

## Langstone ETRO Consultation Summary - Phase 2

Road Name	Support	Representation	Objection	Grand Total
Brookmead Way	1			1
Langstone Avenue		5	1	6
Southbrook Road	1			1
Downley Road			1	1
Rectory Road			1	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>

Support
Representation
Objection

Name & Address	Comment	Officers Response
<b>Mr Brian English 9 Brookmead Way</b>	<p>The parking restrictions in Brookmead Way, as implemented in 2014 and not changed in the recent 2015 adjustments, are still working very effectively. I would like to see the ETRO adopted permanently.</p> <p>I would like to thank the Parking and Traffic Team for holding the workshops last November and their continued efforts on preventing all day parking in Langstone residential roads.</p>	Noted
<b>Mr Brian Radford 22 Southbrook Road</b>	<p>I wish to support the proposals however I have the following comments:</p> <p>The single space shown for allowed parking on the southern side of Southbrook Road, as shown in 2014 Langstone ETRO Phase 2, is a source of danger and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The location of the bay is sufficient distance from each bay on the northern kerb to enable vehicles to pass.</p>

	<p>congestion, being too close to spaces on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>This space produces a slalom which is too sharp for larger vehicles to safely negotiate, and should be removed.</p> <p>Otherwise I think the TRO has had a very beneficial effect in the area and should be made permanent.</p>	<p>See above. The location of this bay is also designed to reduce the speed of vehicles using Southbrook Road, thereby increasing road safety.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Mr Dominic Eadie Unknown Residential Address in Portsmouth Area</b></p>	<p>An objection to the scheme as a whole was received and can be read in <b>Appendix E</b>.</p> <p>In summary the objection requests that Cabinet resolve to dismiss the restrictions in a permanent form and the area reverts to the previous TRO ; and that the Council enforces local planning agreements imposed on Southern and Scottish Energy, and the 2002 Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Mr Derek Holmes 9 Langstone Avenue</b></p>	<p>Request he makes the whole of the hammer head turning facility a double yellow line as agreed by the LRA and at the ETRO workshop meetings.</p> <p>Currently 2 parking spaces have been left there which are very often filled by Emsworth and other local dog walkers. The results of this has been considerable damage as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) When heavy vehicles try to turn they often mount the grass verge turning it into a morass in the winter</li> <li>2) A tree planted at the end of the Avenue bought by</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. The LRA recently undertook a survey of all properties in Langstone Avenue. The results were that 9 properties wished for the bays to remain, 8 properties wished for the bays to be removed and a no waiting at any time restriction be implemented in their place, and 3 properties were unable to be contacted. The decision is to be fed back to the LRA by the lead resident on this matter was that the bays should remain as per the current scenario. The survey can be seen in <b>Appendix F</b>.</p>

	<p>Avenue residents for £100 to repair the depredations of the 1987 hurricane has been knocked over and destroyed.</p> <p>3) The railings at the end of the Avenue have been knocked over and bent and one of the rotten posts has been leaning against our garden fence and damaging it. A makeshift repair to the railings was made by Graham Parker and his HBC gang on 3rd March last week but more money will have to be spent on a new fence when funds become available in the new financial year .</p> <p>4) Long vehicles reversing to return along the Avenue have stove in the featheredge panels of my garden fence on several occasions but fortunately I have generally been able to catch the culprits and to get them to reimburse me for new panels and repair of the damage.</p> <p>Clearly action is required as detailed above to reduce further unnecessary expense for myself and HBC.</p>	
<p><b>Ms Franciose White 8 Langstone Avenue</b></p>	<p>I was pleased to hear that you had decided to maintain these two unrestricted parking bays that I use on regular basis during the week as I have no parking space for my car on our property.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I had not understood that you were planning on having double yellow lines on the north side of the cul-de-sac, alongside our fence. I feel strongly against this proposal imposing additional unnecessary restrictions to residents.</p> <p>We have been living in the avenue for the last 15 years</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The restrictions on the north side of the turning head ensures that the area is kept clear of parked vehicles, thereby ensuring that there is still room for larger vehicles to turn around, even with the parking bays in the southern section.</p> <p>The LRA recently undertook a survey of all properties in</p>

