

Agenda item:

Title of meeting: Traffic and Transportation Committee

Date of meeting: 05 February 2015

Subject: Parking restriction proposals in various locations:
Traffic Regulation Order No.77/2014

Report by: Head of Transport and Environment

Wards affected: All

Key decision: ~~Yes~~/No

Full Council decision: ~~Yes~~/No

1. Purpose of report

To consider the responses to the formal public consultation on proposals contained within this Traffic Regulation Order. There is a statutory requirement to take into consideration any comments from the public before determining whether to confirm or refuse an order whenever objections are received to advertised proposals.

See Page 12 for the road-by-road proposals advertised during formal public consultation undertaken between 03 - 31 December 2014.

See Pages 5-11 for a summary of the consultation responses.

2. Recommendation

That the Order is brought into operation as advertised, with the exception of:

- 2.1 the proposal to reduce the double yellow lines on the south side of Devonshire Avenue (west of Prince Albert Road junction) in light of the response from Portsmouth Cycle Forum.**

3. Background

In response to concerns raised by residents, businesses, ward councillors, public and emergency services, along with changes to road layout and usage, this order aims to introduce and amend parking restrictions in various roads to –

a) improve road safety, pedestrian safety, visibility and traffic management (reducing congestion), and improve access for the emergency services, public services, delivery vehicles and refuse collection vehicles

b) amend, introduce and/or remove parking restrictions to accommodate changing local needs and make the most effective use of the public highway

4. Reasons for recommendation

4.1 The proposals were drawn up following concerns raised by members of the public and/or public services about each location. The proposals were then put forward under TRO 77/2014 for formal public consultation. The initial reasons for the enquiries and the subsequent responses to the public consultation have been taken into account and contribute to the recommendations:

10 expressions of support

8 objections

4 comments / suggestions

4.2 Havant Road: The response to the proposal is disappointing as each household on both sides of Havant Road between Portsdown Avenue and Rectory Avenue was advised of the proposal by letter and given the opportunity to comment. 14 out of 174 properties represents an 8% return. However, as those who did respond showed a majority in support (9-2) the recommendation is that the proposal is approved and implemented.

4.3 Ferry Road: One resident expressed concern at vehicles parking at the Fort Cumberland Road end of Ferry Road, hence the proposal to extend the double yellow lines. A separate resident objected to the extension of the parking restrictions given the impact on the rest of the road and other issues that exist there. Engineers are currently working on proposals to better manage the parking arrangements along the length of Ferry Road, and therefore the recommendation to delete the current proposal is made so that the road can be considered as a whole.

4.4 Devonshire Avenue: The Portsmouth Cycle Forum has expressed concern at the reduction of any double yellow lines, in this case in Devonshire Avenue. There are currently 10 metres of double yellow lines; the shortest length that would be considered is 7 metres, leaving is scope for a 3 metre reduction. The current parking arrangement gives 2.5 spaces: the proposal allows for 3 spaces without vehicles overhanging the double yellow lines or dropped kerb at either end.

- 4.5.1 Whitecliffe Avenue / Hayling Avenue: Although Hayling Avenue's junctions with Lichfield Road, Sunningdale Road, Ascot Road, Whitecliffe Ave and Chilcote Road all have 7 metres of double yellow lines, the north side of this junction has been highlighted by residents as a particular problem in terms of visibility and safe turning onto Hayling Avenue. In an area where on-street parking is at a premium, these concerns are not made or taken lightly.
- 4.5.2 The 2-metre extension to the double yellow lines in Whitecliffe Avenue (east side, northwards) aims to prevent confusion. The existing restriction is 1 metre shorter than the end of the dropped kerb entrance, leading motorists to think they can park immediately after the double yellow lines. However, it is a contravention of parking laws to obstruct a dropped kerb and the 2-metre extension will prevent any fines being issued as a result of misunderstanding.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

This report has undergone a preliminary equality impact assessment and there are no equality issues arising from this report.

6. Legal Implications

- 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 make include provisions prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles. A TRO may also make a provision prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic of a particular class specified in the order subject to such exceptions as may be so specified or determined, either at all times or at times, on days or during periods so specified.
- 6.3 A proposed TRO must be advertised and the public given a 3 week consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.

7. Finance Comments

- 7.1 The costs associated with implementing items A,B,D,E,F,G,H,I & J of this order are estimated to be £5,700 which includes the commuted sum that pays for the ongoing maintenance cost.
- 7.2 The above costs will be met from the existing on street parking revenue budget.

