

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  | <b>Objection/Comments</b>   | <b>Comments from Director of Highways &amp; Transport</b>   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p><u>17 Residents of Pagham Close</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• concerned about displacement of parked vehicles further into Pagham Close</li> <br/> <li>• believe a residents parking permit scheme should be introduced instead</li> <br/> <li>• believe restrictions outside Nos 37-41 opposite the junction of Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk are unnecessary and will cause hardship for those residents</li> <br/> <li>• believe loss of parking will diminish property value</li> </ul> | <p>Whilst the proposed parking restrictions are limited in extent to reflect the advice given in the Highway Code, the introduction of parking restrictions will lead to some displacement of vehicles. Whilst relatively small in number, vehicles would be expected to redistribute around the roads in the area. This could cause problems in these other roads. The Council will monitor the situation and propose further restrictions if necessary.</p> <p>Residents parking permits are delivered through the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ). There are no proposals at the present time to develop a CPZ for Southbourne. These schemes are generally promoted in larger towns on a neighbourhood basis. It is seldom the case that individual roads are considered as the cost of parking permits for an individual road would be exorbitant and consequently it would be unlikely to be widely supported by local residents. Such a scheme would not be an effective way to manage localised parking problems such as the obstruction of road junctions.</p> <p>Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions</p> <p>Householders cannot rely on the public highway for parking places directly outside of their properties. The onus is upon drivers to find suitable and appropriate parking for their vehicles. The proposed restrictions simply reinforce Highway Code advice on suitable and appropriate parking within the public highway.</p> |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concerned that removing parked vehicles will increase traffic speed</li> </ul>  | <p>The proposed removal of parked vehicles is very localised and will redistribute in the locality. Consequently the effect on traffic speeds will be negligible.</p>  |
|  | <p><u>8 Residents of Sadlers Walk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>believe a residents parking permit scheme should be introduced instead</li> <li>concerned displacement of parked vehicles will create parking pressure for residents</li> </ul> | <p>Residents parking permits are delivered through the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ). There are no proposals at the present time to develop a CPZ for Southbourne. These schemes are generally promoted in larger towns on a neighbourhood basis. It is seldom the case that individual roads are considered as the cost of parking permits for an individual road would be exorbitant and consequently it would be unlikely to be widely supported by local residents. Such a scheme would not be an effective way to manage localised parking problems such as the obstruction of road junctions.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed parking restrictions are limited in extent to reflect the advice given in the Highway Code, the introduction of parking restrictions will lead to some displacement of vehicles. Whilst relatively small in number, vehicles would be expected to redistribute around the roads in the area. This could cause problems in these other roads. The Council will monitor the situation and propose further restrictions if necessary.</p> |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• believe restrictions opposite the junction of Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk will cause hardship for elderly and disabled residents</li> <br/> <li>• concerned that removing parked cars will increase traffic speeds</li> <br/> <li>• believe loss of parking will diminish property value</li> </ul> | <p>Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions. However any vehicle is permitted to stop on double yellow lines to load and unload, including passengers, providing it is safe to do so. For those with restricted mobility or wheel chair users, they are very likely to have access to a blue disabled badge. Vehicles displaying such a badge can park on double yellow lines for up to three hours, provided it is safe to do so. However in terms of enforcement it is doubtful whether Blue Badge holders should be parking in those locations given the advice contained within the Highway Code.</p> <p>The proposed removal of parked vehicles is very localised and will redistribute in the locality. Consequently the effect on traffic speeds will be negligible.</p> <p>Householders cannot rely on the public highway for parking places directly outside of their properties. The onus is upon drivers to find suitable and appropriate parking for their vehicles. The proposed restrictions simply reinforce Highway Code advice on suitable and appropriate parking within the public highway.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Resident of Lumley Road</u><br/>While in principle, they do not object to the double yellow lines, they do object to the Council failing to contact ALL residents, prior to agreeing to this proposal. Advises not all residents agreed to the petition.</p> <p>There is no problem around parking in Lumley Road, OUT of working hours, which demonstrates the clear fact that people working in Emsworth are using these roads as their daily car park. These unwanted vehicles are the ones who park too close to junctions. Suggests the introduction of a "Residents Parking Scheme", would resolve the situation BUT West Sussex County Council would benefit from the revenue and perhaps the financial gain would be used towards maintaining our roads. Permit arrangements work so well in other districts.