	<p>and our visitors, our neighbours, dog walkers and ourselves have used this space regularly to no inconvenience to anybody. I would go further and insist that this space is less restrictive to the traffic in the avenue than all the other areas of now yellow lines allowing at the week-end for parking on both sides of the avenue. I am also convinced that many other cul-de-sac in the county do not have a bigger “turning circle “ than the one used at present at the end of our road. Furthermore the possible use of our drive in an emergency situation rules out the possibility of any emergency vehicle not being able to turn freely.</p> <p>I would therefore like to suggest that your proposed double yellow lines go from the existing double bay to alongside the east boundary of the cul-de- sac but leave the single yellow line along our fence, as is already designed in the present scheme.</p> <p>As a comment to the general parking scheme in the avenue, I feel it has been successful in restricting day parking of employees from the nearby industrial parks but it has caused difficulties for some residents, I am one of them, who have limited parking space available on their properties.</p> <p>I feel the number of unrestricted bays along the Langstone Avenue are too few. Some additional unrestricted parking bays of shorter length if need be, catering for smaller cars, and located between drives on the same side of the avenue would make parking for</p>	<p>Langstone Avenue. The results were that 9 properties wished for the bays to remain, 8 properties wished for the bays to be removed and a no waiting at any time restriction be implemented in their place, and 3 properties were unable to be contacted. The decision to be fed back to the LRA by the lead resident on this matter was that the bays should remain as per the current scenario. The survey can be seen in <b>Appendix F</b></p> <p>See previous comment. In order to maximise the turning space available with two parking spaces in the southern section, the northern kerb should remain restricted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, the location of the current bays are where access and egress from properties in Langstone Avenue are not restricted and the size of the bays are standard. Smaller bays located in other areas may cause problems for larger vehicles who would overhang the bay and obscure</p>
--	---	--

	<p>residents and their visitors much easier and would reflect the way we have happily parked in the avenue for years, before any restriction were even thought of.</p> <p>Could your revised scheme include any additional unrestricted bays?</p>	<p>visibility to/from properties. There is no method of identifying bays that are to be used solely by smaller vehicles. Outside of restricted times, drivers may choose to park in these locations, however we cannot condone parking in these locations by providing shorter bays.</p> <p>See previous comments.</p>
<p><b>Mr Henry Thursden 11A Langstone Avenue</b></p>	<p>I am writing in my capacity as a resident of Langstone Avenue.</p> <p>I strongly support the comments by Neil Paterson and Ian Munro concerning the need to keep the hammerhead at the eastern end of Langstone Avenue unobstructed, to allow turning by the many goods and public service vehicles that use the Avenue. I recollect that Derek Holmes (whose house is adjacent to the hammerhead) raised this problem with you some months ago, and when it was tabled at the ETRO workshop meeting the street plan provided showed that the twin parking bay there was to be removed. I assumed that this had been agreed, so I was surprised to see in the plan 1415LANG_2E attached to the reference that the unrestricted twin parking bay is still shown.</p> <p>Unless there is an urgent reason to retain the parking bay that I am unaware of, I believe it should be removed.</p> <p>I also believe that one more (single vehicle) unrestricted parking bay could be provided in the Avenue without obstructing residential access.</p>	<p>The LRA recently undertook a survey of all properties in Langstone Avenue. The results were that 9 properties wished for the bays to remain, 8 properties wished for the bays to be removed and a no waiting at any time restriction be implemented in their place, and 3 properties were unable to be contacted. The decision to be fed back to the LRA by the lead resident on this matter was that the bays should remain as per the current scenario. The survey can be seen in <b>Appendix F</b>.</p> <p>the location of the current bays are where access and egress from properties in Langstone Avenue are not restricted and the size of the bays are standard. Smaller bays located in other areas may cause problems for larger vehicles who would overhang the bay and obscure visibility to/from properties. There is no method of identifying bays that are to be used solely by smaller</p>

