1. Purpose of report

1.1 To consider the responses to the second public consultation regarding the proposals to reverse the existing one-way system within Montague Road.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Option 2, the existing layout of the current one-way remains unchanged.

2.2 That appropriate action is taken to improve the parking arrangements and enforcement within the proximity of the Tesco Express store within the vicinity of Montague Road.

3. Background

3.1 Following a request from the Local Councillors, Portsmouth City Council were asked to canvas residents' views regarding whether they would support the reversal of the existing one-way system within operation in Montague Road. The current one-way system allows traffic to travel east for its entire length from its junction with London Road to its junction with Beresford Road.

3.2 Montague Road is perceived by residents to be a heavily trafficked residential road due to the location of a Tesco Express store located on the southern side of the junction of London Road/Montague Road. Residents have complained to Councillors of it being utilised as a 'rat-run' by traffic wishing to utilise the store. Montague Road, along with surrounding residential roads within the vicinity, is part of the citywide 20mph speed limit which was implemented in October 2007.
3.3 The Parking Team conducted a review of the penalties issued within the vicinity of Montague Road from 01 January 2014 until 14 January 2015. For this time period records indicated that 296 penalty notices had been issued to vehicles within Montague Road that had illegally parked within the area.

3.4 A postal consultation was carried out with residents of Montague Road and Beresford Road (from its junction with Kirby Road to its junction with Stubbington Avenue) from the end of June 2014 until 06 August 2014. The results were as follows:

From the 120 letters addressed to residents we received 47 completed voting forms (a return of 39%). The breakdown of the results is as follows:

Option 1 - Consisting of the proposal to reverse the direction of the existing one-way system within Montague Road (Traffic would travel westbound from its junction with Beresford Road to its junction with London Road) - received 20 votes from residents (43% of returns);

Option 2 - That the existing layout of Montague Road remains unchanged (Traffic would continue to travel eastbound from its junction with London Road to its junction with Beresford Road) - received 27 votes from residents (57%);

3.5 Unfortunately, several residents within the area, including Belham Apartments, were not included within the consultation. Therefore, this was deemed to be flawed and a more detailed consultation undertaken with residents within the area.

3.6 A second postal consultation was carried out during December 2014 until 19 January 2015. This was supported with a drop-in session that was held at North End Bowling Club, Beresford Road on Wednesday 17th December 2014 from 18:00 to 20:00. The purpose of this session was that residents could drop-in at any time during the event to discuss and ask questions regarding the proposals with officers and Local Ward Councillors.

3.7 Portsmouth City Council sent out 149 consultation letters and voting forms to the residents within the area, including those who had been missed during the first public consultation. (A plan of the agreed consultation area can be found in Appendix 1). From the 149 letters addressed to the residents we received 57 completed voting forms (a return of 38%). The breakdown of the results is as follows:

Option 1 - That the existing layout of Montague Road remains unchanged (Traffic would continue to travel eastbound from its junction with London Road to its junction with Beresford Road) - received 38 votes from residents (67%);

Option 2 - Consisting of the proposal to reverse the direction of the existing one-way system within Montague Road (Traffic would travel westbound from its junction with Beresford Road to its junction with London Road) - received 19 votes from residents (33% of returns);

4. Reasons for recommendations
4.1 Option 1, the existing layout of Montague Road remains unchanged, received the majority of votes from those residents that participated within the consultation;

4.2 Due to the difficulty of predicting the effect the possible changes to the existing one-way would have on traffic patterns within the area the Transport and Environment Service will continue to monitor vehicle speeds and volumes and address any problems that may arise in the future;

4.3 By retaining the existing layout, drivers familiar with the area that drive without acknowledging any possible changes within the area will be less lightly to violate the existing one-way Traffic Regulation Order. There will also be a reduced risk of confrontation between drivers.

4.4 Due to vehicles parking inconsiderately within the entrance of Montague Road at the London Road junction, consideration can be given to implementing measures to prevent this from happening. There are also measures that could be considered that would make the parking self-enforcing at the junction and prevent vehicles from violating the existing one-way. However, it will be necessary for funding to be identified to allow for these possible improvements.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)
5.1 An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendation does not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

6. Legal comments
6.1 Traffic regulation orders (TROs) can be made for a number of reasons, including avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road, for preventing damage to the road or any building on or near the road, for facilitating the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians) or preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

6.2 A TRO may include provisions prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles. A TRO may also make provisions prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic of a particular class specified in the order subject to such exceptions as may be so specified or determined, either at all times or at times, on days or during periods so specified.

6.3 A proposed TRO must be advertised, the appropriate bodies notified and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.
6.4 If it is decided to modify any parking restrictions it will be necessary to follow the above procedures to amend or introduce any TRO and if there are any objections the matter must be brought before the executive member again.

7. Head of Finance’s comments

Any proposals that arise following the review into measures to improve the parking arrangements and enforcement as referenced in recommendation 2.2 will need to be financially appraised and a source of funding found to implement them. These will be brought to a future meeting where the costs and potential funding sources will be proposed for recommendation.

..............................................................
Head of Transport and Environment

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of document</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Table of Responses and comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing - Montague 01 - Existing Layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing - Montague 02 - Reverse One-Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Road Voting Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by Councillor Ken Ellcome on 5 February 2015.

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