

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio:	Public Protection
Subject:	Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Hollybrook Gardens, Locks Heath
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 Hollybrook Gardens and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

Executive summary:

This report considers the reasons for proposing waiting restrictions in Hollybrook Gardens.

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
 Appendix B: Responses to public advertisement

Executive Briefing Paper

Date: 13 December 2016

Subject: Traffic Regulation Order - Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Hollybrook Gardens, Locks Heath

Briefing by: Director of Operations

Portfolio: Public Protection

Supporting Information

Background

1. Hollybrook Gardens is the main road for a small housing estate accessed off Locks Road. Complaints have been received about parking in two locations, namely at its junction with Locks Road where visibility is obscured by parking too close to the junction, and secondly around the inside of the bend to the west of Oleander Close.
2. In order to address these concerns it is proposed to prohibit waiting at all times in these two areas of complaint, as shown on the drawing at Appendix A

Consultations

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

Representations

5. The proposal was advertised in November 2016 and eight responses were received. Of these, one expressed the view that the restrictions around the junction area with Locks Road were unnecessary but all of the others were in support of these.
6. Three of those in support asked that the restrictions could be extended further on the north side, however they have been designed to be longer to the south since traffic approaching from this direction (i.e. to the right) is physically closer and therefore potentially a greater hazard. Traffic approaching from the left is further

away (by virtue of being on the opposite side of the road) and can thus be seen from further away too.

7. These restrictions will provide an improvement over the present situation, and making them too extensive risks increasing parking pressures in the nearest locations where they are not provided, as well as increasing the risk of parking closer to private driveways further along the road.
8. These restrictions will be monitored once introduced, and considered further if there is any pressing need to do so.
9. Other comments made concerned the other part of the proposal, i.e. the inside of the bend to the west of Oleander Close. There was a mix of views about the proposals here, including one saying that they were unnecessary, two saying that they would penalise residents (one of these specifically asking for a scheme for residents only) and three saying that the proposals did not go far enough.
10. It is fair to say that these proposals were made after a good deal of consideration of views such as those which had already been expressed, and with the Ward Members and the Executive Member on site. With the responses reflecting views ranging from the proposals being unnecessary, to them being insufficient, and then that they would penalise residents unfairly, it was never likely that any proposals would please everyone, and neither would the alternative of doing nothing.

Conclusion

11. In conclusion it is therefore recommended that the proposed restrictions are implemented as advertised and shown at Appendix A.
12. It is also recommended that the performance of these restrictions should be monitored after their introduction. They could then be re-assessed but only if there is a clear need to do so in due course, along with a likelihood of majority support for any further changes.