



KEYHAM REFUSE SCHEME

I. INTRODUCTION

This report seeks delegated authority to implement amendments to The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2004 in association with the Keyham Refuse Scheme TRO.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

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

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Admiralty Street, the east side from its junction with Saltash Road to a point 4 metres south of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East
- (ii) Admiralty Street Lane East, all sides for its entirety .
- (vi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Renown Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in an easterly & westerly direction
- (x) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 3.5 metres in a westerly direction and 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (xiv) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly direction & 4 metres in an easterly direction
- (xviii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 3 metres in a westerly direction & 5.5 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 3.5 metres in a westerly direction and 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxvi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly & easterly direction
- (xxx) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 3 metres in a westerly direction & 4 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxiv) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from a point 21 metres west of its junction with Ocean Street for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction

OFFICIAL

- (xxxviii) Admiralty Street Ope South, both sides from its junction with Renown Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly & 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (xlii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly & easterly direction
- (xlvi) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 3 metres in a westerly direction & 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (l) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 4 metres in a westerly direction & 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (liv) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 4 metres in a westerly direction & 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (lviii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 4.5 metres in a westerly direction & 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (lxii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 3.5 metres in a westerly & easterly direction
- (lxvi) Fleet Street, both sides from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (lxx) Fleet Street, the east side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly & southerly direction
- (lxxiv) Fleet Street, the east side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly & southerly direction
- (lxxviii) Fleet Street, the west side from its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 4 metres in a northerly direction & 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (lxxxii) Fleet Street Lane East, all sides for its entirety .
- (lxxxvi) Ocean Street, the east side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
- (xc) Ocean Street, the west side from its junction with Renown Street Lane East Ope for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly & southerly direction

OFFICIAL

- (xciv) Ocean Street, the west side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly direction & 3 metres in a southerly direction
- (xcviii) Ocean Street, the west side from its junction with Vanguard Terrace Lane for a distance of 7 metres in a northerly direction and 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (cii) Ocean Street, the west side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (cvi) Renown Street, both sides from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (cx) Renown Street, the east side from its junction with Vanguard Terrace Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly and southerly direction
- (cxiv) Renown Street, the east side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly direction & 2.5 metres in a southerly direction
- (cxviii) Renown Street, the west side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 3 metres in a northerly direction & 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (cxxii) Renown Street, the west side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly direction & 4 metres in a southerly direction
- (cxxvi) Renown Street Lane East, both sides for its entirety .
- (cxxx) Renown Street Lane East Ope, all sides for its entirety .
- (cxxxiv) Royal Navy Avenue, the north side from its junction with Admiralty Street to a point 29 metres east of its junction with North Down Crescent
- (cxxxviii) Royal Navy Avenue Lane, both sides for its entirety .
- (cxlvi) Vanguard Terrace Lane, both sides for its entirety .
- (cxlii) Victory Street, both sides from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (cl) Victory Street, the east side from its junction with Victory Street Lane East for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly direction & 5.5 metres in a southerly direction

OFFICIAL

- (cliv) Victory Street, the east side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly direction & 4 metres in a southerly direction
- (clviii) Victory Street, the west side from its junction with Fleet Street Lane East for a distance of 3 metres in a northerly direction & 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (clxii) Victory Street, the west side from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue Lane for a distance of 5 metres in a northerly & southerly direction
- (clxvi) Victory Street Lane East, all sides for its entirety.

No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm

- (i) Admiralty Street Ope North, both sides from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 12 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 12 metres in a westerly direction & 11 metres in an easterly direction
- (vi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (x) Admiralty Street Ope North, the north side from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (xiv) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 5 metres in an easterly direction
- (xviii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxvi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 7 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxx) Admiralty Street Ope South, both sides from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction

OFFICIAL

- (xxxiv) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxxviii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 6 metres in an easterly direction
- (xlii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 6 metres in a westerly direction
- (xlvi) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly direction
- (l) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (liv) Admiralty Street Ope South, the south side from its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
- (lviii) Royal Navy Avenue, the north side from its junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 88 metres in a westerly direction

Limited Waiting To 1 Hour No Return For 4 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm

- (i) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from a point 5 metres east of its junction with Admiralty Street to a point 5 metres west of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East
- (ii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from a point 4 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street Lane East to a point 6 metres west of its junction with Victory Street
- (vi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from a point 8 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street to a point 3 metres west of its junction with Fleet Street Lane East
- (x) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side from a point 5 metres east of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East to a point 7 metres west of its junction with Fleet Street
- (xiv) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from a point 15 metres east of its junction with Admiralty Street to a point 3 metres west of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East
- (xviii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from a point 5 metres west of its junction with Fleet Street to a point 5 metres east of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East

- (xxii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from a point 6 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street to a point 4 metres west of its junction with Fleet Street Lane East
- (xxvi) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side from a point 6 metres west of its junction with Victory Street to a point 5 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street Lane East
- (xxx) Fleet Street, the west side from a point 5 metres south of its junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 8 metres in a southerly direction

REVOCATIONS

Items to be revoked from:

THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION AND STREET PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2004

No Waiting At Any Time

Royal Navy Avenue, the north & west side, from the junction with North Down Crescent for a distance of 19 metres in an easterly direction

No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm

- (i) Admiralty Street Ope North, both sides, from its junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Admiralty Street Ope North, both sides, from a point 11 metres east to a point 12 metres west of its junction with Fleet Street
- (vi) Admiralty Street Ope North, both sides, from a point 10 metres west to a point 12 metres east of its junction with Victory Street
- (x) Admiralty Street Ope South, both sides, from a point 10 metres west to a point 10 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street
- (xiv) Admiralty Street Ope South, both sides, from a point 10 metres east to a point 10 metres west of its junction with Victory Street
- (xviii) Fleet Street, the east side, from a point 13 metres south of its junction with Saltash Road to a point 6 metres south of its junction with Fleet Street Lane East
- (xxii) Fleet Street, the east side, from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 13 metres in a northerly direction

OFFICIAL

- (xxvi) Fleet Street, the west side, from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 14 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxx) Ocean Street, both sides, from the junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 10 metres
- (xxxiv) Royal Navy Avenue, the north side, from a point 26 metres east of its junction with Ocean Street to a point 88 metres west of its junction with Admiralty Street
- (xxxviii) Victory Street, both sides, from its junction with Royal Navy Avenue for a distance of 11 metres in a northerly direction
- (xlii) Victory Street, the east side, from a point 13 metres south of its junction with Saltash Road to a point 5 metres south of the junction with Victory Street Lane East

Limited Waiting To 1 Hour No Return For 4 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm

- (i) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side, from a point 10 metres east of the junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 14 metres in an easterly direction
- (ii) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side, from a point 11 metres west of the junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 8 metres in a westerly direction
- (vi) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side, from a point 10 metres east of its junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 9 metres in an easterly direction
- (x) Admiralty Street Ope North, the south side, from a point 9 metres west of its junction with Victory Street for a distance of 9 metres in a westerly direction
- (xiv) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side, from a point 10 metres east of the junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 9 metres in an easterly direction
- (xviii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side, from a point 10 metres west of the junction with Victory Street for a distance of 9 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxii) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side, from a point 15 metres east of the junction with Admiralty Street for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxvi) Admiralty Street Ope South, the north side, from a point 10 metres west of the junction with Fleet Street for a distance of 8 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxx) Fleet Street, the west side, from the junction with Admiralty Street Lane East for a distance of 13 metres in a southerly direction

Items to be revoked from:

THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION AND STREET PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT NO. 2004.06D - VARIOUS ROADS) ORDER 2006

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Fleet Street Rear Lane West, both sides, from its junction with Saltash Road Rear Lane South (between Admiralty Street and Fleet Street) southwards for a distance of 20 metres.
- (ii) Saltash Road Rear Lane South, both sides, for the entire length

Items to be revoked from:

THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT ORDER NO. 2021.2137256 TRO REVIEW .7) ORDER 2021

No Waiting At Any Time

- (vi) Admiralty Street, the east side, from its junction with Saltash Road for a distance of 35 metres in a southerly direction

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the Keyham Refuse Scheme TRO were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 24th November 2023. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 20th November 2023.

There have been 12 representations received relating to the proposals included in the Traffic Regulation Order.