	<p>With many thanks for your hard work in resolving what has been an intractable (parking) problem throughout Langstone for several years.</p>	<p>vehicles. Outside of restricted times, drivers may choose to park in these locations, however we cannot condone parking in these locations by providing shorter bays.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Mr Ian Munro 1 Langstone Avenue</b></p>	<p>I write to confirm that I support fully Mr Neil Paterson's statement regarding the turning circle at the east end of Langstone Avenue. At present lorries (e.g., dustbin lorries, delivery vans (Tesco) etc.) and other such vehicles which visit the Avenue invariably end up reversing back out of Langstone Avenue from the east end because they are unable to turn round due to the cars parked there. This often causes disruption to vehicles of those who live in the Avenue from entering until the lorries/vans have backed out (perilously close to cars parked on the north side at the west end of the Avenue). And all for the sake of two additional parking spaces!</p> <p>This unnecessary situation needs to be seriously reconsidered and the decision reversed.</p>	<p>Please see previous responses.</p>
<p><b>Mr Neil Paterson 12 Langstone Avenue</b></p>	<p>I wish to congratulate you on the manner in which the Langstone Area ETRO has been conducted and on its general effectiveness. However, I have to say I am deeply disappointed that the request to remove parking from the turning circle at the east end of Langstone Avenue has been ignored. It is there for a very good reason. It is a "dead end" and while some small vehicles may "three point turn" out of there larger vehicles do so at the expense of verges and occasionally fences.</p>	<p>Please see previous responses.</p>

	<p>There is no need to provide parking there. There is adequate parking on the other unrestricted bays and "of peak" on the single yellow lines.</p>	
<p><b>Mr Len Slater 45 Langstone Road</b></p>	<p>My wife and I live at 45, Langstone Road and we wish to object to the above order.</p> <p>The unrestricted parking bay immediately outside our property attracts people who work for example, at Langstone Business Park, parking virtually all day from 07.30 hours to 18.00 hours during the normal working week.</p> <p>As the pedestrian access gate to our property is opposite the parking bay which is occupied as stated above, it is impossible for any visitors to park or deliveries to be conveniently made.</p> <p>We object not only for the reasons given above but also because Langstone Avenue is being used as a car park for businesses that should have made proper provision for their employees and what is more the Planning regulations should have been enforced upon those businesses to take their full responsibility.</p> <p>As residents, we have no objection to motorists parking from time to time but the parking bay outside our property is not being used on that basis it is merely an overflow car park being used by cars which do not move virtually all day. May we ask if it is possible to at least leave one car park space immediately outside our access gate to allow our friends, relatives who care for us and general visitors/deliveries to be made?</p>	<p>Noted, this is public highway and any vehicle can park in this location.</p> <p>Deliveries can be made by parking on the restrictions which allow for loading and unloading. Visitors can utilise the driveway of the property within restricted hours.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>As the road is public highway, we cannot allocate spaces to individual properties. Deliveries can be made by parking on the restrictions which allow for loading and unloading. Visitors can utilise the driveway of the property within restricted hours.</p>

	<p>It does not seem fair that we as residents who pay our Council Tax and live in the area are effectively placed second to others from outside the area who unfortunately find it difficult to park their cars adjacent to their employment. Perhaps more pressure should be brought to bear upon local employers to provide for their staff rather than merely inconveniencing local residents.</p> <p>Finally, it has been brought to our attention that this ETRO is potentially having an adverse effect upon property prices in the area for which purpose the residents have every right to seek legal advice with regards to compensation.</p> <p>We do sincerely hope that our objections are fully considered and taken into account and that in the very least; an accommodation along the lines we have suggested will be made.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>We are unaware of any evidence to this effect. Independent legal advice should be sought if this is a concern.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Mr Michael Harris 30 Rectory Road</b></p>	<p>I am unhappy with the parking restrictions you have proposed at the junction of Rectory Rd, outside of and between 86 Southbrook Rd and 23 Rectory Rd, Langstone.</p> <p>When parking restrictions are lifted outside of 11:00am and 13:00pm I can only exit from my road on opposite carriageway, because of parked vehicles, visibility is impaired as a result of the restrictions being lifted.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Parking occurred in this location prior to the current restrictions, and no concerns were raised previously. There are no recorded accidents in this location. The traffic management team will continue to monitor road safety and seek to implement remedial measures should any traffic management concerns arise.</p>