

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to the Executive Member for Public Protection for Decision

Portfolio:	Public Protection
Subject:	Traffic Regulation Order – Proposed Waiting Restrictions – Castle Street, Portchester
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 introduce waiting restrictions and to obtain authorisation to implement a Traffic Regulation Order.

Executive summary:

This report considers the introduction of waiting restrictions into Castle Street, to address concerns expressed by local residents and Ward Members.

Recommendation:

That the waiting restrictions as shown at Appendix B are introduced.

Reason:

To provide a clearer route for the passage of vehicles and to improve road safety.

Cost of Proposals:

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

Risk Assessment:

There are no identified risks associated with this proposal.

Appendices Appendix A : Proposals as advertised
Appendix B : Proposals as recommended
Appendix C : Responses to letter drop
Appendix D : Responses to formal consultation

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Executive Briefing Paper

Date: 2 December 2014

Subject:: Traffic Regulation Order – Proposed Waiting Restrictions - Castle Street, Portchester

Briefing by: Director of Environmental Services

Portfolio: Public Protection

Supporting Information

Background

1. Castle Street runs south from the main A27 in Portchester. It serves a sizeable housing area, and part way along its length it has a junction with White Hart Lane which runs to the West. South of this junction, Castle Street is a lengthy cul de sac which ends at Portchester Castle.
2. Concerns have been expressed by local residents and also by Ward Members in respect of overspill parking from the car parks at the Castle, which regularly occurs at weekends and bank holiday periods. At these times the car parks at the castle are unable to accommodate all of its visitors, who then search for the nearest available spaces to park, which are along Castle Street itself.
3. Castle Street has houses along both sides, some of which have off road parking available, although even among those who do; some park on the road because their cars cannot all be accommodated off road.
4. When parking spills over from the car parks at the castle, this often leads to congestion in Castle Street, which is particularly problematic as some of its visitors arrive by coaches which are unable to pass along the road. Obstruction of larger vehicles such as coaches also has concerning implications for the passage of emergency vehicles which, even if they were able to pass along the road themselves, could be held up behind coaches and other vehicles which could not move forwards.
5. For these reasons it has been proposed to prohibit parking along the eastern side of Castle Street throughout its length between White Hart Lane and the point where the road widens, near to the "Cormorant" public house.
6. This prohibition would apply from 8.00am to 7.00pm in order that parking for residents can be accommodated overnight. However, the restrictions would need

to apply every day of the week as all days are vulnerable to high levels of parking when the weather is fine.

7. A letter drop was carried out to all (approximately 100) frontagers who would be directly affected by this proposal. In response to the letter drop, 8 replied to express their support to the proposal, and 5 to express their objection. A further 3 were particularly concerned about the length of time that the restrictions applied, but indicated that they would be happier if the time restrictions were shortened. These are summarised at Appendix C.
8. Those who expressed their objections included comment that the restrictions would unfairly penalise the residents.
9. Some further comments were received expressing concern that parking would be displaced into Barbican Mews, a short cul de sac lying shortly to the north of White Hart Lane.
10. Taking these comments into account, waiting restrictions have therefore been advertised to apply throughout the east side of Castle Street to the south of Barbican Mews as far as the Cormorant public house, and also for a short length into Barbican Mews itself. These are shown at Appendix A.
11. With regard to Barbican Mews, these restrictions are to apply as far as the carriageway narrowing feature for road safety reasons, but further into the cul de sac it is thought to be far enough away from the Castle that there should be no major direct effects of the new proposals. This can nevertheless be monitored as and when they come into force.
12. The length of time for the restrictions in Castle Street has been advertised to be the same as in the letter drop, but further consideration is given to making them apply for shorter times below.

Consultations

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

Representations

15. The proposal was advertised in September 2014 as shown at Appendix A, and 11 representations were received, however 4 of these (all objectors) had already expressed their views in response to the letter drop. These are summarised at Appendix D, along with officer responses.
16. To summarise these responses, the objections were on the grounds that parking would be made difficult for residents, however it is not possible to remove the obstructive parking that has led to the concerns, without providing restrictions. The length of time that these restrictions would apply is considered further below.

17. Concern was also expressed that speeding may result if parking is removed. This will be monitored, but the removal of parking along one side of the road is necessary in order to reduce the risks of congestion.
18. Another comment made was to express concern that the restrictions in Barbican Mews did not go far enough. Parking already occurs in Barbican Mews and will not be entirely due to parking displaced from Castle Street, and in any event the proposals have already been modified to include part of Barbican Mews.
19. As stated above, this can be monitored and further action taken if necessary, and will be subject to a further report as required. However, it is not thought that this concern warrants immediate action purely on the basis of the proposals for Castle Street.
20. Some further comments have been made reiterating concerns that were expressed in response to the letter drop about the restrictions causing inconvenience to local residents, particularly because of the length of time that they have been proposed to apply.
21. In view of the concerns expressed about the length of times that the restrictions have been proposed, it is recommended that the restrictions can be reduced to apply 10am-5pm instead of 8am-7pm. This will afford more parking for local residents and their visitors, while still covering the peak times that people park to visit the castle. These new times are shown at Appendix B.
22. In respect of the proposed "No waiting at any time" restrictions outside Nos. 140-146, this length is particularly hazardous when vehicles are parked on the inside of the bend and it is therefore proposed that this aspect should not be changed.

Summary

23. The foregoing summarises the principal factors as follows:
 - Overspill parking at Portchester Castle has led to numerous complaints including problems of congestion and obstructions in Castle Street
 - Waiting restrictions were proposed to address the concerns, to apply 8am-7pm (on all days) on the east side of Castle Street, and at all times on the bend outside Nos. 140-146.
 - Responses to a letter drop (to all directly affected residents) was mixed, leading to a reduction in the recommended times during which the restrictions apply, to 10am-5pm (all days), and to the addition of restrictions in Barbican Mews.

Conclusion

24. It is recommended that the proposed waiting restrictions are reduced from those as advertised, and implemented as detailed at Appendix B.