- 7.3** The resources required to enforce this traffic regulation order can be met by the parking function and no other additional revenue costs will be incurred as a results of its implementation.
- 7.4** The costs associated with implementing item C of this order is estimated to be £17,400 which includes the commuted sum that pays for the ongoing maintenance cost. This cost will be funded by the Local Transport Plan.

.....
Signed by:
Head of Transport & Environment Service

Pages 5-11: summary of public consultation responses
Page 12 - public notice detailing the proposals

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
20 emails / letters	Transport Planning, 4 th floor, Civic Offices

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

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

Summary of public consultation responses.

Support - Havant Road (Drayton & Farlington) double yellow lines and cycle lane on north side.

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>This action has been a long time coming and is most welcome. With the current parking, Havant Road is reduced to a single lane in places. We also have a layby at the end of our drive, where inconsiderate drivers block our access and sometimes cars for sale and long term 'parkers' are left for weeks at a time. When this passing area (layby) is blocked it caused tailbacks eastbound as drivers wait to turn right into Lower Farlington Road.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>The response from residents of Havant Road in support of the proposals highlights the issues currently experienced by motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed cycle lane in place of parked vehicles will improve visibility and reduce traffic congestion on the main distributor road, which is also a bus route.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>I experience the safety hazards associated with parked vehicles on a daily basis and fully support this proposal. My grounds of support are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is dangerous exiting a driveway in reverse onto a main highway when vision is obscured by parked vehicles; - Cyclists tend to use the pavement because of parked vehicles; - Havant Road is a main route for emergency vehicles from QA hospital, a major bus route and used by HGV from the industrial estate onto the A3; - Road sweeping vehicles cannot clean the road when vehicles are parked; - All properties on the north side of Havant Road have off-road parking, so there is no need for parking on this side of the road. Ample parking is available on the side roads if required by visitors; - This section of road did have yellow lines but they were not replaced after resurfacing . 	<p>Whilst a single lane for two-way traffic can reduce vehicle speeds, the result on a major road such as Havant Road is more likely to be significant congestion and poor manoeuvring by frustrated motorists, leading to risks to public safety.</p> <p>The proposals also seek to improve cycling provision on Havant Road, encouraging more people to cycle by providing a safer environment in which to do so. Cyclists, those less confident in particular, will feel able to use the road if it is not obstructed by parked vehicles, rather than using the footways.</p> <p>The success of the cycle route will be monitored and the outcomes used to consider the feasibility of extending it further towards Cosham and/or to the south side of Havant Road.</p>

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> The section of Havant Road between Portsdown Avenue and Farlington Avenue is increasingly dangerous with multiple cars and commercial vehicles parked on both sides of the road, especially during drop off and pick up times for Solent Road Junior and Infant Schools. With parents and young children in the road and between cars it also makes it difficult to get cars on and off driveways safely, as well as interrupting the flow of traffic around the busy junctions. The cycle lane would also help to get cyclists off the pavement and back onto the road. I have witnessed multiple near-misses between cyclists and pedestrians with cars going on and off driveways and adult cyclists racing along the north side of Havant Road.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u> The response from residents of Havant Road in support of the proposals highlights the issues currently experienced by motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed cycle lane in place of parked vehicles will improve visibility and reduce traffic congestion on the main distributor road, which is also a bus route.</p> <p>Whilst a single lane for two-way traffic can reduce vehicle speeds, the result on a major road such as Havant Road is more likely to be significant congestion and poor manoeuvring by frustrated motorists, leading to risks to public safety.</p> <p>The proposals also seek to improve cycling provision on Havant Road, encouraging more people to cycle by providing a safer environment in which to do so. Cyclists, those less confident in particular, will feel able to use the road if it is not obstructed by parked vehicles, rather than using the footways.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> I would like to offer my support for the cycle route along Havant Road and would like feedback on the final result.</p>	
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> Double yellow lines on Havant Road is great news and will make people with more than 1 car use their drives, and hopefully stop people parking vans on the road.</p>	<p>The success of the cycle route will be monitored and the outcomes used to consider the feasibility of extending it further towards Cosham and/or to the south side of Havant Road.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> Pleased you are at long last doing something about the parking on the north side of this road. At busy times the parking has brought a major road to a standstill with 2 lanes of traffic trying to get between parked cars. It's important that the new traffic lights at the Havant Road / Eastern Road junction are phased better to ensure the queues aren't even longer. I support the cycle lane but am not sure what advisory means - a continuous lane will be difficult on the dual carriageway section between Farlington Ave and Eastern Rd. Cyclists will continue to ride on the pavement as they do now, and risk injury from a car exiting a drive.</p>	<p>The Network Management team can advise on the function of replacement traffic lights, which is not relevant to this report.</p> <p>Advisory relates to a cycle lane that can be installed where the road width is insufficiently wide to accommodate a mandatory cycle lane. Whilst not enforceable, the cycle lane will alert motorists to the presence of cyclists. The double yellow lines are included to prevent parking within the cycle lane. Mandatory cycle lanes prohibit any vehicle other than a cycle from using that section of road, which would prevent access to and from the driveways.</p>

