

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio:	Public Protection
Subject:	Traffic Regulation Order – Proposed Waiting Restrictions, Brook Lane, Park Gate
Report of:	Director of Environmental Services
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 amend a length of waiting restrictions and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

Executive summary:

In response to complaints received from local residents, this report proposes the introduction of waiting restrictions in Brook Lane, from its junction with the A27, southwards to its roundabout junction with Headland Drive.

Recommendation:

That the waiting restrictions as shown at Appendix A are introduced as advertised.

Reason:

To reduce hazardous and potentially obstructive parking.

Cost of Proposals:

The cost of the proposal will be met by the Traffic Management Budget.

Risk Assessment:

There are no identified risks associated with this proposal.

Appendices Appendix A : Scheme drawing

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Executive Briefing Paper

Date: 2 July 2014

Subject:: Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions, Brook Lane, Park Gate

Briefing by: Director of Environmental Services

Portfolio: Public Protection

Supporting Information

Background

1. Brook Lane is a busy road which links the main A27 with the western part of Warsash. On the west side of Brook Lane shortly to the south of Pine Walk exists Post Office premises (sorting office), a medical centre, and further to the south a community hospital. On the east side throughout this section of Brook Lane are houses set back from the road, with their own driveways.
2. Prior to 2013 parking had increasingly been the subject of concern in Pine Walk, which had been attributed particularly to staff and visitors at the sorting office. This culminated in the introduction of waiting restrictions into Pine Walk in February 2013.
3. The presence of the houses on the east side of Brook Lane has meant that a small amount of parking has habitually taken place on the east side of the road, but until recent years this was rarely the subject of any concerns. However this parking has increased since the introduction of the restrictions in Pine Walk, and complaints have followed.
4. The width of Brook Lane is insufficient for parking to take place on both sides without obstructing the road, and the increased parking has followed the habitual parking by taking place along the east side of the road. However, this parking has led to numerous complaints, particularly about impaired visibility when leaving driveways
5. In order to address the complaints, a number of options were suggested to all affected frontagers in Brook Lane by letter drop, ranging from "Do nothing" to the provision of double yellow lines throughout the affected length of road, ie from the A27 southwards to the roundabout junction with Headland Drive. The intermediate options included degrees of part time waiting restrictions.

6. The responses to the letter drop were mixed, but the most apparent preference was to protect the driveways on the eastern side Brook Lane, in order to afford visibility protection to these driveways. This protection would be throughout the working day (8am to 6pm Mondays to Saturdays), outside these times the road is less busy and the concerns are reduced.
7. At the request of the County Councillor, and taking into account the feedback from the letter drop, the restrictions on the west side of Brook Lane have been designed to match those that exist in Pine Walk, which have been successful in removing long stay commuter parking.

Consultations

8. The Ward Councillors, County Councillor and the Police were consulted on this proposal and all expressed their support. The Statutory Consultees were consulted and no objections were received.

Representations

9. The proposal was formally advertised in May 2014 and no further objections were received. Comments made in response to the letter drop have already been considered above.

Conclusion

10. It is recommended that the proposed waiting restrictions are implemented as advertised and detailed at Appendix A.