



## DRAINAGE SITES

### I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 & The City of Plymouth (Moving traffic Regulation Orders) (Consolidation) Order 2014 in association with the TRO Review.<sup>8</sup> TRO.

### 2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

2.1 The elements that need a Traffic Regulation Order are as follows (as proposed):

#### To Add;

##### I.1 No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Beaumont Street, the north side from its junction with Wolseley Road for a distance of 21 metres in a south westerly direction
- (ii) Beaumont Street, the south side from its junction with Wolseley Road for a distance of 12 metres in a south westerly direction
- (iii) Blandford Road, the west side from its junction with Thames Gardens (northern junction) for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly and southerly direction
- (iv) Blandford Road, the west side from its junction with Thames Gardens (southern junction) for a distance of 21 metres in a southerly direction
- (v) Boringdon Terrace, the south-east side from the extent of the adopted highway (entrance to MOD property) to a point 8 metres south west of its junction with Undercliff Road
- (vi) Boringdon Terrace, the south-east side from a point 20 metres south west of its junction with Undercliff Road for a distance of 11 metres in a south westerly direction
- (vii) Boringdon Terrace, the south-east side from a point 48.5 metres south west of its junction with Undercliff Road for a distance of 9 metres in a south westerly direction
- (viii) Bretonside, the south side from its junction with Buckwell Street to its junction with Martin Lane
- (ix) Bretonside, the south side from a point 21 metres west of its junction with Hawkers Avenue for a distance of 32 metres in a westerly direction
- (x) Bridwell Road, the north-west side from its junction with Northumberland Street for a distance of 6 metres in a north easterly and south westerly direction
- (xi) Bridwell Road, the north-west side from its junction with Keyham Street for a distance of 6 metres in a north easterly and south westerly direction
- (xii) Compton Avenue, the north side from its junction with Mannamead Road to its junction with Dormy Avenue
- (xiii) Crescent Avenue, the south side from its junction with St James Place East for a distance

of 5 metres in a westerly direction and 4 metres in an easterly direction

- (xiv) Crescent Avenue, the south side from its junction with Athenaeum Street rear service lane for a distance of 3 metres in a westerly direction
- (xv) Curtis Street, the north side from its junction with James Street for a distance of 7 metres in an easterly direction
- (xvi) Curtis Street, the south side from its junction with James Street for a distance of 6 metres in an easterly direction
- (xvii) Deptford Place, the north side from its junction with Providence Street for a distance of 15 metres in a westerly direction & 14 metres in an easterly direction
- (xviii) Fullerton Road, both sides from its junction with Sturdee Road for a distance of 6 metres  
in an easterly direction
- (xix) Fullerton Road, both sides from its junction with Bartholomew Road for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction
- (xx) Hotham Place, the south-east side from a point 29.5 metres east of its junction with Molesworth Road for a distance of 13 metres in a north easterly & north westerly direction
- (xxi) Hotham Place, the north-west and south-west side from a point 23 metres east of its junction with Molesworth Road for a distance of 10.5 metres in a north easterly and north westerly direction
- (xxii) James Street, the east side from its junction with Curtis Street for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxiii) James Street, the east side from its junction with Curtis Street for a distance of 27 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxiv) James Street, the west side from a point 11 metres south of its extended kerbline of Curtis Street to a point 11 metres south of its southern junction of Duke Street
- (xxv) Keyham Street, both sides from its junction with Bridwell Road for a distance of 6 metres in a north westerly direction
- (xxvi) Melville Road, the west side from its junction with Nepean Street for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxvii) Nepean Street, the east & north side from a point 17 metres west of its junction with Melville Road for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly and northerly direction
- (xxviii) Nepean Street, the north side from its junction with Melville Road for a distance of 2 metres in a westerly direction
  
- (xxix) Nepean Street, the south & west side from its junction with Melville Road for a distance of 57 metres in a westerly and northerly direction
- (xxx) Northumberland Street, both sides from its junction with Bridwell Road for a distance of

