



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

**Date of meeting:** 2 September 2021

**Subject:** TRO 39B/2021: Proposed parking restrictions in various locations

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

**Wards affected:** Baffins, Cosham, Hilsea, Milton, Paulsgrove

**Key decision:** No

**Full Council decision:** No

---

**1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1.** To consider the public response to the proposed parking restrictions in a number of locations in Portsmouth.

In this report, TRO means traffic regulation order.

Appendix A: The public proposal notice for TRO 39/2021

Appendix B: Public views submitted

Appendix C: Confirmation of communications (statutory and non-statutory)

**2. Recommendations**

In relation to the proposals promoted under TRO 39/2021, it is recommended that:

- 2.1** The double yellow lines in Hayling Avenue remain unchanged, meaning the proposal to reduce their length by 5m at each end is not implemented;
- 2.2** 9m of the 11m of double yellow lines proposed on the bend in Cheslyn Road is implemented;
- 2.3** The proposed 5m extension to the double yellow lines on both sides of Woolner Avenue is applied to the east side only, southwards from Havant Road junction;
- 2.4** The 11m of double yellow lines proposed in front of the access road to Orford Court in Magdala Road, is implemented;
- 2.5** The 30m of double yellow lines proposed on the bend in Peronne Road, north of Bapaume Road, is implemented;



- 2.6** The parking in Shelley Avenue remains unchanged, meaning the proposal to install double yellow lines on the south side and move all parking (including 3 disabled bays) to the north side is not implemented;
- 2.7** It is noted that the remainder of TRO 39/2021 was brought into operation under TRO 39A/2021 at the end of July, due to no objections being received to those proposals. Therefore, any proposals approved following this report will be brought into operation under TRO 39B/2021.

### **3. Background**

- 3.1** Parking restrictions and amendments are considered and may be proposed where concerns are raised by residents, councillors, the public and/or emergency, public or delivery services in relation to road safety and traffic management, and/or to accommodate a change to the highway network. A number of traffic regulation orders are put forward each year in response to such concerns and requests raised about locations across the city. TRO 39/2021 was formed of 28 such proposals.
- 3.2** Parking congestion increased in most parts of the city during the Covid-19 pandemic, as the usual turnover of parking spaces is affected when travel movements are reduced and more people work from home etc. This led to some drivers parking in places they would not consider suitable under normal circumstances, such as on bends or within road junctions. With lockdown restrictions eased, parking in some of the less suitable locations has either become normal practice, or the road safety issues would reoccur if motorists choose to park there again in future. Therefore it has been necessary to consider new parking restrictions in some locations.

### **4. Consultation and notification**

- 4.1** Statutory 21-day consultation and notification under TRO 39/2021 took place 28 May - 18 June 2021.
- 4.2** Under statutory consultation, statutory bodies (police, fire & rescue, utilities companies etc.) are directly consulted on the Council's formal proposals and the public has a right to object. The Council has a statutory obligation to consider any objections received (see paragraph 8.3), although any comments received are given due consideration. Appendix B contains the full representations received in response to the proposals.
- 4.3** In addition to the legal requirement of publishing the proposal notice in a local newspaper, the proposal notice was published on the Council's website, yellow copies were displayed at affected locations and copies were posted to adjacent residential properties to raise awareness.
- 4.4** Appendix C confirms the communication steps undertaken (statutory and non-statutory), for reference purposes.



## 5. Consultation response

- 5.1 26 representations were received overall. Objections were received to the proposals for Hayling Avenue (3), Cheslyn Road (1), Woolner Avenue (2), Magdala Road (2), Peronne Road (1) and Shelley Avenue (6). An objection relating to Kingsley Road was subsequently withdrawn.
- 5.2 Support was received for the proposals in Shelley Avenue (8) and Old Bridge Road (2)

