

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio:	Public Protection
Subject:	Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Catisfield Lane, Titchfield
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 at the junction areas of Catisfield Lane with Fishers Hill and Samuel Mortimer Close and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

Executive summary: This report considers the reasons for proposing waiting restrictions in Catisfield Lane.

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

Reason: To remove the risk of obstructions and to improve road safety.

Cost of Proposals: The cost of the proposals will be met by the Developer.

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

Appendices Appendix A: Scheme drawing as advertised
Appendix B: Summary of responses to public advertisement
Appendix C: Scheme drawing as recommended for implementation

Executive Briefing Paper

Date: 25 January 2017

Subject: Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Catisfield Lane, Titchfield

Briefing by: Director of Operations

Portfolio: Public Protection

Supporting Information

1. Catisfield Lane runs between Highlands Road and Fishers Hill towards the western side of Fareham. It is a residential road with a mix of older and newer houses and is regularly used by traffic driving between the large residential areas served by Highlands Road and the industrial estates at Segensworth.
2. A new residential development has recently been completed (during 2016) on the former site of The Limes hotel, which now has the new name of Samuel Mortimer Close.
3. Parking in this area has been the subject of much concern since the development works commenced in 2013, as contractors vehicles have, despite repeated request not to do this, regularly parked in Catisfield Lane.
4. This parking led to complaints from a number of the residents, but the feelings about it have been very mixed. Some wanted the introduction of waiting restrictions, while others were convinced that this parking was only temporary and would stop once the development work was complete (on the grounds that parking would no longer be taking place by contractors vehicles).
5. In order to reduce the risk of parking in Catisfield Lane by the new householders, and as a separate issue to that of parking by contractors, money was taken from the Developers to provide waiting restrictions to prevent parking by the new residents along the development frontage. This was for safety reasons to counter any parking that might take place in the junction area of Catisfield Lane with and Samuel Mortimer Close.
6. Parking has been provided within Samuel Mortimer Close as part of the Planning requirements for the new development and the residents have been asked to use these designated parking areas rather than parking in Catisfield Lane. However, despite these requests some still choose to park in Catisfield Lane, and there is

no legal means of preventing them from doing this unless waiting restrictions are provided.

7. It might appear that there is little point in providing restrictions across the development frontage because parking does not take place there anyway. It takes place opposite, outside the cottages, and if it did so outside the development frontage then the road would become obstructed because it is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides simultaneously.
8. However, with this pressure from the new householders to park in Catisfield Lane, there is a risk that on any occasions that parking was not taking place outside the cottages, it could start to take place outside the new houses. In turn this would make parking even more difficult for those living in the cottages. At least with parking prevented on the opposite side of the road to the new cottages, this would overcome that risk.
9. As a result of all of these considerations, parking restrictions have been proposed as shown at Appendix A. These are designed to keep the junction areas clear for road safety reasons, and to protect against the risk of parking outside the new houses.
10. It should be noted that these proposals also extend to cover the junction area of Catisfield Lane with Fishers Hill, in order to cater for the risk of any future parking in that junction area which is close to the development.

Consultations

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

Representations

13. The proposal was advertised in December 2016 and 16 responses were received. Of these, 10 were objecting to the proposals, 3 were in support, 2 were in support with reservations, and one did not express a view as they focussed on making a separate request. These responses are summarised at Appendix B.
14. Many of those making comments also focussed on the speed and volume of the through traffic, however this proposal is not for that purpose. The speed and volume of through traffic was considered in detail by Hampshire County Council (HCC) some two years ago, including an extensive consultation exercise with local residents. No action was agreed at that time and any further pursuit of this should be directed to HCC. This has been explained to all those who have commented on this.
15. The main objections about the restrictions themselves is that parking does not take place around the junction area of Catisfield Lane with Fishers Hill, making the proposals here unnecessary.

16. While contractors vehicles were regularly parking on the southern-eastern side of this junction, recent observations have showed that this parking has subsided and no longer takes place any more than occasionally.
17. It is also true to say that parking on the western and north-eastern sides of this junction has never been a particular concern. Restrictions were proposed on these sides of the junction because it is normal traffic management practice to include junction areas into proposals if restrictions are proposed nearby or adjacent, as they are here, in order to prevent parking migrating to the junction itself. However, this particular junction is largely self-enforcing in this regard as drivers do not perceive it as an attractive place to park.
18. In addition, this junction is a focal point of the Catisfield conservation area, and both conservation officers and local residents would prefer not to have yellow lines around this junction for that reason.
19. However, the one issue that remains in this junction area is the south-eastern side, where parking is still a slight risk and where those who have supported the proposals would like to see the restrictions introduced. Recognising this, it is suggested that on the south-east side of the junction the proposals could be deferred at this stage but introduced at a later date should parking here become an issue. This could be monitored and then be the subject of a further short report in due course if necessary.

Conclusion

20. In conclusion, it would be reasonable to reduce the proposals to exclude the junction area of Fishers Hill and Catisfield Lane as shown at Appendix C, with a possible review of the south-eastern side of this junction area in due course.
21. It is therefore recommended that the proposed waiting restrictions are reduced from those as advertised, and implemented as shown at Appendix C.