

Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio: Public Protection

Subject: Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting

Restrictions - Southampton Hill. 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 area of Southampton Hill with the A27 Southampton Road and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

Executive summary: This report considers the reasons for proposing waiting restrictions in Southampton 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 Hampshire County Council.

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 – Southampton

Hill, Titchfield

Briefing by: Director of Operations

Portfolio: Public Protection

Supporting Information

1. Hampshire County Council are carrying out major improvement works to the A27 between the railway station roundabout in Fareham, and Segensworth roundabout to the south of the M27 junction 9.

- 2. Southampton Hill serves the north-western side of Titchfield village, and parking in the junction area of this road with the A27 has raised concerns, which Hampshire County Council are addressing as part of their works.
- 3. As part of these works they have asked that waiting restrictions could be introduced in the junction area of Southampton Hill with Southampton Road, as shown at Appendix A.

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 December 2016. No responses were received.

Conclusion

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