## 6. Reasons for the recommendations

- 6.1.1 Hayling Avenue, Baffins: The 40-metre lengths of double yellow lines on both sides of Hayling Avenue at its junction with Marina Grove occasionally gives rise to requests to shorten the restriction in favour of street parking. When this was proposed some years ago, residents did not object until the contractor arrived to amend the highway restrictions, at which point it was agreed to leave the double yellow lines unchanged.
- 6.1.2 The above account does not preclude a similar proposal being put forward some time later, to see if local people's views have changed. Therefore a proposal to reduce the length of restriction on the north side by 5 metres at each end was included in the consultation on TRO 39/2021, in response to suggestions to review the restrictions.
- 6.1.3 As the proposal received 3 objections from residents, who feel the double yellow lines are needed to protect the access road, junction and provide space for pulling in to give way to oncoming vehicles, it is recommended that the proposal is not implemented. Whilst no longer a bus route, the parking on both sides of Hayling Avenue leaves a single lane for two-way traffic. This means there are few places to pass between the junctions of Marina Grove and Ebery Grove: a lengthy distance of around 360 metres.
- 6.2.1 Cheslyn Road, Baffins: Residents and refuse collection vehicle drivers expressed concern about vehicles parking on the footway around the bend opposite the service road to the flats at Nos.54-64. This parking affects travel along Cheslyn Road, the footway is obstructed and visibility of oncoming traffic and pedestrians is reduced. Refuse collection vehicle drivers have been unable to manoeuvre the vehicles into the service road due to the severe parking congestion in Cheslyn Road. This can impact on rubbish and recycling collections, and may prevent other large vehicles, including the emergency services, from accessing the service road.
- 6.2.2 The objector is concerned about parking availability being reduced in the vicinity. Therefore the proposed 11-metres of double yellow lines starting from No.35's dropped kerb is recommended to be scaled back slightly to 9 metres.
- 6.3.1 Woolner Avenue, Cosham: The 4 metres of existing double yellow lines on both sides of Woolner Avenue at its junction with Havant Road have proved inadequate with increased parking congestion and vehicles parking closer to the junction than previously. This means there is little space for vehicles to turn off the main Havant Road into the cul-de-sac; particularly difficult for larger vehicles. As a result, traffic congestion can build up on the main road, which is more of a concern now that traffic



levels have increased again and the highway network is busier. A resident of Woolner Avenue suggested the double yellow lines could be extended to be more in keeping with other junctions in the area and to relieve the issues experienced.

- 6.3.2** Other residents do not wish to lose street parking, as not all properties have private parking available and there have been no accidents on the junction. Vehicles already use part of the footway on both sides to cater for the parking demand. Extending the double yellow lines on the left side in the image below, instead of on both sides, will still create more space for vehicles to pull off the main road, into the correct lane in Woolner Avenue, whilst being mindful of concerns over the street parking provision.



- 6.4.1** Magdala Road, Cosham: The access road to Orford Court (Salvation Army Housing Association) in Magdala Road leads to parking for more than 15 vehicles, along with a service area and emergency exit. Concerns have been expressed about vehicles squeezing into the gap between the dropped kerbs in Magdala Road, as shown by the red car in the image below. This practice can prevent access to Orford Court, and/or severely reduce visibility of oncoming traffic when exiting.



- 6.4.2** The objectors feel the space between the driveways is useful for residents returning home late in the evening, and are concerned about parking availability overall. However, any vehicles that cannot access the service road are obliged to use street parking, reducing availability for Magdala Road residents there who do not have private



parking. This exacerbates both issues; reduced parking and poor visibility of approaching traffic when leaving the access road. It is therefore recommended that the proposed 11m of double yellow line is implemented.

**6.5.1** Peronne Road / Bapaume Road, Hilsea

Concerns were raised by residents of Peronne Road and Carronade Walk about vehicles parking on the bend in Peronne Road northwards from the junction with Bapaume Road (see image below). This practice obscures visibility of the junction and causes traffic to meet unexpectedly on the bend, with one vehicle driving onto the footway for others to pass. The paving slabs are severely damaged for some distance. The entrance to the parking area on the left in the image below compounds the issue, particularly with vehicles exiting.



**6.5.2** The objector feels the vehicles will be displaced elsewhere, possibly into Bapaume Road. However, Bapaume Road is more suitable for local parking as a side road with no residential addresses. Therefore the road safety and traffic management improvements on the main Peronne Road and at the junction of Bapaume Road outweigh this concern. Parking space for 3 vehicles will remain between the end of the new double yellow lines and beginning of existing restrictions: the proposal ends just after the car park entrance.

**6.6.1** Shelley Avenue, Paulsgrove

A number of residents approached a Ward Councillor about parking in Shelley Avenue, requesting a similar arrangement to that installed in nearby Chaucer Avenue and Dryden Avenue. Parking in those roads was moved from the south side to the north side, to make the best use of the street parking available. Some residents are concerned about damage to the grass verge, the dropped kerbs for driveway access reducing the public parking and the road being narrowed when vehicles park on alternating sides.

**6.6.2** Unlike Chaucer Avenue and Dryden Avenue, Shelley Avenue has 3 large driveways on its north side, and some vehicles also make use of the verge on the north side for parking, which is more level in places. Unfortunately, the gradient of the majority of the grass verge and the utilities services close to the surface means the cost to convert it to a hard surface for parking is prohibitive. There is a limited programme and funding to harden verges, which has been allocated for some years to come.