</p> | <p>The County Council invests considerably in public consultation. For small scale schemes, statutory consultation is undertaken with the statutory consultees and for the wider community, through public advertisement. Whilst not everyone may have agreed with the petition's proposals, it placed it in the public domain. Consultation with individual frontagers or users of the road would not be cost effective in terms of the cost of scheme versus cost of consultation consequently not the best use of public money. In view of the number of responses to the public advertisement the process has been successful at raising awareness of the proposals coming forwards in the local community.</p> <p>Many drivers park their vehicles on street on roads where they are not resident. Residents parking permit are delivered through the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ). There are no proposals at the present time to develop a CPZ for Southbourne. These schemes are generally promoted in larger towns on a neighbourhood basis. It is seldom the case that individual roads are considered as the cost of parking permits for an individual road would be exorbitant and consequently it would be unlikely to be widely supported by local residents. Such a scheme would not be an effective way to manage localised parking problems such as the obstruction of road junctions.</p> |
| <p><u>Resident of Brook Gardens</u><br/>Advises that residents of Pagham Close purchased houses with parking in front for easy access and asks the justification for taking it away.</p>  | <p>Householders cannot rely on the public highway for parking places directly outside of their properties. The onus is upon drivers to find suitable and appropriate parking for their vehicles. The proposed restrictions simply reinforce Highway Code advice on suitable and appropriate parking within the public highway.</p>   |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Advises Pagham Close is not a main road but a quiet back street chosen for that very reason, and putting yellow lines down ruins the very reason the houses were bought in the first place</p>   | <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions.</p>  |
|  | <p><u>Resident of Beach Road</u></p> <p>Yellow lines will prohibit parking for visitors, residents and local business people. It has not been a problem previously so the yellow lines are unnecessary and only cause undue frustration on local people. They regularly visit family in Pagham Close and this will be a problem if the yellow lines are introduced.</p> | <p>The problem of parking in this area has been raised with the County Council previously. In 2016 it considered proposals similar to those presented but resolved not to process as there were 9 objections and no real evidence of wider community support. Subsequently the County Council received further representation and was presented with a petition signed by 41 residents. Following public advertisement it received nine direct letters of support and a further petition signed by 232 residents adjusted to remove those that have subsequently objected. This appears to confirm a high level of local support suggesting that indiscriminate parking is considered a problem locally.</p> <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions.</p> |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><u>District Councillor for Southbourne</u></p> <p>Suggests putting double-yellow lines on the Pagham Close/Sadlers Walk corner will likely create very real problems for some residents who front onto the road.</p> <p>Suggests once the Lumley Road/Pagham Close is clear of parked vehicles pedestrians – including those with buggies or in wheelchairs – will be able to cross this corner safely without the need for lining.</p> <p>There are compelling arguments why those with disabilities, serving firefighters, etc. need close access to their cars.</p> <p>Their preference therefore is that double yellow lines are not implemented on this corner until and unless as part of a scheme which addresses the parking needs of those residents who will be most affected.</p> | <p>The principal applicant had previously secured the support of the Local District Councillor to the proposal. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Any vehicle is permitted to stop on double yellow lines to load and unload, including passengers, providing it is safe to do so. For those with restricted mobility or wheel chair users, they are very likely to have access to a blue disabled badge. Vehicles displaying such a badge can park on double yellow lines for up to three hours, provided it is safe to do so. However in terms of enforcement it is doubtful whether Blue Badge holders should be parking in those locations given the advice contained within the Highway Code.</p> <p>The suggestion does not align with advice in the Highway Code as previously outlined.</p> |
| <p><u>Resident of Westbourne</u></p> <p>1. There is already a distinct lack of parking around Lumley Road/Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk due to people who work in Emsworth who park for the day and then walk in from there or from driveways being created (but not always used) thereby removing another available space . Placing additional restrictions which will limit the spaces available even further will cause even more issues in the local area.</p>  | <p>Many drivers park their vehicles on street on roads where they are not resident. The proposed parking restrictions are limited in their extent and reflect Rule 243 of the Highway Code which states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions.</p>  |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>2. It will devalue the properties at the entrance of Lumley Road because it will become almost impossible to be able to park outside or relatively near to their properties.</p> <p>3. The petition signed by local residents would have most likely been the residents further up Pagham Close who do not have to park at the junction of Lumley Road and Pagham Close and so who would not be affected by these additional restrictions.