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> I support this proposal and believe it should be extended to restrict parking to non-commercial vehicles only (e.g.no vans). There are a number of these that restrict views and safe entry when turning onto Havant Road from roads south. I only have one concern - the respite centre (235 Havant Rd) where vehicles park for a short time to allow the disabled children to be removed from their transport. Could a small length of the road outside allow a waiting time of approximately 30 minutes? Looking forward to a speedy conclusion to this proposal, as the current road conditions are inviting an accident to happen.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u> See comments on previous pages.</p> <p>Restricting commercial vehicles from using the public roads to park is difficult as the term "Commercial Vehicles" is recognised by the Department for Transport as vehicles over 5T in weight. Locally however, residents apply the term "commercial vehicle" equally to cars (e.g. child minders or estate agents) and to medium-sized vans used for utilities, double-glazing, property maintenance etc (all under 5T in weight).</p> <p>Whilst it is not possible to add further proposals to this Order without consultation, a short-term parking bay or alternative measure can be considered if the resident's concern is realised. Double yellow lines allow vehicles to drop off and collect passengers, which may meet the requirements.</p> <p>The Council's Civil Enforcement Officers enforce marked parking restrictions. Sometimes locations require additional attention. Residents can inform the Traffic Management Centre on 023 9268 8291.</p> <p>The double yellow lines and cycle lane would prevent long-term parking and therefore encourage local employees to consider alternative methods of commuting, including car-sharing, public transport, walking, cycling etc.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> We feel this is an excellent proposal, given the appalling parking situation on Havant Road. Our only concern is that parking on the south side of the road will increase. Cars/vans/delivery vehicles still park at the Waterworks Rd bus stop despite yellow lines. Staff from the Alexandra Rose Home constantly park on both sides of the road and vehicles are left for long periods despite the assurance that the Home would provide parking at the Planning Permission stage.</p>	

Objections - Havant Road (Drayton & Farlington) double yellow lines and cycle lane on north side.

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u> My complaint is that no route is proposed on the south side for westbound traffic.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u> There is no requirement to do so, but the Council would look at feasibility for doing that following the completion on the north side, allowing time for it to mature and if there was support from residents.</p>
--	---

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>I am not aware the highway needs any alteration to enable its most effective use or a change in the needs of the neighbourhood. Any changes to the current configuration is liable to lead to less than optimum traffic flows.</p> <p>Practicality - Narrowing the highway to accommodate a cycle lane is liable to needlessly add to traffic congestion whilst providing little or no advantage to the few cyclists using the road. This route is a primary one for emergency vehicles outbound from QA hospital. No alterations should be made that impede their progress. The proposal will make the pinch point outside St Andrews Church worse. Between Farlington Avenue and Eastern Road the cycle lane will narrow the 2 lanes, potentially leading to excessive traffic queuing and associated rise in exhaust pollutants.</p> <p>Financial impact - Local government funding is currently severely constricted, adversely affecting the ability to provide services and guarantee employees' long-term futures. The proposed changes will have a cost associated with their installation, maintenance and enforcement. I would like to see the cost/benefit analysis and business case to show this is best use of the Council's scarce resources.</p>	<p><u>Officer's comments</u></p> <p>The reasons for the proposal, issues also highlighted by residents and motorists, indicate there is a need to maintain 2-way traffic on the busy Havant Road to avoid congestion, to improve visibility of oncoming traffic and a need to improve provisions for safer cycling.</p> <p>The majority of the route will see on-street parking replaced on one side by double yellow lines, enabling 2-way traffic flows and allowing more cyclists to use this route safely, thus encouraging consideration of sustainable transport.</p> <p>There is a short section along Havant Road that does narrow and is currently unrestricted on both sides. Continuing the cycle lane is more practical than breaking it up. One of the key benefits of a cycle lane is that its presence highlights to drivers that cyclists are around and to be more aware, reducing the risks. Psychological road narrowing has a calming effect on traffic speeds.</p> <p>See the Finance section of this report. The scheme is relatively inexpensive compared to the significant costs of attending a serious accident, and meets the council's statutory obligations to improve road safety.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal. There is already a lack of parking along Havant Road as it is. I always have cars parked either tight to my entrance of part across the drive. Havant Road is not wide enough to accommodate a cycle path, which will result in cars parking down the side streets taking up residents' parking, and if residents do have a drive it's only for 1 car. Elderly visitors and care workers won't be able to park near or outside the property. There is no safety issue, so if it's not broken don't try to fix it by wasting time and money.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>Havant Road is not wide enough to accommodate a cycle lane without restricting parking on one side with double yellow lines.</p> <p>The reasons for the proposal and grounds for residents supporting it (see above) outweigh potential parking issues, which can be addressed separately if realised.</p>