- 6.6.3** As can be seen from the aerial view of Chaucer Avenue (top), relocating street parking to the north side has been effective in increasing and managing the parking provision. However, looking at Shelley Avenue (bottom) the same positive outcome is unlikely to result from the current proposal, particularly as there is no support for relocating the disabled bays in this road. Whilst approximately 6 vehicles park on the north side by choice, this arrangement cannot be formalised as there is only space to accommodate parking on one side fully on the carriageway.



- 6.6.4** For the reasons set out above, combined with concerns from the owners of both disabled bays plus concerns from other residents about the disabled parking being relocated, it is recommended that the proposals are not implemented. One resident would only support double yellow lines on the south side if the same is applied in front of the driveways opposite, requiring further restrictions to be proposed. Whilst there are a couple more responses in favour of changing the parking arrangements, the reasons for the objections are considered valid and the Council does not intend to disadvantage its disabled residents.
- 6.7** An objection was received from a resident of Kingsley Road, concerned that the proposed double yellow lines would make it impossible to park outside their property. It was confirmed that the restriction would only extend in front of the dropped kerb from the junction, and the objection was withdrawn.

## **7. Integrated Impact Assessment**

- 7.1** An integrated impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a significant positive or negative impact on communities and safety, regeneration and culture, environment and public space or equality and diversity.



**8. Legal Implications**

**8.1** 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 their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:

- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
- (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

**8.2** 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.

**8.3** A proposed TRO must be advertised and the statutory consultees notified and given a 3-week period (21 days) in which to register any support or objections. Members of the public also have a right to object during that period. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account any objections received from the public and/or the statutory consultees during the consultation period.

**9. Director of Finance's comments**

**9.1** The costs of implementing the measures within this report is likely to be less than £5,000 and will be met from the On Street Parking 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
26 emails/letters in response to the published proposals under TRO 39/2021	1. Portsmouth City Council's "TROteam" inbox, Microsoft Outlook 2. Parking team's online storage (content reproduced within the report; anonymised)

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

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

**Appendix A: The public proposal notice for TRO 39/2021**

**THE PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS) (PARKING PLACES, WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND AMENDMENTS) (NO. 39) ORDER 2021**

28 May 2021: Notice is hereby given that the Portsmouth City Council ("the Council") proposes to make the above Order under sections 1, 2, 4, 32, 33 and 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act"), as amended, the Traffic Management Act 2004, the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007, and of all other enabling powers, and in accordance with Parts III and IV of Schedule 9 to the Act. The effect would be as follows:

**A) NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines; measurements exclude footway width)**

- 1. Anglesea Road**  
East side, a 2m extension to the existing restriction at the entrance to Victoria Park
- 2. Bapaume Road**  
North side, a 5m length westwards from Peronne Road
- 3. Blakemere Crescent**  
South side, a 4m length westwards and eastwards of Dorstone Road junction
- 4. Craneswater Park**  
West side, a 10m length on the junction outside No.36, adjacent to the letter box
- 5. Cheslyn Road**  
South side, an 11m length westwards from No.35's dropped kerb, around the bend
- 6. Dorstone Road**  
Both sides, a 5m length southwards from Blakemere Crescent junction
- 7. Dysart Avenue**  
Both sides, a 5m extension eastwards of Tregaron Avenue junction
- 8. East Cosham Road**  
West side, an 8m length northwards from Southdown Rd, outside No. 39
- 9. George Street**  
North-west side, a 13m length in front of the garages access road east of Burleigh Road
- 10. Hester Road**  
East side, a 6m extension southwards from Old Canal
- 11. Ironbridge Lane**  
Both sides, a 5m length northwards from Kingsley Road
- 12. Kingsley Road**  
North side, a 5m length westwards and eastwards from Ironbridge Lane
- 13. Lonsdale Avenue**  
South side, a 3m length westwards and a 1m length eastwards of Rosebery Avenue junction
- 14. Magdala Road**  
North side, an 11m length from the driveway outside No.23 across and past the driveway of Orford Court
- 15. Mansvid Avenue**  
Both sides, a 6m extension westwards of Tregaron Avenue junction
- 16. Peronne Road**  
West side, a 30m length northwards from Bapaume Road to opposite the private car park
- 17. Rosebery Avenue**  
Both sides, a 4m length southwards from Lonsdale Avenue junction
- 18. Shelley Avenue**  
South side, its entire length between Browning Avenue and Wordsworth Avenue (see Part F)