</p> <p>4. These restrictions will push all the car parking further up Pagham Close and from my previous experience, tyres have been let down numerous times (to the point where the police have been called) and various letters of complaint are left on car windscreens because you are parking in front of someone else's house. These restrictions will make this even worse.</p> <p>Suggests adequate signage on the road to prevent people parking on the corners will deal with this problem without causing more stress and obstruction for current residents who will be immediately affected by this. Parking is already a sore point amongst local residents.</p> | <p>Householders cannot rely on the public highway for parking places directly outside of their properties. The onus is upon drivers to find suitable and appropriate parking for their vehicles. The proposed restrictions simply reinforce Highway Code advice on suitable and appropriate parking within the public highway.</p> <p>As the extent of proposed parking restrictions is limited, few frontagers are directly affected by the proposals. The signatories to the petition identified themselves by postcode which included a significant number in Pagham Close, the principal road affected to the proposals.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed parking restrictions are limited in extent to reflect the advice given in the Highway Code, the introduction of parking restrictions will lead to some displacement of vehicles. Whilst relatively small in number, vehicles would be expected to redistribute around the roads in the area. This could cause problems in these other roads. The Council will monitor the situation and propose further restrictions if necessary. Many drivers park their vehicles on street on roads where they are not resident. Any acts of vandalism should be reported to the Police and would not be sufficient justification for not introducing effective traffic management.</p> <p>Road signing and lining must be in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. It is not permitted to erect informal signing to prevent parking. The appropriate method is by the introduction of double yellow line restrictions in accordance with current legislation.</p> |
|--|--|

## Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><u>Resident of Langstone</u></p> <p>It's a vital parking space/area for the economic viability of Emsworth. For people who work in the village every day of the week it is used as an alternative for parking as there is nowhere else to park for a long period of time for free in the village. We are a company of 34, and we only simply do not have enough space for everyone to park in our company carpark.</p> <p>If you are going to stop people from parking at Lumley Road then I suggest reducing the cost for parking permits, otherwise you'll ultimately loose business for the area, and businesses will be moving out of the area too.</p> | <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions</p> <p>There is no intention or proposal to prohibit parking in Lumley Road, or any of the other roads, in their entirety, only at the junctions.</p> |
|  | <p><u>Resident of Fishbourne</u></p> <p>Objection to the proposed changes in Lumley Road as these areas provide vital parking spaces for workers in the town of Emsworth. By having these spaces for the workers and commuters to Emsworth they also provide economic viability for the town.</p>  | <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions. There is no intention or proposal to prohibit parking in Lumley Road, or any of the other roads, in their entirety, only at the junctions.</p>       |
|  | <p><u>Resident of Midhurst</u></p> <p>Believes it's disgusting imposing parking restrictions on older residents. The current parking arrangements suit the residents. Asks what jurisdiction the Council have to dictate what restrictions should be imposed.</p>  | <p>The proposals will be apply to all drivers with exemptions for loading, off loading and blue badge holders, provided it is safe to do so.</p> <p>As Highways Authority for roads in West Sussex, West Sussex County Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make Orders to regulate the use of our roads including the introduction of waiting restrictions</p>  |

Consultation Response Summary - CHS1801

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><u>Resident of Waterloo</u></p> <p>As you will be aware, parking in the village is limited and these are vital parking spaces for the continued economic viability of Emsworth. They work in the village and always take care not to park on corners/junctions or block any driveways. Believes it is possible to park in the areas in question without causing inconvenience or danger to other road users.</p>  | <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions. There is no intention or proposal to prohibit parking in Lumley Road, or any of the other roads, in their entirety, only at the junctions.</p>   |
|  | <p><u>Business in Queen Street</u></p> <p>The parking of cars on the roads in Lumley provides vital additional parking for office and retail workers in Emsworth. They have never seen a delivery vehicle obstructed here. The roads are sufficiently wide to accommodate the parking and have done so for many years.</p> <p>Cars were parked in Lumley prior to the relatively recent housing estates construction.</p> <p>It is a public road and they do not own it. Moreover, it is an example of very efficient use of parking spaces since when the residents vacate for work, the day time parkers arrive. Then at the end of the day when Emsworth workers leave, the residents return.</p> | <p>The proposal is for a very limited extent of parking restrictions to deal with localised issues which is of concern to many residents. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states "<i>do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction</i>", which is the full extent of the proposed parking restrictions. There is no intention or proposal to prohibit parking in Lumley Road, or any of the other roads, in their entirety, only at the junctions.</p> <p>The road is a public road and drivers should adhere to the advice set out in the Highway Code as previously outlined</p> |