

Appendix C

Responses to Traffic Regulation Order 137/2023 Consultation for Portsmouth Car Club designated parking bays

Specific car club bay	Comment Received	Objection/Support
<b>Central Southsea - Talbot Road, Devonshire Square, Francis Avenue</b>		
Devonshire Square	<p>I wish to register an objection to the proposed designated Car Club parking for Devonshire Square. Parking in this area is already problematic due to a high level of car ownership, and many houses being HMOs or having additional business vehicles (at least one taxi, a delivery van, a flatbed van, and a removal van regularly park in this street overnight). It's a regular occurrence to have to park several streets away in the evening. Because we've been forced to find parking in areas outside our zone in recent months, we've also received parking fines - an unwelcome additional cost to the parking charge we pay for our two cars. In addition, football traffic parks in this area which puts additional pressure on the availability of parking for residents during weekends and evenings, despite the 5-7pm restriction. Although the street has 14 spaces &amp; 11 properties, the property beside ours has multiple occupants, as does that opposite - with additional associated vehicles. In addition, Devonshire Square is often used for overspill parking for residents of Jubilee and Bath Roads, which evidently have very tight parking. Consequently, I would ask you to reconsider the location of this particular Car Club space.</p>	Objection
Francis Avenue and All	<p>This TRO removes a further 11 Parking permit bays from the city which will mean the cars that used these places will now be pushed into other streets creating more of a parking concern, at this rate parking permits will be of no use as time goes on there will be no places available within your permit area.</p> <p>Fancies Avenue is a concern as this will mean for permit holders we are losing another space, recently to a Bike shed that would be better suited to flat fronted houses directly onto the street and areas of flats and apartments rather</p>	Objection

	<p>than in a road that houses have front porches and in some cases back alleyways to store bikes within their own sheds which some have purchased and placed within their own front porch.</p> <p>In total this year alone Francis Avenue will lose approx. 5 parking spaces, 1 to the bike shed, 1 for car share and around 3 at the top by Goldsmith Avenue.</p> <p>It also seems once all the work has finished by Fratton Bridge another pedestrian crossing by lights, closure of Orchard Road. More traffic will be pushed to use Fawcett Road, Victoria Avenue as more traffic builds up by Fratton Bridge due to slow movement along Goldsmith Avenue therefore pushing traffic toward using Jessie Road, Devonshire Avenue.</p> <p>Basically all you are doing is pushing traffic to make more rat runs.</p> <p>What happens in the future when more electric cars are around more parking places lost to be used for charging but not for parking??</p> <p>Who made the decision to put a cycle/scooter lane directly in front of a bus stand at Fratton Bridge accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>It is getting more dangerous to walk on a pavement with bikes and electric scooters using them instead of the road, which apparently is illegal but nothing is done about it.</p>	
<b>Eastney and Craneswater - Festing Grove, Kimberley Road, Cranewater Park</b>		
Craneswater Park	The proposal doesn't specify what signage will be introduced either on the road itself or the wall or lamppost next to the space. Also the proposal doesn't specify if the current residents parking time restrictions will apply to the space. Please could you clarify.	Clarification requested regarding signage and road markings to be used
<b>St Jude - Clarence Road, Victoria Rd South, Kent Road</b>		
Kent Road	<p><u>Three separate objections received, as detailed below</u></p> <p>I am not against the scheme as I believe it could work electric cars placed around the city for general use may ease the current traffic issues. My objection is to the placement of the dedicated space for it in Kent Rd, the KC zone is already over subscribed with a maximum of 2 residents permits per household. I understand it is only 1 space but why take that away when a space on Pier Rd could be utilised where KC permit holders cannot park. Parking near to our properties is vital for easy access for loading and unloading, shopping, holidays, children etc. I would ask that</p>	3 Objections for Kent Road. Support for scheme overall