- 19. South Road, Fratton**  
South side, extend existing double yellow lines to the end; rear of Nos.53 & 55 Hampshire Street
- 20. Tregaron Avenue**  
(a) East side, a 5m extension northwards and a 5m extension southwards of Dysart Avenue  
(b) West side, a 5m extension northwards and a 2m extension southwards of Mansvid Avenue
- 21. Woolner Avenue**  
Both sides, a 5m extension southwards from Havant Road
- B) REDUCTION OF NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines)**
- 1. Doyle Avenue**  
North side, an 8m length east of Northern Parade
- 2. Hayling Avenue (near Marina Grove junction)**  
a) North side, a 5m length outside No.89  
b) North side, a 5m length outside No.99
- C) CHANGE FROM RESIDENTS' PARKING BAY (KB) TO NO WAITING AT ANY TIME**
- 1. Diamond Street**  
North side, its entire length eastwards from Flint Street junction
- D) CHANGE FROM NO WAITING AT ANY TIME TO RESIDENTS' PARKING BAY (KB)**
- 1. Diamond Street**  
South side, its entire length eastwards from Flint Street junction
- E) CHANGE FROM PAY & DISPLAY TO DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING PLACE**
- 1. Anglesea Road**  
East side, a 7m bay by the entrance to Victoria Park
- F) RELOCATION OF DISABLED BAYS FROM SOUTH SIDE TO NORTH SIDE**
- 1. Shelley Avenue**  
Bays outside Nos. 15 and 43 to be moved to the north side along with all street parking (see Part A18 above for double yellow lines)
- G) CHANGE TO PARKING BAY TO INCLUDE MH PERMIT HOLDERS:  
3 HOURS NO RETURN WITHIN 4 HOURS / MH AND MI PERMIT HOLDERS 8AM-8PM**
- 1. Devonshire Avenue**  
South side, the 9m bay outside Nos. 260-262
- H) CHANGE TO MF PARKING BAYS TO INCLUDE MD PERMIT HOLDERS:  
MF AND MD PERMIT HOLDERS 11AM-NOON AND 6PM-7PM**
- 1. Old Bridge Road**  
Both sides, all parking bays in the road (approximately 26 parking spaces)
- I) ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS**  
This order also updates existing traffic orders relating to parking restrictions to ensure consistency, making no changes on the public highway itself. This includes renaming the car park and spaces at The Camber, Old Portsmouth, from INEOS Team UK to Camber Quay; a return to a location-specific title instead of sponsors, who can change fairly frequently. The yacht racing headquarters facility is unaffected by this order.

To view this public notice or the draft order on Portsmouth City Council's website [www.portsmouth.gov.uk](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk) search 'traffic regulation orders 2021'. For those without access to a computer, a printed copy of the draft order including the statement of reasons can be requested by calling 023 9268 8501.

Persons wishing to object to these proposals may do so by sending their representations via email to **TROteam@portsmouthcc.gov.uk** or by post to Nikki Musson, Parking team, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth PO1 2NE, quoting ref **TRO 39/2021** by **18 June 2021** 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 a decision to be made at a public meeting, representations are anonymised in accordance with data protection law and included in the published report. Please see the Council's website for full details of the [Data Protection privacy notice](#).

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

**Appendix B: Public views**

**Shelley Avenue:  
Objections to proposed double yellow lines and/or relocation of disabled bays**

**1. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I am strongly opposed for my disabled parking to be on the other side of the road. You always make sure that you make the disabled people have no rights and you have made it obvious that we don't matter. How am I supposed to get out of our car when there's a slope so when it is wet the grass is very slippery and I have a problem with falling over. We applied for a dropped kerb and we were turned down as it not long enough yet lo and behold you have let another address dig out the area by the steps so that gives them the right size. I don't see why I have to be penalised because I am disabled.  
*(Officer note: the dropped kerb complaint has been dealt with separately)*

**2. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

We have just been told that my disabled bay will be moved to the other side of our road due to new parking arrangements being put in place. Opposite my home are 3 dropped kerb driveways, so my disabled bay would not only be on the opposite side to my home, but also about 200 yds further down the road. I only just manage to use my bay where it is now - right outside my home. This move would mean that my freedom (the little bit I still have) would be fully restricted as I would then be unable to go out. I cannot make it to our car if it is not outside our home. I just cannot ! I already have an OT involved in my health as my mobility and other things are VERY BAD ! This move is totally against any disabled inclusion rights etc. PLEASE PLEASE CAN YOU HELP ME , I AM DISTRAUGHT OVER THIS.

**3. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I would like to mention the concerns we have regarding the Relocation of Disabled Bays in Shelley Avenue. We do feel this is slightly discriminatory to disabled people due to the fact that moving of the bays to the opposite side means they do not have a safe access to enter or vacate their vehicles. They will either get in/out in the road with traffic coming in either direction or onto a wet grassy or muddy banks which could cause harm and injury to the persons. This will also affect those without disabilities. The grass bank needs to be made into a safe area if the proposal goes ahead to avoid unnecessary risks to others. The bank in places has no grass so when wet is a greater hazard. We do agree that the parking needs sorting out but do feel for the disabled people who are already struggling and making things harder for them is not a good solution. Recommendations would be to cut the grass/ mud bank at the site of the disabled bays and tarmac to give them easier access on the side you are proposing to move the bays to.