Comments / suggestions - Havant Road (Drayton & Farlington) double yellow lines and cycle lane on north side.

<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>I don't object to the double yellow lines, but fail to see the benefit of a cycle lane on an already narrow and congested busy main road. I have witnessed several near misses on this road because of traffic parked on both sides so surely a cycle lane and double yellow lines will have the same problem.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>The double yellow lines will enable the cycle lane to be installed, as they remove the on-street parking. With vehicles parking on one side of Havant Road only, the problems caused by parking on both sides will be resolved.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>Will the cycle way go along the same route as the double yellow lines? If so how can it be implemented from Galt Road to Rectory Avenue as this is such a narrow piece of road?</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>For the majority of the route there is ample width once parked vehicles are removed to provide a cycle lane. Whilst there is a short section along Havant Road that does narrow it makes sense to continue the lane rather than stop and start it. One of the key benefits of a cycle lane is that its presence highlights to drivers that cyclists are around and to be more aware, reducing the risks. Psychological road narrowing can have a calming effect on traffic speeds.</p>
<p><u>Resident, Havant Road</u></p> <p>The following will need addressing to make any cycle lane proposal safe:</p> <p>The lighting columns between Gillman Rd and Old Rectory Rd are too high and surrounded by tree canopies. This will need assessing.</p> <p>There are no speed signs beyond the 40mph sign as you enter 'Portsmouth' and people regularly drive along here between 30-70mph - no 30mph are visible (except when joining from a side road). Infrequent speed traps are set but the width of the road and coming from the motorway/dual carriageway onto Havant Road with a clear stretch into Farlington is not defined enough for people to switch from 'fast' mode to 'town' mode.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>The team that deals with street lighting have received this information and the site will be inspected.</p> <p>The proposal relates to eastbound traffic (the north side of Havant Road). For information however - Local authorities are governed by Department for Transport regulations for signage on the highway, including the placement of speed limit signs. Repeater signs are not approved for use in 30mph areas as drivers are expected to recognise them by the street lighting and no repeater signs. The signage will be reviewed in this location however, and any alterations that can be made will be made. Hampshire Constabulary is requested to treat Havant Road as a priority route for speed enforcement.</p>

Objection - Ferry Rd extension of double yellow lines both sides from Fort Cumberland Rd

<p><u>Resident, Ferry Road</u></p> <p>I don't usually write to the council with cause for concern but unfortunately this proposal is about to generate a problem given the extended double yellow lines on Ferry Road. I can see the sense in it, turning into Ferry Road from Fort Cumberland Road can be somewhat hazardous due to parked cars, but extending the double yellow lines and generating parking issues is not a solution.</p> <p>Has a one-way system been considered? Can other options be explored? I'm strongly opposed to increasing the parking restrictions - there has to be a better solution for local residents.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>Road Safety officers are currently working on proposals to better manage the parking arrangements along the length of Ferry Road, and therefore it is recommended that this proposal is deleted so that the road can be considered as a whole, along with other options that are available.</p>
---	---

Support for increased parking restrictions, concern regarding the proposed reduction of double yellow lines in Devonshire Avenue