6 metres in a north westerly direction

- (xxxix) Springfield Road, the north side from a point 3.5 metres west of its boundary of numbers 138 & 140 Springfield Road for a distance of 20 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxxii) St John's Drive, both sides from its junction with Church Hill Road for a distance of 6 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxxiii) Sturdee Road, the east side from its junction with Fullerton Road for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly and southerly direction
- (xxxiv) Tailyour Road, the south side from its junction with Crownhill Court for a distance of 13 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxv) Tavistock Road, the east side from its junction with Runway Road for a distance of 53 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxxvi) Thames Gardens (northern Junction), both sides from its junction with Blandford Road for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxxvii) Thames Gardens (southern Junction), both sides from its junction with Blandford Road for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxxviii) Trefusis Gardens, both sides from a point 5 metres south of its boundary between 2 & 4 Trefusis Gardens to its junction with Old Laira Road
- (xxxix) Valletort Road, the north-east side from a point 20 metres north west of its boundary of 40 & 42 Valletort Road for a distance of 26 metres in a north westerly direction
- (xl) Wadham Terrace Rear Service Lane, both sides from its junction with Alexandra Road for a distance of 5 metres in an south easterly direction
- (xli) Eden Valley Gardens – north side, from its junction with Miller Way for a distance of 60 metres in an easterly direction
- (xlii) Eden Valley Gardens – north side, from a point 100 metres east of its junction with Miller Way for a distance of 18 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xlili) Eden Valley Gardens – south side, for its entirety
- (xliv) Ambleside Place – west side, from its junction with Eden Valley Gardens to its junction with Ravenglass Close
- (xlv) Ambleside Place – east side, from its junction with Eden Valley Gardens for a distance of 12 metres in a southerly direction
- (xlvi) Ravenglass Close – north west side, from its junction with Ambleside Place for a distance of 3 metres in a south westerly direction
  
- (xlvii) Bell Close, the north & east side from a point 15 metres east of its junction with Bradford's staff exit to a point 10 metres north of its junction with Bradford staff entrance

- (xlviii) Bell Close, the north side from its junction with Bell Park Industrial Estate to a point 15 metres west of its junction with Morris Engineering
- (xlix) Bell Close, the south side from its junction with Plympton Park Industrial Estate to a point 10 metres west of its junction with Coop Exit

### **3.100 Limited Waiting To 1 Hour No Return For 2 Hours At Any Time**

Bretonside, the south side from a point 53 metres west of its junction with Hawkers Avenue for a distance of 24 metres in a westerly direction

### **3.101 Limited Waiting To 10 Mins No Return For 2 Hours Monday – Friday 8am-6pm**

Eden Valley Gardens – north side, from a point 60 metres east of its junction with Miller Way for a distance of 40 metres in an easterly direction

### **8.01 Permit Parking At Any Time**

- (i) Boringdon Terrace, the south-east side from a point 31 metres south west of its junction with Undercliff Road for a distance of 17.5 metres in a south westerly direction
- (ii) Boringdon Terrace, the south-east side from a point 8 metres south west of its junction with Undercliff Road for a distance of 12 metres in a south westerly direction
- (iii) Crescent Avenue, the south side from a point 3 metres west of its junction with Athenaeum Street rear service lane for a distance of 20 metres in a westerly direction

### **7.1 Width Limit at Any Time (1.98m)**

- i. Priory Road – from its junction with Charles Terrace to its junction with Blandford Road

## **REVOCATIONS**

### **No Waiting At Any Time**

- (i) Beaumont Street, the north side, from the junction with Wolseley Road for a distance of 25 metres
- (ii) Beaumont Street, the south side, from the junction with Wolseley Street for a distance of 24 metres
- (iii) Bedford Mews, the north side, from its junction with Providence Street for a distance of 15 metres in a westerly direction
- (iv) Boringdon Road, the south side, from the extent of the adopted highway (entrance to MOD property for a distance of 27 metres in a westerly direction
- (v) Boringdon Road, the south side, from a point 39 metres west of the entrance to the MOD property for a distance of 12 metres in a westerly direction

