton Park for emergency vehicles. If the end of the residents area (GB?) was pushed back to beyond the back entrance to Nos 28 a-d, which are on Priory anyway, that would help as well.</p>
--	---

	<p>Something else which would greatly alleviate the problem would be for another survey of Priory and Maylands regarding becoming a residents only parking area. We were left out of the original scheme because the response was lower than some other areas. However all the other areas responses were less than 50% so I couldn't understand why any of them were implemented. The survey was done in July at the end of the school year when people were more concerned with school exams or holidays, which might explain the low response. I am sure another survey would be welcomed if you could arrange one. The survey might apply only to the residential side of Priory if that would make more sense.</p> <p>Hope this didn't take up too much of your time, but it would greatly help if some or all of this was implemented.</p>
23. RACTON AVENUE - South side, opposite Lordington Close	
	<p>With reference to your plans to install an electrical charging point opposite lordington close. I would like to bring it to your attention that we have plans in place with colas to have a dropped kerb. Therefore we object to the proposals with regard to the above.</p>
25. ST RONAN'S ROAD - East side, outside No.80	
	<p>I am writing to you about the planned electric vehicle charging point that you are thinking about putting in St Ronans road.</p> <p>As you are probable aware, the parking situation in this road is already very stretched - there are far more cars than places available. This situation is only going to get worse when the zone parking is brought back into the area to the north of Albert road in couple of days. The last time that these parking zones were enforced there was a movement of vehicles to the south of Albert Rd making it almost impossible to find a place to park if you arrived back in the street after the evening rush hour. Even without the parking zone restrictions, parking after 7.30pm generally means parking in the Craneswater area, certainly a far distance from our house.</p> <p>I work out of the city and always arrive back in the street after this time to park overnight, before leaving early in the morning. Although, on account of this a saved parking space for my plug-in hybrid car might be considered welcome, it would have a negative</p>

	<p>effect on the neighbours and on my wife, who does not own a hybrid and tends to be the one arriving earlier with a car load of shopping. Furthermore, I charge my car at work and have little requirement for a place to charge. On a more considered level, parking is so limited for the street, I would not wish to upset the neighbours by having a 'reserved' space that restricts the street parking further.</p> <p>Therefore, although I asked to be considered for a charging point when the survey was sent around, I cannot now support the positioning of this facility. I don't think that there is another household in this area of the street that has an EV so the space would in effect be reserved for my car 24 hours a day or perhaps someone else's from outside the street. Having spoken with other members of the street, there is strong objection to putting a charging point in the location that you are proposing as this would prevent 99% of the people that live here from using it, therefore I cannot support this facility.</p> <p>I do understand the need to reduce pollution in the city, however, and the need to support the introduction of EVs but I feel there are much better locations for these to be positioned:</p> <p>As a resident, I feel that around the corner in Albert road, either in front of the shops or, better still, in front of the school in the layby, that is not effectively used at present, would be a much better option all round. There is even a bike rack shaped like a car there that I have never seen used. If the charging point or points were place on Albert Road, they would be far more visible to passing traffic and so more likely to be used by those in the wider vicinity. In your literature you hint that the points are for overnight charging which would in fact also favour a space outside Craneswater School – though this would still not be a preferred option as this would still take away valuable parking from St Ronans Rd. In short, we object to the positioning of the charge point. I have no need to charge at night as I charge at work so would not use the facility, so I do hope you will not place one – we would not be happy about it and I would not use it.</p>
27. SHADWELL ROAD - (a) South side, outside No.39 - (b) South side, outside No.93	<p>I am contacting with regards to the proposed Electric vehicle charging points in Shadwell Road as per the letter received 11th December 2018,</p>

	<p>I can appreciate the drive towards electric vehicles as part of the cities commitment to improve air quality, however, I object to the proposal based on the following concerns and would like to hear how these would be addressed;</p> <p>1. I have concerns as to the lack of parking available on the road already. After 4.30pm each day, it is already a challenge to find a space within Shadwell road and myself and my wife often will have to park in road adjacent, or opposite. Sometimes walking as much as 3-5 minutes to reach my home. What will be done to ease this?</p> <p>2. What should happen if I, or my wife become blue badge holders? - With a charging bay installed, adding a 'Disabled parking bay' won't be feasible and therefore make our lives challenging.</p> <p>3. How will these electric charging bays be enforced? - Currently, Shadwell road is a 'free for all' without need for regular traffic enforcement? How will these be adequately 'policed' to prevent abuse of their intended purpose? Is the public expected to report offenders or will the road be added to the rotation for traffic wardens? If so? How regularly?</p> <p>4. How many Shadwell road residents currently need electric vehicles? Have residents requested such bays? I would like to understand why Shadwell road has been chosen as part of this trial and by which rationale? How utilised to we expect these bays to be at present? Given the aforementioned concerns, I feel there may be other roads in Portsmouth that are better suited to trialing these bays.</p> <p>5. What other options have been considered? - To my knowledge - Electric vehicles are able to be charged using a home supply or dedicated home charging points for which government grants are available. I would query why this option isn't being presented as an alternative as it would not result in additional congestion through loss of spaces.</p> <p>6. Have you considered adding rather than removing existing spaces? - at the top of Shadwell road next to and opposite 'Excell Fish bar', there is room for multiple spaces where there are currently double yellow lines preventing public parking. Has this</p>
--	---

