



TRO REVIEW 11

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 11.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

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

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Albert Road, the south side from its junction with Exmouth Road for a distance of 39 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Bellingham Crescent, the west side from its junction with Glen Road to its junction with Hedingham Close
- (iii) Bellingham Crescent, the east side from its junction with Glen Road for a distance of 28 metres in a southerly direction
- (iv) Brest Road, both sides from its junction with Derriford Roundabout to its north west junction with William Prance Road
- (v) Brest Road, the north side from a point 250 metres north west of its junction with Peregrine Road to its north westerly junction with William Prance Road
- (vi) Brest Road, the north side from a point 207 metres north west of its junction with Peregrine Road for a distance of 13 metres in a north westerly direction
- (vii) Brest Road, the north-east side from its junction with Peregrine Road for a distance of 48 metres in a northerly direction
- (viii) Brest Road, the south side from its north west junction with William Prance Road to its south east junction with William Prance Road
- (ix) Coleridge Road, the north side from its junction with Prince Maurice Road for a distance of 89 metres in an easterly direction
- (x) Coleridge Road, the south side from its junction with Prince Maurice Road for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction

- (xi) Coleridge Road, the south side from its junction with Jinkin Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction
- (xii) Conrad Road, both sides from its junction with St Peters Road for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction
- (xiii) Efford Lane, the south side from its junction with Severn Place for a distance of 11 metres in a westerly direction
- (xiv) Elburton Road, the north side from its junction with Haye Road to its boundary of 181a & 183 Elburton Road
- (xv) Exmouth Road, the east side from its junction with Albert Road for a distance of 22 metres in a southerly direction
- (xvi) Exmouth Road, the west side from its junction with Albert Road for a distance of 14 metres in a southerly direction
- (xvii) Faringdon Road, both sides from its junction with Salisbury Road for a distance of 13 metres in a southerly direction
- (xviii) Flamsteed Crescent, both sides from its junction with Kings Tamerton Road for a distance of 10 metres in a north westerly direction
- (xix) Flamsteed Crescent, the north side from a point 4.5 metres west from the boundary of 83 & 85 for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (xx) Flamsteed Crescent, the north side from a point 4 metres east of the boundary of numbers 65 & 67 for a distance of 12 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxi) Haye Road, the east side from its junction with King George Playing Fields to its junction with Hercules Road
- (xxii) Haye Road, the west side from its junction with Elburton Road to its junction with Hercules Road
- (xxiii) Hedingham Close, the north side from its junction with Bellingham Crescent for a distance of 7 metres in a westerly direction

OFFICIAL

- (xxiv) Hooe Hill, the west side from its junction with Hooe Road for a distance of 18 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxv) Hooksbury Avenue, the east side from its junction with Maddock Drive for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxvi) Hooksbury Avenue, the west side from its junction with Maddock Drive for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxvii) Jinkin Avenue, both sides from its junction with Coleridge Road for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxviii) King's Tamerton Road, the north-west side from its junction with Flamsteed Crescent for a distance of 12 metres in a south westerly direction
- (xxix) Lucas Lane, the north side from its junction with Orchard Lane for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction and 6 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxx) Maddock Drive, the south side from its junction with Hooksbury Avenue for a distance of 12 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxi) Meadow Park, both sides from the centre line at the junction with Hooe Road for a distance of 9 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxxii) Normandy Way, the north side from its junction with Daymond Road for a distance of 11 metres in a westerly direction and 12 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxiii) Normandy Way, the south side from its junction with Seacroft Road for a distance of 12 metres in a westerly direction and 15 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxiv) Portland Square Lane North, the north side for its entirety.
- (xxxv) Radford Park Road, the south-east side from a point 1 metre south west of the boundary of numbers 75 & 77 Radford Park Road for a distance of 33 metres in a north easterly direction
- (xxxvi) Segrave Road, the north-west side from its junction with Wolseley Road to a point 5 metres north east of its boundary of 79 & 77 Segrave Road
- (xxxvii) Severn Place, both sides from its junction with Severn Place (side of 120) for a distance of 12 metres in a southerly direction