- (vi) Brentford Avenue, the south side, from a point 162 metres west of the eastern junction with Taunton Avenue for a distance of 16 metres in a westerly direction
- (vii) Bretonside, the south side, from a point 21 metres west of the junction with Hawkers Avenue to the junction with Buckwell Street
- (viii) Compton Avenue, the north side, from the junction with Mannamead Road for a distance of 10 metres
- (ix) Crescent Avenue, the south side, for a distance of 5 metres either side of the junction with St James Place East
- (x) Deptford Place, the north side, from a point 15 metres east to a point 15 metres west of the junction with Providence Street
- (xi) Deptford Place, the north side, from its junction with Providence Street for a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction
- (xii) St Vincent Street, the north & west side, from the western extent for a distance of 9 metres
- (xiii) St Vincent Street, the north & west side, across the closed end of the road at the western extent
- (xiv) St Vincent Street, the south-east side, from the western extent for a distance of 9 metres in an easterly direction
- (xv) James Street, the west side, from its junction with Duke Street for a distance of 73 metres in a north-easterly direction
- (xvi) James Street, the west side, from its junction with Duke Street in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 metres

### **Permit Parking At Any Time**

- (i) Boringdon Road, the south-east side, from a point 27 metres south-west of the eastern extent (entrance to MOD property) for a distance of 12 metres in a south westerly direction
- (ii) Boringdon Road, the south-east side, from a point 51 metres south-west of the eastern extent (entrance to MOD property) for a distance of 24 metres in a south westerly direction
- (iii) Crescent Avenue, the south side, from a point 5 metres east of the junction with St James Place East for a distance of 20 metres in an easterly direction

## **3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

### **Proposals**

The proposals for the TRO Review.8 were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2021. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2021

**There have been representations received relating to the Traffic Regulation Order proposals as below:**

**There have been 4 representations received relating to Boringdon Terrace**

Consultation	Comments
<p>I believe that a request has been made to you to appoint 'double yellow lines' outside the properties 7 &amp; 8 Boringdon Terrace, Turnchapel.</p> <p>I believe that the request is an act of 'bad faith'. The Terrace Residents are perfectly able to access the parking area's on the Terrace at any given time. The only time that the parking can be 'tricky' is when the spaces are used by non-residents who are not alert to the issues. There is ample space for reversing Bongo's and other large vehicles. The Boringdon Arms takes it's brewery deliveries through the cellar on Boringdon Road and regardless of the space at the end of the Terrace outside No's 7 &amp; 8 , their occasional deliveries would still not be able to access the immediate vicinity of the Pub without damaging the pavement. The current method of a 'Facebook' request for Scaffolding vans/removal vans etc works perfectly well.</p> <p>I also doubt the legality of PCC placing double yellow lines outside these properties, as to my knowledge, it is unadapted road, and therefore, your restrictions would be not be enforceable.</p> <p>This was the situation approx 15 years ago when Highways did the same thing and then had to remove the lines as your department was challenged over the legality, so unless the legislation has changed since that time, your department does not have the right to add/change or do anything to that land.</p> <p>Also, a recent Turnchapel building application to Plymouth City Council was refused on the grounds of ' lack of parking' - the applicant did win on appeal- but the point is, the Planning Team are perfectly aware of the intensely limited parking within the village.</p> <p>As a village, the loss of two parking spaces will cause stress and further impact the precarious situation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>I can inform you that the land is HMPE land (Highway Maintainable at Public Expense and that I will be checking the notices on site today.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing to object to the notice, ref: Amd.2021.2137271 TRO on Boringdon Terrace, Turnchapel</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p>

