

# FAREHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

<b>Portfolio:</b>	Public Protection
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Coach Hill, Titchfield</b>
<b>Report of:</b>	Director of Operations
<b>Strategy/Policy:</b>	
<b>Corporate Objective:</b>	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 three junction areas along Coach Hill and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

**Executive summary:** This report considers the reasons for proposing waiting restrictions along Coach Hill.

**Recommendation:** That the waiting restrictions as shown at Appendix A 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 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:** 25 January 2017

**Subject:** Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Coach Hill, Titchfield

**Briefing by:** Director of Operations

**Portfolio:** Public Protection

## Supporting Information

1. Coach Hill runs westwards from the southern end of Titchfield village, towards Warsash Road. Complaints have been received about parking at the three road junctions along this length, i.e. the junctions with Gardner Road, Garstons Road (including Lower Bellfield almost opposite) and Posbrook Lane.
2. In order to address these concerns it is proposed to introduce waiting restrictions in these junction areas as shown at Appendix A.

## Consultations

3. The Police, Ward and County Councillors have been consulted on this proposal and expressed their support. The Police expressed a minor concern that traffic speeds may increase as a result of the removal of parking but they recognised that this was outweighed by the safety aspects of the proposal.
4. The Statutory Consultees were consulted and no objections were received.

## Representations

5. The proposal was advertised in December 2016 and no responses were received.

## Conclusion

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