- (xxxviii) Severn Place, the south side from its junction with Severn Place (by number 2) for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxix) Severn Place, the south side from its junction with Severn Place (by 120) to its junction with Efford Lane
- (xl) St Peters Road, the west side from its junction with Conrad Road for a distance of 10 metres in a north westerly direction and 10 metres in a south easterly direction
- (xli) Underlane, the north side from its junction with Cot Hill for a distance of 14 metres in an easterly direction
- (xlii) Underlane, the south side from its junction with Cot Hill to its boundary between 148 & 146 Underlane

No Waiting midnight-8.00am, 10am-3pm and 4pm-midnight

- (i) Brest Road, the north side from a point 220 metres north west of its junction with Peregrine Road for a distance of 30 metres in a north westerly direction
- (ii) Brest Road, the north-east side from a point 48 metres north of its junction with Peregrine

School Entrance Clearway At Any Time

Severn Place, the north side from the boundary of number 8 & 10 Severn Place for a distance of 43 metres in a westerly direction

School Entrance Clearway Mon-Fri 8am-5pm

- (i) Cambridge Road, the south side from a point 20 metres west of its junction with Melville Road for a distance of 43 metres in a westerly direction
- (ii) Estuary Way, the west side from a point 11 metres north of its junction with Morwellham Close for a distance of 43 metres in a northerly direction
- (iii) Flamsteed Crescent, the north side from the boundary of numbers 59 & 61 for a distance of 43 metres in a westerly direction

No U-Turn

Drake Circus, at the junction of Coburg Street

No Right Turn

Embankment Road, at the junction of Elliot Road

Prohibition of motor vehicles (except access)

Howard Road, from the boundary of number 67 and 69A, for a distance of 550 metres

REVOCATIONS

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Bellingham Crescent, both sides, from its junction with Glen Road for a distance of 20 metres in a southerly direction
- (ii) Brest Road, both sides, For its entirety
- (iii) Coleridge Road, both sides, on both sides from the junction with Prince Maurice Road for a distance of 6 metres in an easterly direction
- (iv) Efford Lane, the south side, from a point 20 metres west of its junction with Severn Place to a point 54 metres west of its junction with Severn Place
- (v) Exmouth Road, the west side, from the junction with Albert Road for a distance of 10 metres
- (vi) Hooe Hill, the west side, from its junction with Hooe Road for a distance of 14 metres in a southerly direction
- (vii) (Normandy Way, the north side, from a point 11 metres west to a point 20 metres east of the junction with Daymond Road
- (viii) Normandy Way, the south side, from a point 19 metres west to a point 25 metres east of the junction with Seacroft Road
- (ix) Portland Square Lane North, the north side, from the junction with Kirkby Place to a point 32 metres west of the junction with Endsleigh Place
- (x) Portland Square Lane North, the north side, from its junction with Sherwell Lane for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (xi) Segrave Road, the north-west side, from a point 23.5 metres north east of its boundary of 97 & 95 Segrave Road to its boundary of 81 & 79 Segrave Road

- (xii) Segrave Road, the north-west side, from a point 4 metres north east of its north boundary of 95 Segrave Road to its junction with Wolseley Road

No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm

- (i) Albert Road (keyham), the south side, from the junction with Exmouth Road for a distance of 34 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Exmouth Road, the east side, from the junction with Albert Road for a distance of 31 metres
- (iii) Exmouth Road, the west side, from a point 10 metres south of the junction with Albert Road for a distance of 21 metres in a southerly direction

Permit Parking Mon-Sat 10am-5pm

Portland Square Lane North, the north side, the north side from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Endsleigh Place for a distance of 22 metres

School Entrance Clearway At Any Time

- (i) Cambridge Road, the south side, from a point 20 metres west of its junction with Melville Road for a distance of 26 metres in a westerly direction
- (ii) Severn Place, the north side, from a point 53 metres east of its junction with Torridge Way for a distance of 37 metres in an easterly direction

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the TRO review 11 were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 21st July 2023. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 11th August 2023.