<p><u>Portsmouth Cycle Forum</u></p> <p>We support the proposed extension of the double yellow lines to increase safety, especially at road junctions. However, we are concerned about any removal of no waiting restrictions, in particular Devonshire Avenue. The location is close to the Prince Albert Road junction, which is a north-south route much used by cyclists to avoid the busy main road through Milton Market. The removal of double yellow lines will further restrict visibility of oncoming traffic for people travelling north-south. Devonshire Avenue is a distributor road (not just a residential street) and is used by buses. This proposal should be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <p>The proposal aims to treat both sides of the junction equally, although only the double yellow lines on the north side, east of Prince Albert Road, were raised as an issue. In light of the concern from Portsmouth Cycle Forum, it is recommended that the proposed reduction on the south side of Devonshire Avenue does not go ahead.</p> <p>The current parking arrangement on the north side allows 2.5 spaces, which causes problems with vehicles overhanging the double yellow lines at one end or the dropped kerb at the other. The proposal will allow for 3 vehicles to park, better accommodating local needs. The reduction in double yellow lines will leave 7 metres of restriction in place, which is the minimum length that would be considered for a junction of this type. Therefore, any further reduction would not be considered.</p>
---	--

Objections - increase in double yellow lines on Hayling Avenue / Whitecliffe Avenue.

<p><u>Resident, Whitecliffe Avenue</u> We wish to oppose this crazy notion to extend the double yellow lines, making even less space for parking and increasing pressure on other streets. Businesses in Tangier Road should also be considered as there will be less parking for their customers.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u> It is recommended that both proposals are approved: the 2-metre extension to the double yellow lines on the east side of Whitecliffe Avenue and the 3-metre extension to the double yellow lines in Hayling Avenue, east from that junction.</p> <p>See the full reasons for the recommendations given at paragraphs 4.5.1 and 4.5.2.</p> <p>In Whitecliffe Avenue the proposal aims to prevent confusion caused by the existing restriction ending within a dropped kerb area and motorists parking at the end of the double yellow lines. However, obstructing a dropped kerb can result in a parking fine being issued. The 2-metre extension will prevent such misunderstandings.</p> <p>A number of residents have raised concerns over safety at the junction of Whitecliffe Avenue and Hayling Avenue, which cannot be taken lightly.</p>
<p><u>Resident, road not given</u> It is already hard enough to get parking in the street without you extending the double yellow lines and making there even less space available. Our voices need to be heard.</p>	
<p><u>Resident, Whitecliffe Avenue</u> I am not in favour. Exiting Whitecliffe Ave is no worse than other junctions here or elsewhere in the city and to extend further will limit the already inadequate parking availability.</p>	

Support and suggestion - new double yellow lines in Stride Avenue and extension to the restriction in Sunningdale Road.

<p><u>Resident, Sunningdale Road</u> The proposal for double yellow lines in Stride Road at its junction with Sunningdale Road is great news. However, we would also like the existing double yellow lines in Sunningdale Road extended. Heavy vehicles don't have the turning room into Sunningdale Road, especially when larger vehicles park near or over the existing lines. It is frustrating when numerous lorry drivers knock on our door asking us to move our cars so they can manoeuvre around the corner without hitting vehicles parking opposite.</p>	<p><u>Officer comments</u> It is not possible to add further proposals to this Order without consultation. Therefore a proposal to extend the parking restrictions in Sunningdale Road will be put forward under a separate Traffic Regulation Order in the coming months.</p> <p>No further issues were raised following the double yellow lines installed on this junction in 2009, indicating the original concerns had been addressed.</p>
--	--

Copy of the public notice detailing the proposals:

Dated: 3 December 2014

THE PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS) (NO.77) ORDER 2014

Notice is hereby given that Portsmouth City Council is consulting the public on proposals within the above Order under Sections 1 – 4, 32, 35 and 36 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The effect would be as detailed below:

A) PROHIBITION OF WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines)