**4. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I am contacting you with regard to the proposed parking arrangements in Shelley Avenue. My husband and myself are apposed to the suggestions laid out in your letter dated 28th May 2021.

Firstly you state that it is too costly to convert the grass verge into a hard surface but you seemly have allowed 3 households on the North side to erect there own drive ways. You have also allowed the footpath to be crossed and the grass verge to be dropped and bricked over as also the foot path. We are more then surprised that these drive ways have been allowed while other applications (also on the North side) have been rejected! Since these 3 driveways have been completed parking along both sides of the street has begun.

Also you state that the disabled parking bays will be relocated to the North side of the road. We feel it's unfair that the disabled bay of number 43 be moved as they have recently had their own hard standing parking bay built so surely they can use that. Car places are already limited within this street and if the disabled bay was moved to this side houses 44, 42 and 40 would find it hard to park.

We do not feel that these arrangements would help ease the problems as it would then put more pressure on alot of other surrounding roads.

**5. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

Thank you for your letter. I am writing to OBJECT to the proposed installation of double yellow lines on the south side of Shelley Avenue, for the following reasons:

- Your letter refers to the steep “gradient of the grass verge”, however this same gradient also makes it unsafe for people to regularly walk on and safely enter and exit parked vehicles. When the grass is wet the risk of injury will be even greater. I am especially concerned about this for the elderly and physically more vulnerable residents/visitors. By installing the double yellow lines as planned, PCC are exposing people to this hazard. Will the council be accepting liability for injury and/or damage to property if accidents happen? We do not want to encourage more exit and entry to vehicles from the roadside where possible. The safety of people needs to be properly thought through.
- Entering and exiting the car via the grass verge, potentially over muddy ground or worse, animal faeces, can be very inconvenient. Particularly if you are in clean/polished shoes, for example when on your way to work. We have experience of this because of parking on Browning Avenue. I have personally slipped up on the wet grass on Browning Avenue, which in comparison is relatively flat, while entering my car on the way to work. Fortunately, I was younger then and suffered no injury except for my trousers and shoes.
- Has any assessment been carried out on how many additional spaces, if any, this plan will create? From observations many of the houses with drives on the south side also often have cars parked across them in the evening after most people are home from work (at least until very recently when people decided to start parking on the north side). Could moving parking to the north side make less spaces available, particularly now drives have been installed on the north side?

- This proposal will not solve parking congestion. What is the council doing to actually solve this problem? Where is the improvement in frequent and affordable public transport? Why is Paulsgrove and particularly the west end of Paulsgrove the last area to be considered for car sharing schemes and e-scooter trials etc., when it is one of the furthest and least connected from the city centre and other areas of interest? If additional measures are put in place to ensure the safety of residents/visitors and to get more vehicles off the road and on people's own drives, I would be happy to withdraw my objection to this plan. Measures could include:

- Installation of a row of reasonably flat paving at the kerb edge so that cars can be accessed from the verge without walking on the sloped grass/mud. This will be especially important for those with disabled bays, the elderly, less mobile and young.

- If the south side receives double yellow lines there should be a relaxation of the latest dropped kerb rules (i.e. dimensions of front gardens required for approval) on Shelley Avenue for properties on the south side of the road so that they can provide additional off road parking, like many in the past have already done. In very recent years (circa 2020), the dimensions required in front gardens for dropped kerbs to be approved has increased to a point where it has now stopped some houses from being able to obtain approval for off-road parking, even though their neighbours with identical size gardens already have. Car sizes or other factors related to our ability to park in front gardens have not changed in the time the rules were made stricter and so the recent increase in required dimensions do not appear to be warranted. However if yellow lines are installed on the south side, dropped kerbs should now be encouraged (on the south side) including for those with gardens with previously acceptable dimensions. This will become even more important as more people switch to electric vehicles - having the ability to charge cars from peoples own homes will be necessary. This would also take some burden off the Council to provide street charging.

I am happy to discuss my objection, concerns raised and proposed measures with you if you wish. Please do not hesitate to get in touch.

**Shelley Avenue: Support for proposed double yellow lines**

**6. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

Many Thanks for latest action on the above parking situation in Shelley Ave being considered, the problem is increasing daily. I did pose the problem to our councillor some time ago but various problems came about but, we hope this plan will be carried out

**7. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I'd like the yellow lines to be placed on the south side of our road.

**8. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I agree the yellow lines should go on the south side of our road.