<p>The notice states that ‘double yellow lines’ will be painted outside the properties 7 &amp; 8 Boringdon Terrace, Turnchapel.</p> <p>This will put extreme pressure on the already limited parking situation in the village by the removal of two additional parking spaces.</p> <p>The spaces have been in use constantly since my moving to the village and there has never been any ongoing access issues raised. Residents purchasing or renting property are made aware of the parking restrictions prior to moving to the area. The houses along the terrace are not sold with allocated parking or sold with the land parallel to the properties and instead this is handed/observed by locals to support the parking situation.</p> <p>Poor parking or short term blockages have been dealt with quickly and locally with no issue and managing the long term situation would usually be handled by the Residents association, so I am unsure to where this particular request has been raised from.</p> <p>The spaces are used not only by locals but also visitors to the local business including pubs, b&amp;bs, cafes and holiday let’s- especially increased in popularity following the pandemic and more people discovering the village and local walking routes.</p> <p>There is an account that a previous dispute of the spaces circa 2000, was deemed none enforceable due to the conditions of the ownership of the terrace’s unadopted road, I believe this would need to be clarified prior to any further action taking place.</p>	<p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>I can inform you that the land is HMPE land (Highway Maintainable at Public Expense).</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>With regard to the suggestion that double yellow lines be placed outside 7 &amp; 8 Boringdon Terrace, Turnchapel I would like to register a protest in the strongest terms. The current system has worked perfectly well for many years and, as always, it is wrong to fix something which is not broken!</p> <p>There is a chronic shortage of parking spaces in Turnchapel and the idea of ruling out a further two spaces is horribly counter-productive. There is ample space to park cars and larger vehicles on the cobbled section, together with space for van deliveries etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p>

<p>The Boringdon Arms receives its deliveries via the lower section of road through the cellar, while the current method of a Facebook request for scaffolding vans/removal vans etc works perfectly well.</p> <p>Furthermore, I understand that this section of road is officially 'unadopted' and so PCC have no jurisdiction over it.</p> <p>Parking issues in Turnchapel can create a great deal of stress and negative impact upon the Conservation Area.</p> <p>I hope you will give this your sympathetic attention.</p>	<p>I can inform you that the land is HMPE land (Highway Maintainable at Public Expense).</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I strongly object to traffic managements proposal of placing double yellow lines on the road in front of No 7 , &amp; 8 , Boringdon Terrace.</p> <p>Limited parking is already a grave issue to the infrastructure of this small village , so the removal of two parking spaces will further escalate the problem. Plymouth city council have acknowledged the problem as planning officers have refused planning proposals on these grounds. Namely Kelly Cottage's Undercliff Road although this decision was overruled on appeal.</p> <p>Notwithstanding I would also question PCC jurisdiction to uphold any penalty enforcement, on the grounds of the vague information of the Highway's Register B. It has no date for completion of making up. The NIS O/S reference is not a definitive, and only ref the lower section of Boringdon Road from the junction of St John's Rd ,approximate distance , to No3 Undercliff Rd . It excludes the section in question,the entrance to the raised cobbled area from No 7 including No's 8,9,10,11,12,14,&amp;15 Boringdon Terrace. This remains an anomaly.</p> <p>Approximately fifteen years ago PCC had to remove a resident's parking bay in front of No 7 Boringdon Terrace for this very reason. At the same time double yellow lines were extended from the front of No 2 Shipwrights to No 3 also removing a parking space. This perfectly adequate space should, if anything , be reinstated as residents parking?</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>



<p>The raised cobbled area of Boringdon Terrace is not accessed by heavy goods vehicles, delivering to the Boringdon arms public house due to its restricted width and public footpath. All the drey delivery's are made to the cellar via the lower Boringdon Road. Any other need to access Boringdon Terrace has never been an issue for the residents so I am perplexed as to the need for change now.</p>	
--	--