- 1. Bransbury Road** (a) Southwest side, a 54m length on the inside of the bend north of Eastney Farm Road
(b) Northeast side, a 58m length on the inside of the bend west of the car park entrance (opposite Henderson Road junction)
- 2. Cooper Road** Both sides, a 2m length southwards from the junction with Stanley Avenue
- 3. Ferry Road** Both sides, a 22m extension of the double yellow lines from the junction with Fort Cumberland Road, up to the dropped kerb on each side
- 4. Havant Road, North End** West side, a 9m length north of No. 53 (access to Kidson Court, No.55)
- 5. Hayling Avenue** North side, extend the existing double yellow lines by 3m in front of No.51
- 6. Herbert Street** North side, from its eastern dead end westerly for 45 metres
- 7. Highgrove Road** (a) West side, a 3m length southwards from the junction with Stanley Ave
(b) East side, a 2m length southwards from the junction with Stanley Ave
- 8. King Albert Street** 2 lengths of double yellow lines around the bends opposite 86-101 Crown Court to enable through-traffic and improve visibility of on-coming vehicles
- 9. Peronne Road** West side, an 18m length southwards from the boundary of No.32 (access road to the AR Centre)
- 10. Range Green** North side, extend the double yellow lines by 5 metres up to No.2's dropped kerb (to protect access to the fire hydrant)
- 11. Salisbury Rd, Cosham** West side, a 4m extension to the existing double yellow lines from Magdala Road up to the first dropped kerb on that side
- 12. Solent Road** South side, extend the existing double yellow lines at the junction of Dene Hollow by 4m eastwards and 3m westwards
- 13. Southampton Road** North side, a 20m length from outside the nursery, up to the bus stop clearway to the east
- 14. Stanley Avenue** (a) Southwest side, a 2m length north-westwards and 2m length south-eastwards of the junction with Cooper Road
(b) Southwest side, a 2m length north-westwards and 3m length south-eastwards of the junction with Highgrove Road
- 15. Stride Avenue** Both sides, 3m eastwards from its junction with Sunningdale Road
- 16. Tangier Road** North side, a 5m extension of the double yellow lines westwards from the junction with Stanley Avenue (outside No. 247)
- 17. Tudor Crescent** West / South sides, a 23m length from the bridge access road around the bend opposite No.34
- 18. Whitecliffe Avenue** East side, extend the existing double yellow lines by 2m from Hayling Ave

B) REMOVAL OF NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines)

- 1. Balliol Road** East side, a 5m reduction of the restriction alongside No. 17 New Road
- 2. Devonshire Avenue** (a) North side, a 3m length outside No. 177
(b) South side, a 3m length outside No. 200

3. Liss Road South side, the 9m length westwards from No.2

C) PROHIBITION OF WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines) and CYCLE LANE (advisory)

1. Havant Road, North side between the junctions of Portsdown Avenue and the
Drayton & Farlington City Boundary (Rectory Avenue) - outside odd Nos. 203 - 371

D) NO WAITING MON-FRI 7AM - 11AM (single yellow line)

1. Chichester Road South side, a 5m length outside No.194 (west of Paulsgrove Rd junction)

E) NO WAITING SATURDAY 7AM - 11AM (single yellow line)

1. Beaulieu Road East side, a 10m length alongside the convenience store

F) NO WAITING MON-SAT 8AM - 6PM (single yellow line)

1. Herbert Street North side, from the junction of Flathouse Road easterly for 36m

**G) CHANGE FROM NO WAITING MON-SAT 8AM-6PM TO:
NO WAITING MON-FRI 8AM-5PM**

1. Chelsea Road West side, the existing single yellow lines northwards from Albert Road

**H) CHANGE FROM NO WAITING MON-FRI 8AM-5PM (single yellow line) TO:
NO WAITING AT ANY TIME (double yellow lines)**

1. Tudor Crescent East / South sides, an 18m length from the bridge access road around the bend to approximately opposite No.35

**I) CHANGE FROM PAY & DISPLAY TO:
LOADING ONLY 8AM-6PM**

1. Elm Grove South side, 9m of the existing Pay & Display bay outside Nos. 146-148

**J) CHANGE FROM 3-HOUR LIMITED WAITING TO:
3 HOURS LIMITED WAITING, LA PERMIT HOLDERS EXEMPT**

1. King Street Both sides to the front of the former Southsea Community Centre

REASONS FOR ORDER

- 1) To introduce parking restrictions in various roads across the city to improve road safety, pedestrian safety, visibility and traffic management (reducing congestion), and improve access for the emergency services, public services, delivery vehicles and refuse collection vehicles (**A, D, E, H**)
- 2) To amend, introduce and/or remove parking restrictions to accommodate changing local needs and make the most effective use of the public highway (**B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J**)

A copy of the draft Order and a plan may be examined at the Information Desk, Ground Floor, Civic Offices, Portsmouth during normal office hours. A copy of this Public Notice can be viewed on Portsmouth City Council's website - visit and search 'traffic regulation orders 2014'

Persons wishing either to object to or support these proposals may do so by sending their representations in writing to Nikki Musson, Transport and Environment, Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Portsmouth PO1 2NE, or via email to engineers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk quoting ref: **TRO 77/2014** by the **31 December 2014** stating the grounds of objection / support. (Due to the Christmas period, the 21-day consultation period has been extended to 28 days).

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

SIMON MOON, Head of Transport and Environment
Portsmouth City Council, Civic Offices, Guildhall Square, Portsmouth PO1 2NE

(End of Report)