**9. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I wish the yellow lines to be on the south side of our road please Many thanks

**10. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I would like the yellow lines to be on the south side of our road please

**11. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I would like the double yellow lines to go on our side ( SOUTH).



**12. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I have read your letter and understand the need for action to take place .However I feel its to little and too late. Especially for myself and wife after living in Shelley for many years we recently successfully appealed for a drop kerb and Driveway we spent thousand of pounds in the process plus paying extra for having a line painted outside which will be no Longer required due to your proposal for double yellow lines

We only have one car by the way and we thought it would help when family visited to keep them safe .

The main problem is people having more than one car sometimes three plus per household and work vans you need to have a different approach .

I.E. Car parking permits one car £20.00 per year second car £200.00 third car £500.00 and work vans £1000.00 per household.

If you are going ahead please can you do it sooner rather than later as people are already parking opposite and not leaving space for service vehicle's should there be emergency in the road god forbid .

**Shelley Avenue: Feedback and suggestions**

**13. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

I agree with the plans to make one side of the road all double yellows. However I worry about people who have disable spaces, something needs to be done about the bank to make it easy for these people. and also people with small children and push chairs.

The bank on the side that is proposed for parking can be steep in places and slippy at times of wet weather. Something would need to be put in place maybe just a couple of slabs going into the grass verge to give something to walk on.

**14. Resident, Shelley Avenue**

There are 3 driveways along the 'North' side, No 18, 20 and 22. Two of these are suffering from persons parking across their driveways( taxi, delivery-non stop, large LGV, friends of neighbours etc) due to congestion and the yellow lines will cause further parking obstructions across the driveways as there will be nowhere to naturally stop if the lines are installed and all cars park on North side.

I am not against the yellow lines, I simply ask that the 3 driveways are also included with yellow lines. This will give us the freedom to come and go as we please and avoid confrontation with the law on our side. I am willing to pay, if this is a barrier to the decision process.

Please consider this proposal, as it took many years to get approval from the council and was very costly to install. Our driveways have become delivery parking slots for the street with the drivers ignoring our complaints; this is unacceptable and causing stress and anxiety. We have had to wait to exit our property on many occasions and our neighbour had issues with an important visit, that caused them a lot of stress.



### Woolner Avenue: Objections to double yellow lines

#### 15. Resident, Woolner Avenue

This road is very narrow with no possibility of creating additional off-road parking. There are currently 19 roadside spaces, (plus 1 disabled) and 12 houses in Woolner Ave. (4 with shared drive, 2 without any drive and 4 with virtually no drive). This necessitates some residents having to park at the top of the road and any reduction in roadside parking space will force cars to park in nearby roads.

A disproportionate number of spaces are occupied by either a Havant Road address or the recent addition of a large dropped kerb in Woolner Avenue serving a different Havant Road property. This effectively means that there are currently 20 roadside spaces to support 14 houses and the proposed amendment will reduce it by 10% to 18 spaces.

Since there has not been any accidents on this junction there seems to be no justification on the grounds of safety, particularly as the lines were increased in length not so long ago and I would therefore urge the council to reconsider and not to penalise the residents further.

#### 16. Resident, Havant Road

I strongly object to the additional 5 metres of double yellow lines that runs near my property (sic). If the current plans go ahead, we will lose three potential spaces. I have lived in Havant Road for many years and it has always been quite difficult to park, but since a neighbour moved in and installed a dropped curb; that's a further additional 2 spaces lost. Also, safety has never been an issue on this road, there hasn't been any collisions at all. I require for the reasoning for installing these lines on this road, if there have been no safety concerns previously since the neighbour has moved in, and has previously specified that they don't want anyone parked near their dropped curb.

### Magdala Road: Objections to double yellow lines

#### 17. Resident, Magdala Road

I object to the double yellow lines that you guys are planning to put in place. I object because some people on our road come back home late from work and it would be unfair on them because you guys are taking the parking places away. Thank you for your understanding.

#### 18. Resident, Magdala Road

In light of the pending changes to occur outside our home, we are deeply concerned and object on many accounts especially considering the devastating nature of my wife's poor health. She has suffered with severe mobility issues and needs extensive care and support which is provided by residents and relatives with a license to drive enabling access to many facilities required i.e. quick access to the local High Street etc.

Along with other regularly visiting elderly relatives that hold multiple health conditions and reduced mobility whom also do not possess a blue badge permit would alongside require immediate and easy access. Imposing double yellow lines would make finding adequate parking available and then walking from these areas extremely difficult and overwhelming. It

is vital that necessary efficiency in there travel is maintained and these double yellow lines will prove to be a hindrance for any caregivers/relatives restricted by them.