	<p>location been considered as an option for these points? In addition, I feel that having these charging bays located on London road in the existing bays there would allow the points to serve multiple roads (e.g Mountbatten, St Chad's, Oriel) and therefore be utilised more, than locating them within a road itself.</p> <p>7. Have you considered working with Tesco Express and identifying if it would be an option to locate a few charging points in their car park? Again, for the above reasons this would enable them to serve multiple roads.</p> <p>I look forwards to hearing your response to the above points ahead of any decisions being made,</p> <p>--</p> <p>(as above)</p> <p>As a point has every home in Shadwell Road been informed of this as my neighbours have not been contacted by you in reference to the bay (your letter states for all residents effected by this and if you are taking away 4 parking spaces in an already congested road it would effect all) ?</p> <p>Also is this being contracted out and who pays for the installation and is there a charge for this facility?</p>
30. VICTORIA ROAD NORTH - East side, outside No.48	
	<p>I saw the notice in Victoria Road North for the charging points and until I re-read the email below today I didn't realise the notice was seeking support as well as objections, as it only asks for objections in the Notice, otherwise I would have responded with my full support.</p> <p>Now the notice has been issued, what is the timescale now for the electric points being installed as I'd like to start looking for a car to buy?</p>
31. WARREN AVENUE - South-east side, outside North Lodge (opposite industrial estate)	
This road also has a chargepoint proposed outside no.57 not included in the TRO.	As one of the people who asked about on-street charge points before you submitted your application, I strongly support your proposed charge points in my road, Warren Avenue.

I am delighted with your work in making this happen and thank you for all you are doing :)

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed plan to install two charge points in Warren Avenue.

The Transport Planning Team has stated that 43 charge points will be installed across Portsmouth. There are more than 43 streets in Portsmouth so why is Warren Avenue identified for two of these?

The letter also states that “once we have been informed that A RESIDENT in Warren Avenue owns an electric vehicle.... we will be marking the parking space”. So no-one in Warren Avenue even owns an electric car yet?

Parking is already an issue in this road... we have several disabled parking bays that are very often not occupied (so I am unsure if current information on those qualifying is up to date?). We also have several camper vans and numerous work vans using residential parking spaces. And once the new flats are built on the site of the old Brewers Arms in Milton Road (with no parking facilities for those residents) we will have even more vehicles vying for parking in our road.

This is simply not sustainable and I am highly opposed to the plan to further restrict residential parking and mark off two more “no-go” areas.

Incidentally, I would be very keen to see a residential parking permit scheme introduced in Warren Avenue... and even a one-way system to reduce the amount of dodge-run drivers cutting through our road to avoid the Velder Avenue traffic lights.

I look forward to your response and to receive confirmation that my views will be taken into consideration ahead of any scheme implementation.

--

I am a resident of Warren Avenue and wonder whether at the moment 2 charge points is necessary.

	As this is a trial would one be enough? I fully back the need for alternatives to petrol, but at the moment parking can be very difficult without losing another 2 places.
33. WIMBLEDON PARK ROAD - South side, opposite No. 23 Wimbledon Park Road	
	I am writing to object to your proposal to install an electric charging bay in Wimbledon park road. As a resident of this road there is already an extreme shortage of parking in this area. By allowing the installation of this bay not only will another desperately needed space be lost, but also guarantee a permanent parking place for one resident, which seems grossly unfair.
Glencoe Road - outside no.60 (not included in TRO)	<p>The idea of using the lamppost outside 54 Glencoe and making it an EV only parking zone will not work for me.</p> <p>Currently as the only FULL ev owner in the street (as far as I know) and as I work very late - the road is usually full by the time I get home.</p> <p>My neighbour may benefit however as they have a hybrid.</p> <p>If it is allocated as an EV parking only zone that may not sit well with other ICE car owners.</p>

(End of report)