There have been 11 representations received relating to the proposals included in the Traffic Regulation Order.

There have been 2 representation received relating to Albert Road

Consultation	Comment
Good afternoon, I have read your proposals for double yellow lines at the junction of Albert Road and Exmouth	Response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.

<p>Road. One reason why parishioners sometimes park there is the lack of disabled parking spaces outside St Michael's Church. Is there any satisfactory way of resolving this issue?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you,</p>	<p>I have attached the plan of the proposal for you to view, the proposal is for the removal of No Waiting (single yellow line) and implementation of double yellow lines for junction protection and to protect the build out with pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>It may be helpful to inform you that blue badge holders can park on single or double yellow lines for three hour periods.</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>Regard's Albert Road the location in front of St Michael's Church it has been brought to our attention by a member of said church that there is a proposal of new parking restrictions in the form of double yellow lines. Albert Road already has issues with parking availability especially as the road has seen the increase of apartments and bedsits in former single home conversions into HMOS plus the build of large</p> <p>Blocks of flats on the former site of the original church. The parking for which is at the rear but due to residents owning perhaps more than one vehicle plus the issues with the electric gates which seem each week to be needing fixing as they won't open / close means that visitors to and residents f the flats adjacent to the church use the parking spaces along the front of the building in Albert Road but also in front of the church itself.</p> <p>Additionally, other users of the parking spaces in front of St Michael's church are the parishioners themselves and staff who maintain the grounds and interior on a weekly basis. The owners of PREMIER KWIK SHOP located opposite the church is a busy successful contribution to the community but also to many passing trade who use the space's available for popping in to buy goods and then leave ... the introduction of these new proposals will therefore have a significant affect on these community places and on residents who maybe visiting or living in the area.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</p> <p>I have attached the plan of the proposal for you to view, the proposal is for the removal of No Waiting (single yellow line) and implementation of double yellow lines for junction protection and to protect the build out with pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>It may be helpful to inform you that blue badge holders can park on single or double yellow lines for three hour periods. Angled parking that you mentions is rarely used on the Highway and would not be suitable on Albert Road, drivers tend to drive into the spaces and reverse out which would cause a safety concern.</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 myself affected as I am a carer for an 83 year old retired teacher who can take 6 minutes just to cross the road to my minibus to take trips out. This is because for most days in the year it is impossible to find spaces to park in front of our own home. In the last week there was an evening where we arrived home late and I had to drop her off and leave her alone in the home whilst I spent 30 minutes driving around the local streets until I managed to find a space as a customer of the Railway Pub on Albert Road left as the establishment closed for the evening.</p> <p>I feel that these restrictions not only will have a negative impact upon the establishments in the community but restrict the use of the church's activities and creates impossible conditions for the likes of the elderly retirees like the teacher I care for. I there ask you please reconsider this plan to introduce double yellow lines as this particular section of Albert Road is already difficult.</p> <p>I feel there is a need for discussion on the layout of Albert Road that need to be covered to improve safety and community and would be very interested in suggestions for improvements especially the consideration of angled parking rather than end to end as is now as not only would this make parking easier and quicker (improving road traffic flow) but also could enable periodical planters for small Cherry Tree's along the length of Albert Road increasing green space commitments along the roads entire length but also to widen the side walk on the opposite side of the road to the church along the roads entire length which will enable the increase of greenery but also provide more opportunities for the traders for cafes and public houses to include outdoor seating and stalls for vegetables etc ...</p> <p>We are living in a community but at the moment there is little spaces for those within it to meet, socialise, and make friends.</p>	
--	--

There has been 1 representation received relating to Coleridge Road

Consultation	Comment
<p>Hi just noticed that Coleridge Road maybe loosing 50% of its parking ? The whole of one side at the Prince Maurice Road end. Can you clarify if this is really happening as residents will literal have nowhere to park ? Is there anything being</p>	<p>Standard response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</p> <p>Plymouth City Council are currently in the consultation period for this Traffic Regulation</p>