Unfortunately this impact will also be felt by many others as follows:

- The local town centre (Cosham High Street) need to allow for proper traffic flow, but incessant yellow lines will make everyday life unbearable for local shoppers who drive to find parking elsewhere
- Some say these over-zealous parking enforcement practices and unfair parking charges could possibly force people away from the high street and into out-of-town shopping centres or online correlating to inactivity for shop owners/businesses in terms of footfall and leading to issues in business operations
- Removing parking entirely can result in higher vehicle speeds which in turn pose dangers to local school children and more that use these streets daily in their travel routes

With the livelihood of our home and neighbours' directly impacted through this imposition we implore you to reconsider and enforce the right to trigger a formal council led review of road restrictions within the area. Where possible suitable alternatives should be considered and undertaken including those that may prove to be greatly affordable and equally as effective. In any case if more action can be taken please do let us know.

**Hayling Avenue: Objections to reducing the length of double yellow lines**

**19. Resident, Hayling Avenue**

I am responding to your notice regarding the reduction of the double yellow lines adjacent to the houses 89 and 99 Hayling Ave. Some years ago the local residence along with a Councilor had meeting regarding the double lines in question. There is a access road between no 93-95 to approx. 20 garages, when approaching Hayling Ave. From the access you come up at an incline making difficult to get a clear view of traffic approaching. When it was agreed to extend the lines as they are at Present made the viewing of oncoming cars clearer and safer. By planning to reduce them in size is only going to create the difficulty in seeing if is safe to enter Hayling Ave. Seeing we have more traffic on our roads roads now, the possibility of a accident occurring will rise. Why were we not consulted about this decision? I am quite convinced that the decision has been made by people who do not live in this area, with no thought to safety. So I am asking that you reconsider this unwise decision to avoid serious accidents, should the worst happen and a accident occurs, you will have contributed to this incident happening. Remember precaution is better than cure.

**20. Resident, Hayling Avenue**

I have seen the proposal to reduce the double yellow lines in Hayling Avenue and would not want to see this implemented.

The junction is very busy for both cars and pedestrians and is used as a holding area due to the length between Marina Grove junction and Ebery Grove junction.



My house currently has double yellows outside, I can't park in front of my home so it may seem bizarre that I would not want the chance to increase parking, but I do believe that by increasing the spaces available it has the potential to cause an accident.

I am not sure what further information you would require but please do come back to me if you do. It would clearly benefit me, but I don't believe it is the right decision in this location

### **Hayling Avenue: comments to be considered**

#### **21. PCC staff member (no address given)**

The double yellow lines were put in place originally I am told to assist with the access road and all the garages behind 83 Hayling Avenue and all the houses up to 125.

The bus stop went last year when the road was resurfaced but residents have been told the raised kerb is remaining as the bus route may return.

The high kerb where the bus stop was is still in place, and this could cause damage to low vehicles if they open the door onto this higher kerb. I agree a few feet could get removed from outside 87/89 up to the high kerb (old bus stop) and that would allow for another two vehicles to park but no further.

The distance of travel between Marina Grove and Ebery is completely different to all other roads along Hayling Avenue and with vehicles parking on both sides there is often conflict and the space currently afforded to drivers reduces this conflict.

Additionally Marina Grove itself is a very busy junction in its own right acting as an access road to Jenkins Grove, Cedar Grove plus Stride Avenue so you might need to look into this proposal a little more deeply

To be honest the reduction of 5 m either end will not make a huge difference in principle so I can't in all seriousness object to this. The problem is currently there are one or two persistent offenders who insist on parking on the double yellows (west side of Marina Grove) which I know is not your issue.

With the extra parking space either end, this will just force those who don't care about double yellows to encroach further onto the junction with Marina Grove but that is not reasonable grounds to object to this.

*(Officer note: the illegal parking has been reported to the Traffic Management Centre, for additional enforcement visits)*

### **Cheslyn Road: Objection to double yellow lines**

#### **22. Resident, Cheslyn Road**

I am writing to you as I wish to object to the proposal to have double yellow lines down Cheslyn Road, and would suggest that Parking permits be issued instead.



I find it nearly impossible to park outside my block as this is taken up by commercial vehicles and cars from people that live further down the road, or in neighbouring roads. You cannot imagine how frustrating it can be to see people leave their commercial vans outside the block and walk down the road where they already have 2 cars and a driveway!

The curb around the bend opposite is sometimes the only place I can find to park, especially with parking enforcement around the garages.

Can I please suggest that the road is restricted so residents have to obtain a parking permit to park down Cheslyn road (like the majority of the city), which would also help when Portsmouth FC games start again. Or, can I please suggest that the area behind the block of flats (huge concrete area with washing lines which is barely used) is turned into parking spaces for the block of flats.

