# FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio:	Public Protection
Subject:	Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting
-	Restrictions – Seamead, Stubbington
Report of:	Director of Operations
Strategy/Policy:	
Corporate Objective:	A safe and healthy place to live and work

**Purpose:** To inform the Executive Member of the outcome of the statutory advertisement of a proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Seamead and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

**Executive summary:** This report considers the reasons for proposing waiting restrictions in Seamead.

**Recommendation:** That the waiting restrictions as shown at Appendix A are introduced.

**Reason:** To address concerns and complaints about parking in the junction area of Seamead with Stubbington Lane.

**Cost of Proposals:** The cost of the proposals will be met by Fareham Borough Council's Traffic Management budget.

**Risk Assessment:** There are no identified risks associated with this proposal.

Appendices Appendix A : Scheme drawing

## **Executive Briefing Paper**

Date: 6 September 2016

**Subject**:: Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Seamead, Stubbington

Briefing by: Director of Operations

**Portfolio:** Public Protection

#### **Supporting Information**

- 1. Seamead is a residential cul de sac leading off Stubbington Lane not far from the sea front at the southern end of Stubbington village.
- 2. Complaints have been received about parking in Seamead near to its junction with Stubbington Lane, which leads to hazards when vehicles are manoeuvring around this junction area.
- 3. The proposed restrictions are designed to remove parking hazards in this area, and to provide a clearer passage for vehicles entering and leaving Seamead.

#### Consultations

- 4. The Police, Ward and County Councillors have been consulted on this proposal and expressed their support.
- 5. The Statutory Consultees were consulted and no objections were received.

#### Representations

6. The proposal was advertised in July 2016 and no responses were received.

#### Conclusion

7. It is therefore recommended that the proposed waiting restrictions are implemented as advertised and shown at Appendix A.