<p>done to provide more parking ie making the path at the other end (by the new pointless electric chargers) narrower to compensate ? I can't see how this isn't going to be a disaster for residents ? Please get back to me with how you see this working out and what can be done to make life better and not worse for residents</p>	<p>Order, comments can be received until 11th August 2023.</p> <p>The reasoning for this proposal is a safety requirement to prevent obstruction of emergency fire service vehicles.</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 has been 1 representation received relating to Flamsteed Crescent

<p>Consultation</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>I write in regard to the proposed parking restrictions, as identified in the Herald on Thu 27th July 23, and the identification of parking restrictions to be applied to Flamsteed Crescent. I am a resident of the street but having served with Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service for some 30 years, I am also very aware of the traffic dangers to children and I do not believe this restriction will achieve any improvement to their safety.</p> <p>This was first made aware to me by a circulatory letter from a Councillor earlier this year. I did respond but received no further communication.</p> <p>I would like to object to the proposed restrictions, albeit the Herald did not specify exactly what the restriction to the Crescent will be. I was originally informed the Councillor that this would be the provision of double yellow lines along the upper part of Flamsteed Crescent, and therefore assume that this is the implication identified in the Herald article.</p> <p>My understanding is that this is primarily due to the parking issues created by parents collecting their children from the school, MAP Academy. I could not see how this provision will stop these parents from parking whilst waiting for their children. Indeed, the parents do not get out of their cars, but park, half on the pavement, and half on the road, until their children arrive.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305, I have attached the proposed plan for you to view.</p> <p>Unfortunately which entrance the School uses is out of Plymouth City Councils control.</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>Yellow lines will not stop this activity unless there is an enforcement officer present, and which will cause the parents to just drive around the block until it is clear. I believe it is far too costly to provide a daily enforcement officer for this period of time.</p> <p>Therefore, the yellow lines will have a much greater restriction on the residents of Flamsteed Crescent, preventing them from parking near their homes, and subjecting them to the potential for fines and enforcement, when all they want to do is to park outside their houses. And this would certainly appear like another hidden tax on the poor drivers of the City who already struggle with ordinary parking issues, the same as residents across a great many streets within our City.</p> <p>In my response to the Councillor, I identified an issue of security, seen more and more with incidents across the national news, of people/criminals etc, being able to access the school grounds without challenge, for whatever the purpose they may have in mind. I suggested that the School itself has a responsibility for the security and safety of all the children and it would make sense to me that they control the school grounds more effectively. I believe there should only be one access point into the school, and that this should be the main entrance. There is an entrance road that leads into the School, adjacent to their car park, that passes across the main entrance and leads back out onto main road, Trevithick Road. This roadway can be controlled far better and reduce the need for an open gate leading onto Flamsteed Crescent. Security would be improved and there would be no need for more costly road works to Flamsteed Crescent, which actually would not achieve anything anyway.</p> <p>I would be happy to discuss this further and have the opportunity to make suggestions that would greatly improve road safety and the protection of the children within Flamsteed Crescent.</p>	
--	--

There has been 1 representation received relating to Haye Road

Consultation	Comment
<p>I would like to state for the record, that the proposed scheme (No waiting at Any time (xxii) Haye Road, the west side from its junction with Elburton Road to its junction with Hercules</p>	<p>Standard response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</p>

<p>Road) has my full support and I sincerely hope that this gets the go ahead.</p> <p>The level of traffic on Hays Road has (as I'm sure you're aware) dramatically increased over the recent years with the construction of Sherford and the A38 deep lane link road.</p> <p>During specific periodic times of the year, Elburton football ground have their football tournaments, (which is at least 5 or 6 weekends a year) where people will (irrespective of any safety cones put out) inconsiderately park on the pavement almost the length of Hays road, down to the traffic lights by Hercules Road. They cause disruption to heavy traffic flow, block the pedestrian footpath, making it extremely difficult for persons using wheelchairs, prams and mobility scooters and not to mention the large numbers of children going to and from the football games. Access to private driveways and to Ashtree Grove Private Road is forever being restricted or blocked and this in turn makes it very difficult to get out driveways safely as the cars parked block the view of oncoming traffic and pedestrians.</p> <p>I have photographic evidence that has been taken over years if required.</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 has been 1 representation received relating to Hooksbury Avenue