*(Officer note: the request for permit parking has been recorded; Cheslyn Road does not currently appear on the Residents' Parking Programme of Consultation due to low demand from residents. The suggestion of converting the area behind the flats into parking has been passed to the Property & Housing Service for consideration, as the area is not part of the public highway).*

### **Bapaume Road/Peronne Road double yellow lines**

#### **23. Resident, Peronne Road**

I have recently seen the sign regarding yellow lines in the above roads.

I have spoken to some residents of Austin Court and we feel that by doing this we lose some of our parking spaces, as it will push vans into our road, which we are not happy about. I am sure you are aware that most people now a days have more than one vehicle, and yes we have private parking but for only one car, so many residents park in Bapaume Road, this will making parking more difficult for residents.

Yes, put yellow lines, but maybe just a shorter one on the corners as it would be safer when pulling out of Bapaume Road. If you really want to do something to improve Peronne Road, can I suggest you install speed bumps as it is being used as a 'rat run' most days. That would be a lot safer. Anyhow, some residents are agreeing that the 30 meters of yellow lines in Peronne Road, is the wrong way to go.....

Update on my last email to you....I have checked Peronne Road for this sign....no where to be seen, no where in the area you intend to yellow line!!! It's tucked the wrong way in Bapaume Road, that's unfair as no one in Peronne Road will be aware of this. I think you are all bang out of order, why don't you send letters to the residents in the area you are considering to yellow line...

I am hoping that you will be accommodating and listen.

I totally understand that you want to put yellow lines on Peronne Road, but surely, just for a few yards and not the 30 metres that you intend to do. I look out onto Bapaume Road and Peronne Road and well aware of the issues. As I said that will be making parking difficult for us....we also have people from Feltons Place park here too, as parking down there can get full up in the evening. I am guessing that no one has been this way in the evenings getting

their info by popping by only during the day. I would really like that someone would be in conversation with me, so that this matter can be sorted instead of PCC or whoever is dealing with this and thinks this is a good idea to try convince me that this is so. Look forward to getting a response from some one PLEASE.

*(Officer note: 2 public notices were displayed in the location. Following the resident's email a further 2 notices were put up, during the consultation period. The resident received a response accordingly. Properties in Peronne Rd fronting onto the proposed location for restrictions were sent a copy of the notice via post in addition to the standard measures; this resident responded to the street notices).*

### **Old Bridge Road: Support for proposed shared RPZ bays**

#### **24. Resident, Welch Road**

I have lived in Southsea for many years, so I am very familiar with parking issues in the area. I was informed that the TROteam e-mail could be used to send positive comments about the parking proposals. So I would like to comment about the following:

H) CHANGE TO MF PARKING BAYS TO INCLUDE MD PERMIT HOLDERS: MF AND MD PERMIT HOLDERS 11AM-NOON AND 6PM-7PM

##### **1. Old Bridge Road**

Both sides, all parking bays in the road (approximately 26 parking spaces).

Myself and my partner fully support this proposal for the following reason. Before residents parking was introduced I was always able to park in the Old Bridge Road area if there were no parking spaces nearer to our house. However, since the introduction of residents permits Old Bridge Road comes under the MF zone and as a carer for my partner I can't always be available to move our car before restrictions apply. So the above proposal would be very useful for us, particularly as there always appear to be spaces available in Old Bridge Road. Also some measure of overspill between zones could possibly help with some of the current issues.

#### **25. Resident, St Ronan's Road**

I would just like to add my support to the following proposition: CHANGE TO MF PARKING BAYS TO INCLUDE MD PERMIT HOLDERS:

MF AND MD PERMIT HOLDERS 11AM-NOON AND 6PM-7PM 1. Old Bridge Road. Both sides, all parking bays in the road (approximately 26 parking spaces).

My shifts often start (and end) at 3am, and I have often really struggled to find a space to park when I am returning from work in the small hours.

I had previously parked in Old Bridge Road, as there were many available spaces, and I thought that I was able to park there as it is literally a 2 minute walk from my house, but unfortunately, I have discovered to my cost that this is not the case.

If you could please arrange for these bays to become available, I would really appreciate it!



**Kingsley Road: Objection to proposed double yellow lines**

**26. Resident, Kingsley Road**

I would like to raise an objection to the proposed double yellow lines on the north side of Kingsley road running westwards from the junction with Ironbridge lane (as stated in TRO 39/2021). The proposed 5 metre length will severely restrict being able to park my vehicle outside of my property. As such, I would like the proposed 5 metre length to be reduced. I would also like a surveyor from the council to visit my property in order to show the exact position of the proposed yellow lines and discuss reducing the length of these lines. I appreciate the need to improve visibility at junctions, however I believe that shortening the length of the lines would not compromise this.

*(End of report)*