#### There have been 4 representations received relating to Crescent Avenue

Consultation	Comments
<p>Reference 2021.2137271 moving the parking bays nearer to the corner of crescent avenue and st james place east. I would like to object to this proposal as cars coming down st james east often do at high speeds and cut the corner. If the cars are parked nearer to the junction as proposed it would be dangerous for cars parked in the new parking areas Residents are resistant to parking on the corner now so with the proposed move over to the junction would be very dangerous. I have been over the years witness to many close calls regarding cars cutting the corner. I think this proposal is unwise and would suit no purpose, but possibly cause future accidents ta, especially as the neighbourhood has elderly residents who often struggle with crossing the road. I hope this can be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I would like to raise an objection to the above proposal. This proposal is certainly not within the interest of the general public. Having lived on Crescent Avenue for over 30 years there has never been a problem with the parking bay in question.</p> <p>Moving the parking bays to the right will restrict vision and space to the junction between Crescent Avenue and St James' Place East. This is already a busy junction where poor vision can result in dangerous driving. The highway code states parking should not take place within 10 meters of a junction, whilst I appreciate this is a designated bay it is far from the ideal already and the proposal will make it worse. Reducing the bay will exacerbate the on-going parking shortage.</p> <p>If access is a problem at this end of the service lane due to illegal parking then surely this is a problem for our fantastic traffic wardens; or</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>those aggrieved could simply use the other end of the service lane on the few occasions access is blocked. Moving the bays at the cost of the tax payer seems excessive.</p> <p>I suspect there is a single complainant, the same complainant who uses parts of their property for Airbnb (offering off-street parking) and would like continued guaranteed access. I knew the previous owner who lived in that property for a very long time and never had a problem; the same with the family next door to them and the family opposite, all of which share the entrance to this service lane.</p>	
<p>I live opposite the junction between Crescent Avenue and St James Place East and regularly see and have been involved in near misses where cars trying to pull out of St James Place East are almost hit by cars travelling on Crescent Avenue.</p> <p>The view is already limited because of cars/vans parked in the existing bays. Moving the parking bay closer to this junction is going to make it so much worse! If anything the bay should be moved the other way allowing for a clearer junction.</p> <p>Why after all these years is the bay being moved? I'm going to contact all my neighbours to make sure they are aware of the proposed changes, how best should they voice their concerns if they have any?</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>We will take your email below as your objection.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p> <p>The best way for anyone to comment is to email <a href="mailto:TrafficManagementInbox@plymouth.gov.uk">TrafficManagementInbox@plymouth.gov.uk</a> quoting ref: 2021.2137271. Comments can be received until 15th December 2021.</p>
<p>Please can I object to these plans on the basis of road user safety and road user access.</p> <p>When driving down St. James' Place East to join Crescent Avenue it can be difficult to see on-coming vehicles coming from the right due to the existing parking bay arrangement. Moving the parking bay 1 meter closer to a busy junction will result in vision being further impeded. Cars travel quickly on this section of road and I witnessed an accident here earlier in the year.</p> <p>This is a busy junction used by larger vehicles, these vehicles already struggle to get round this corner. Moving the parking bays even</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p>

<p>closer will make it impossible. The photographs below were taken within 40 minutes of each other.</p>	<p>The reasoning for this proposal is to move permit parking by 1 metre to allow access and prevent obstruction in the rear lane.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
--	--

**There have been 1 representation received relating to Eden Valley Gardens & side streets**

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>REF: Eden Valley Gardens, Ambleside Place &amp; Ravenglass Close (Amd.2021.2137271 TRO Review 8)</p> <p>In view of the plan and image you have provided of Eden Valley Gardens, Ambleside Place &amp; Ravenglass proposed road amendments I have the following comments and objections.</p> <p>I would like to point out that Eden Valley Gardens already have Double Yellow Lines running up the full length of it, they are not enforced. So unless the extension of these lines 18m into Ravenglass Close and 12m into Ambleside are enforced then these proposals will have no effect. (Please see attached Image 4, Image 5 and image 6 as a twice daily example of what people do with the current double yellow lines in place)</p> <p>The suggestion of a New Limited Waiting of 10 minutes is not sufficient when on average people arrive up to 30minutes for school pick up. Again if this is not enforced it will not be affective.</p> <p>The plans as depicted do not address the issue further along Ambleside Place and Ravenglass Close and these proposals as they stand will just be make the current situation worse further along these two areas.</p> <p>As you can see from Image 1 and Image 2 this is a typical pick up or drop off on the Ambleside place twice a day from beyond the limits that have been stated in the changes. (none of the vehicles in the image 1 or image 2 belong to a resident)</p> <p>In summary I request further extension of these proposals further up Ambleside Place and Ravenglass in the form of the bollards being continued in the sections I have</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>