Consultation	Comment
<p>I have noted the information left on the lamppost on Hooksbury Avenue about modifications under the Road Traffic Act and request for information to be submitted by the end of today, hence this email.</p> <p>I am pleased that double yellow lines have been considered for the junction between Hooksbury Avenue and Maddock Drive. Personally I feel these were needed, hence my previous correspondence.</p> <p>My only concerns with what has been submitted, is the length of the line on the opposite side to 6 and 8 Hooksbury Avenue, the line marked currently as 10m at the junction on the plans.</p> <p>I have submitted information and videos of the coaches moving up Hooksbury Avenue in previous correspondence to the council/traffic management department and you can see the difficulty they have at the junction, often being on the wrong side of the road.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</p> <p>Once advertised we are unable to extend a restriction, we can only reduce or abandon a proposal at the reporting stage. Ten metres should be adequate for this junction, however this can be monitored if and when the restriction is implemented.</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>

The coaches used are full length coaches to Chaddlewood School, which are 12m long, according to UK.Gov guidelines and company fleet information. With the line set at 10m, the coach coming up the hill of Hooksbury Avenue, will not have the space to pull onto the correct side of the road on approach to the junction, when a car is legally parked at the edge of the double yellow line and that creates its own problem of blocking the junction when set at 10m

At 10m length, this will also prevent refuse collection lorries from pulling onto the correct side of the road as well, as they are 10.4m in length.

My request is that this line is extended to 14m or ideally 15m from the junction itself, this just allows the longer vehicles accessing Hooksbury Avenue adequate manoeuvrability at the junction, without the rear of the vehicle protruding into the oncoming lane, or encroachment onto Maddock Drive to fit the 10m space, as they will not have the space to pull in past legally parked cars with the line set at 10m

If you consider a long estate vehicle is under 5m in length, this modification removes less than one long car parking space off the on road parking on Hooksbury Avenue, while guaranteeing the flow of traffic on the junction for ALL vehicles of all sizes, especially at the junction/travelling up hill, which is when I consider the road and pedestrian users to be most vulnerable.

The other line proposed on Hooksbury Avenue will work perfectly as will the line going up on Maddock Drive, giving much better line of site for cars coming down off The Ridgeway towards Hooksbury Avenue, which is great.

I am thankful that my previous application has been considered and after reflection by those in the department it has been decided that some action is required on the junction, I hope you see fit to make this minor modification to the plans as it will ensure the aims of the double yellow lines are done in one go and will therefore not require secondary action to ensure safety at this junction.

There has been 1 representation received relating to Howard Road

Consultation	Comment
<p>Howard Road has been Access Only for decades. How will the prohibition change things? Is it going to be enforced?</p> <p>Enforcement may make the road safer for my elderly mother who uses the lane as a pedestrian daily.</p>	<p>Response sent: Yes, we have added/ordered a new sign to ensure the signage is correct & The Traffic Order is being sorted to ensure this is enforceable going forward.</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</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 has been 1 representation received relating to Radford Park Road

Consultation	Comment
<p>I have read on Facebook from plym live. Taking away some of the yellow lines to add more parking.</p> <p>The road is a very fast moving road. More so at night. About 90+% of people in this street have a drive way or parking at the back of their home.</p> <p>I live on this street. We get boy/girl racers all night cars all most hitting each over. The road is very restricted. We need more yellow lines on the road speed bumps. You need to put cameras up to watch people's driving on this street. Plus nothing gets done about the lorry's delivering to the shops here blocking the road.</p>	<p>Standard response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</p> <p>I have attached the location plan for this proposal.</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 has been 1 representation received relating to Seagrave Road

Consultation	Comment
<p>As a resident of Seagrave Road I would like to object to the proposed removal of the double yellow lines between 77 and 79 Seagrave Road.</p> <p>My car is currently parked the over side of where the proposed change is going to take place. Cars are driving up to the back of mine having to wait</p>	<p>Standard response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</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</p>