	you take residents concerns into consideration and move the placement of the space to Pier Rd for future support in projects.	
KC Residents Parking Zone - Clarence Road and Kent Road	<p>I would like to put in my objection to the 'Car Club' happening within the KC Zone for the reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parking is already hard enough without adding more rental cars to the mix.</li> <li>2. Extra risk of damage to my car from users in rental cars which there are not fully familiarised with. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If damage did happen by rental car how would I go about claiming?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The extra risk of people driving non-familiarised cars.</li> <li>4. The area has a school next to the area proposed which puts even more risk on people driving non-familiarised cars.</li> <li>5. How does the system stop people from coming out of the pubs nearby getting into a rental and driving when under the influence. Note I have seen this happen with the E-scooters.</li> <li>6. If the rental car stays in a car spot who is paying for the parking if I had visitors to my flat and there had a car I then would have to pay for visitor parking. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does this mean as a resident I don't require paying my yearly parking and visitors?</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Also, never had a survey on this just saw two signs mentioned in brief detail. We can not lose that many parking spots in this area, as I am a blue light on-call responder I know for a fact that my response time is already affected by the parking situation.</p>	Objection
<b>Comment not bay specific</b>		
All	<p>I would like to register my objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Has PCC not learnt its lesson from the disastrous e-scooter scheme? More parking spaces being lost to "Car Club" vehicles...why? The people who hire these vehicles will not look after them, as they won't be theirs. Who will check them, clean them, make sure they aren't parked dangerously or left abandoned in locations where they will create problems for local residents? No doubt the</p>	Objection

	<p>police, just like with the e-scooter scheme, will not have the time to deal with issues created</p> <p>Please do not implement YET ANOTHER ridiculous scheme when you know, you absolutely know, that there will be zero enforcement.</p>	
All	<p>I am writing to object to 137/2023 for the 'car club' on three counts.</p> <p>First, the planning notices themselves were placed in an inadequate way. The notices have supposedly been up for 20 days and have not seen them. The notices should be more widely spread, the only two I have been able to see this afternoon are hidden behind areas where cars are constantly parked, only a pedestrian on that particular side of the road would be able to see them. My partner and I personally walked down that road as recently as 29.04.23 and did not see them as we were on the opposite path.</p> <p>Additionally as the car scheme will directly effect the residents of the local area notifying residents directly rather than just placing them in a half hidden location would have been more effective. Frankly, I have seen tree cutting notices better signposted. I would argue direct notification should be made and signs placed more widely in the effected area to allow a genuine public consultation before 137/2023 moves forward.</p> <p>Secondly, the example seen in relation to the scooter hire scheme demonstrates that the dangers short term hire cars pose are unacceptable. I have personally seen people walk directly from pubs in Southsea to the scooter rentals and drive them drunk. I have seen people on scooters crash and also fall in front of moving vehicles, both at day time and at night. The hire of cars to potentially intoxicated people, with little to no verification that the drivers license registered on their smart device matches the person driving, or that that person is sober is terrifying. Given the area of the notices includes a school that has groups of young children walking around between buildings at all times of day there are also concerns for the safety of those school children if an incompetent, intoxicated or unlicensed driver gets behind the wheel. thirdly, parking in the area is already vastly inadequate for the number of cars and the level of tourism. As someone who lives in the area and regularly has parking and driving access removed or restricted, for example during runs or Victorious, reducing parking is not a viable option.</p>	Objection

	<p>My partner is part of the blue light services and is regularly on call for life or death situations and inadequate parking already increases his response times putting lives of locals and tourists at risk - no doubt an issue not isolated to him. Getting rid of personal vehicles is not viable for many locals, such as ourselves, and tourists have plenty of options for transport. Steps such as limiting the number of days a local permit holder can add visitor cars at the reduced fee, or putting it on a sliding fee as with the number of cars per address would be much more effective at limiting the number of cars in the area. In summary, this plan has been under publicised to the local residents, offers little to no benefit for the people who actually live in the area, and will put residents and local children in unnecessary danger.</p>	
<b>Email response received prior to start of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Consultation</b>		
Kimberley Road	<p>An email was received prior to the start of the car club TRO consultation, enquiring about the proposed car club bay in Kimberley Road, as detailed below. No formal objection was made during the TRO consultation period, but this feedback has been included, as it raises concerns regarding the loss of a parking space in this road:</p> <p>Where is this bay to be located? Has there been any consultation with the residents who are about to lose yet more space for parking in what is already a busy street? If not, why not</p>	Submitted as an enquiry, not as part of TRO Consultation