<p>coloured Yellow on Image 3, which is in keeping with the rest of the development.</p> <p>My suggestions will have no effect on residents as it can be proven on a day to day basis that there is ample visitor spaces, garages and personal parking spaces for residents and we do not utilise the pavements for personal vehicles.</p> <p>I would like to conclude by saying the abuse not only I have received but other residents as well has been astonishing from those waiting on school pick up and drop off. I also have two children that I drive to school so when I am face with being unable to easily exit my drive way, ask people to move and my children are witness to the foul language it is not appreciated.</p> <p>Not only this but on many occasions, whilst my wife pushes our youngest to nursery in his pram she is forced into the road due to there being no bollards in the areas of Image 3 that I have highlighted yellow as they are blocked by people waiting.</p>	
--	--

#### **There have been 1 representation received relating to James Street**

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>I live on James Street and we indeed have parking issue. However, we do not have enough parking as it is. We need more parking arranged with street being widened. Double yellows will just cause double parking further down the road (already happens). So potentially redirect the bus or increase the size of the road please.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>

#### **There have been 8 representations received relating to St Vincent Street**

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>I think it would be a good move to remove the yellow lines at the end of St Vincent Street as in the past it seems that only certain cars (like</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p>

<p>my daughter's ) are targeted with fixed penalty notices , and other cars park on the same yellow lines constantly and don't get any tickets. My daughter works as a chef and leaves at 7.45am and returns at 11.00pm or 12.00pm depending when the restaurant is finished and still continues to receive these fixed penalty notices.</p>	<p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>
<p>I am putting in writing my objection for you to remove the double yellow lines at the bottom of St Vincent Street.</p> <p>I have a elderly Nan that has lived in the street for years and who is very disabled. The yellow lines at the top of the street have already been removed which makes reversing even further out onto a busy street dangerous as it is so having the yellow lines where we are able to turn the car is a must.</p> <p>My Nan already struggles with mobility and requires a wheel chair we often use this space to load and unload the chair into the car.</p> <p>I understand the problem with more cars in the street, but feel that if this is a issue for people then maybe people need to start turning the large back areas into car spaces and leave the masses of work vans at work.</p> <p>It's a very tight street as it is. With a lot of elderly people in that require emergency services. This space has always offered them somewhere to stop and help with the residents without blocking the road.</p> <p>This turning spot is also vital as lots of the people in the street have friends that will not visit if unable to turn at the bottom. It's a long street to reverse up which means some of my nans neighbours will also not see family and friends.</p> <p>There is also a lot of work done at the bottom of the street. Normally the drains are done and by making this parking will mean that they will not be able to do the job at hand as quick as needed.</p> <p>I'm not sure how this street keeps getting parking issues and double yellow lines</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>