<p>to go through the gap. It's only moving the narrowing in the road further up the road achieving absolutely nothing other than hardship for local residents.</p> <p>For the volume of traffic that use this road is pretty quite most of the time. The problem is more parking is required here not less.</p> <p>IT'S PARKING HELL HERE!!!!</p> <p>Over the years many attempts have been made to do something about the parking, petitions with many signatures collected to no avail. We are prisoners in our homes when Argyle are home. We have a first class dog toilet which could be used for parking widening the road.</p> <p>There was a scheme to resolve parking here which was scrapped by an objection from a local environmentalist which no longer live here.</p> <p>We have a problem with vans as a resident has two vans, one a large long wheel base at least two family cars in length, we have a car from Bowers Road parking here leaving little parking for anyone else. It is toxic already as one resident thinks they own the parking here. We have a resident opposite with at least four cars room for all on their driveway and garage but often park's two or three on the road over night.</p> <p>What I'm asking for is a review and work with the resident, and local councillors not against us!</p> <p>This only BENEFITS one house who probably complained about accessing their property, selfish bad driver.</p> <p>This is bad for residents will achieve nothing just need a little give and take give way to couple cars.</p>	<p>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 2 representations received relating to Underlane

Consultation	Comment
<p>I am writing with reference to the proposed double yellow lines along side Underlane, Plympton.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to address the issue that this road is used by many residents which live along Cot Hill and Underlane itself. Also during busy seasonal times many visitors will park on nearby roads to visit Saltram House. With a few spaces that are would potentially be taken up by local and visitors this will intern make it extremely difficult for the residents which are elderly and</p>	<p>Standard response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305, I have attached the proposed plan for you to view, the proposal is for junction protection only.</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</p>

young families and need the parking near their homes.

The drives along one side of Underlane are difficult to access for many vehicles as they are narrow and with family cars are tricky to fit into their own driveway without causing difficulties for their neighbour and to continuing to be courteous. These people most have a tendency to park on the road. Should parking be more restricted I'm worried that older residents won't be able to park outside their homes as spaces will be taken up.

I don't understand how this has come into place with only ONE complaint where no concerns have been made aware of beforehand. We have only been made aware of the problems when noticing the purposed noticed put up outside our home. As well as one neighbour coming out and shouting abuse at my husband then walking off, the same week as the notice going up. I have attached two photos at different times of the day. This particular neighbour over the years has also not let us cut our grass/hedge when my husband comes home from work. So we have been courteous and tried our best to fit in with her. Hence why it gets left due to our busy work schedule.

Secondly I believe that if residents cannot park along nearby roads this will cause more problems with parking up Cot Hill itself.

Also some of the vans park here as they are in close proximity to their home, which enables them to look out for them. As you may be aware there are frequent damage and thefts to vans. How are they able to protect their valuables if they are parked far away.? This could potentially cause a loss of many valuables items where people rely on for their work. Which is extremely important during these difficult times. Finally I would also like to make aware that there have been and still some ongoing works in some of residential houses along Cot Hill and previously ourselves which their vans have been parked on Underlane, which is temporary. This is something where I believe that we all have to be courteous at times.

Maybe not at the cost of everyone could not the double yellows be put out on the complaints side across there drive extending to 1 meter each side, so that they feel that they can have easy access at all times.

I hope that you can take my views into consideration.

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.

I have logged your further comments.

<p>Should you need any other information please let me know.</p> <p>Yes I do understand that the proposal for the yellow lines are for the junction only. My concerns are that they will be coming down a long way on one of the sides of the road. Which will have an affect on parking along Underlane and could have implications on parking for elderly residents/ family's which park here. This will encourage more people to park along Cot Hill it's self.</p>	
<p>I fully support the double yellow lines being placed on the Junction</p> <p>There have been a number of large vans parking on the corners.</p>	<p>Standard response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137305.</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

It is recommended that all proposals are 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.