<p>removed so quick when parking in the area is bad ? Maybe look into other streets for parking issues or make the street permit only would also help with the parking problem. I also think the quickness to allow the larger houses to be flats without having parking available has also caused this issue and feel that should be taken into account for any further plans for the street.</p>	
<p>Hi I would like to say that I would definitely like the removal of the yellow lines at the end of the street. they make my life extremely difficult and can't park outside my own home .sometimes have to park a long way away and also my elderly family don't visit purely because they can't park anywhere close by.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>
<p>I am writing in relation to your recent proposition about removing the double yellow lines in our street. As you can appreciate this is a dead end street so driving down is very narrow as there are cars either side. Cars and emergency services drive down at the moment and they have a turning point. We have had incidents before where cars have parked there and emergency services and cars have struggled to get down the street. Emergency services need to be able to access the street and be able to get out of the street swiftly. By removing the yellow lines it will increase the amount of vehicles in the street and make this difficult.</p> <p>I am writing to object to the removal of this as I deem this to not only not be safe but not realistic.</p> <p>I would appreciate you taking this into account as I have lived in the street for over 60 years.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I would like to object to the DYL being removed from the turning point in the cul de sac in my street. I don't understand how removing this DYL will help.</p> <p>We have the drive down and turn around the bottom, how are we expected to turn if this area is blocked with cars. We need this in place. A lot of elderly residents have</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have</p>

<p>ambulances/doctors etc. and they need a turning space. It has always had DYL for over 70 years I have lived here and we need them.</p>	<p>been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport. You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing to say that I would like the yellow lines to be gone as this causes me and my family distress. I am a key worker and work all hours of the day and night. To not be able to come home and park outside my own house is very stressful.</p> <p>It's cul-de-sac and I can't see the need for the yellow lines to be honest.</p> <p>I would also like it brand to your attention that one of the neighbours has a family member who's a traffic warden and calls them at any chance . For instance someone dropping off an elderly relative and ends up getting a ticket . In such a quiet little street well out of the way of town I can't see any reason for this to be happening .</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport. You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>Good Afternoon, Im sending an email in relation to the yellow lines being removed from part of St Vincent Street. Weve lived here for 2 years, parking has always been awful on our street. My partner is a carpenter and relies on his van being safe on the street due to his tools being valuable. The parking has been so bad that we have to sometimes park in Morris town which means he is worrying about his valuables throughout the night. Theres days where I cant park my car in our road either which means walking to Morris town with our 2 year old in all weathers.</p> <p>On behalf of myself and my partner, we very much agree that the yellow lines should be removed, not just for us but for the whole street, we have a few elderly residents on this street so i cant imagine how difficult it must be for then considering all the hills around here. Its a common conversation between ourselves and our neighbours!</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport. You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>
<p>I am very against the removal of these yellow lines as they are needed for us to be able to turn our cars around in the street. Parking here is hard enough and also certain individuals who continually abuse the parking laws and park their cars in the turning circle preventing</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of</p>

<p>us from using it for what it's supposed to be. Your parking officers do a good job catching them but should be harsher outcomes for repeat offenders.</p> <p>This turning circle needs to be kept to enable us to access and egress the street safely especially in the incimate weather.</p>	<p>the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented</p>
--	---

**There have been 1 representation received relating to Trefusis Gardens**

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>You have put up a notice about changing the parking conditions in Trefusis Gardens. I rang you last week to clarify what it meant for this road and was told that yellow lines would be painted. Can you please tell me how this is going to help improve the situation?</p> <p>At the moment we have a no parking sign and this does not deter people from parking there when they take their children to the play park nearby or to leave their car there for prolong periods of time for other reasons.</p> <p>All you are suggestion is a tick box solution. That is you have done something but it does not matter if it works.</p> <p>I believe a better solution to this problem is the one I suggested to the team that is consulting on the flood prevention project. That is to put a car park on the flat ground by the 5G mast that has recently gone up. You could also put a low wall at the back of the cark park and this would prevent people driving their cars and vans up on to the park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2021.2137271.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

**4. RECOMMENDATION**

**After reviewing all comments received our recommendations are below:**

After discussions with the Devonport Ward Councillors, it is recommended that St Vincent Street is abandoned from the TRO Review .8 and re-advertised as an Experimental Order.

It is recommended that the proposals are abandoned relating to Boringdon Terrace & Crescent Avenue

All other proposals are recommended to be implemented as advertised.



## **5. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When considering whether to make a traffic order it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) that sets out that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable subject to certain matters, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act as they practically secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in and around Plymouth and provide for suitable and adequate associated parking facilities.