Consultation responses	Comments
<p>I would still like to object as you will be extending the restricted parking to the side roads that means we will lose very valuable parking in the local area, we cannot afford to lose ANY parking as it is already disproportionate with some streets having longer yellow lines than others and not enough parking for residents that pay their council/road tax, we already battle daily with spaces being taken up by Babcock workers which means that when we come home we are struggling to park as it is, if you restrict this any further it would be grossly unfair particularly when you collect refuse once a week and we have to live there all year!</p> <p>I agree with making the lanes restricted but i am AGAINST extending this onto the roads around the lanes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2023.2137313</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>With regard to the proposed restrictions around this area, I feel that you have not thought this through particularly well, considering that the dustbins are only emptied once a week on a Thursday. As residents who pay the Council Tax</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>

<p>and inevitably, your wages, and Vehicle Excise Duty, we have enough problems now with being able to park anywhere near our houses without further restrictions, particularly with the idea of 'No waiting at any time' from Monday to Saturday in the back lanes around Fleet Street. Restricted parking would be much more appropriate I feel.</p> <p>The other problem is with workers from the Dockyard not being able to use the under used car parks belonging to DML and HMS Drake, as they are not allowed parking permits if they live within 3 miles of the dockyard. These add to our parking problems. Until Plymouth has a decent Public Transport system that can be relied upon, these people will drive to work especially during poor weather conditions as will most of our residents who work, especially those who work shift patterns that do not coincide with public transport timings. We need our cars for work, various appointments, i.e. hospital, doctors, etc.</p> <p>I also understand that the local councillors do not live locally, but in areas with less parking problems and probably off-road parking on drives etc. so do not realise the real world problems we have already.</p>	<p>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>Back lanes people have to park in the lane because the van brigade park in the street clogging it up instead of taking their van to their depot if you put a sign at the top of each service lane no parking on Wednesday and Thursday this may help</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>As a resident in Fleet street , I'm objecting to your new proposed plans. The parking for residents is difficult enough as it is.</p> <p>Currently we have to fight for a space, just in our own street, let alone near our houses.</p> <p>I have a young autistic child, I have to carry to and from the car, to the house and vice versa.</p> <p>I cannot get a Blue badge and hence a parking space , because the child doesnt meet the criteria.</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>So to potentially have even more restrictions on parking, which aren't necessary, then this is ludicrous.</p> <p>There should be reduction in the right areas on corners only , to help the parking situation.</p> <p>Enforce parking permits if you must , with a maximum of 2 per household.</p> <p>Thus will reduce the amount of vehicles alone , plus get rid of those people, using our streets as a car park for work.</p> <p>I've had a number of years experience in waste management, myself, so I know there Canberra difficulties with collections. But that was in remote areas, like Cornwall and build up areas like Essex.</p> <p>I think , by reducing the size of the vehicles being used , could help , but you really would have to invest in electronic vehicles, to fully make this a viable option.</p> <p>This is a battle which needs to be addressed, as you will never solve it otherwise!</p> <p>I'm sure my Labour Party colleges will agree that this is a very volatile situation!</p>	
<p>After having looked at the proposed changes i was hoping to see some amendments made to Ocean street for permitted parking.</p> <p>There is a real issue for residents and business' who are situated in Ocean Street(Amongst others in Keyham too) with regards to parking, especially at the bottom of Ocean Street/Saltash Road, with Dockyard workers parking and leaving no place for residents to park their vehicles where they live.</p> <p>Can this be considered to change please?</p> <p>It seems to tie in with the issues regarding the Refuse trucks having space to carry out their work - Many of those Dockyard workers congest the daytime parking, also at a time when the refuse workers are active.</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 commuters taking advantage of residential parking are already part of the problem which brought this situation to a head.</p> <p>I'm sure the changes already proposed will help for the refuse workers, yet I feel it will only squeeze the already limited parking areas in Keyham that are currently without permitted parking on street.</p> <p>Less parking spaces available for the benefit of the proposed changes will only put more pressure and add to competition for parking for actual residents, never mind the addition of workers who choose not to use public transport, or carshare at the very least.</p>	
<p>I would like to express my objections to this proposed parking permit scheme.</p> <p>I understand the problem with the refuse Lorry's having issues getting up the rear access lanes but I don't see how making everyone buy permits is going to stop the amount of vehicles parking in the streets.</p> <p>With the increase in the cost of living at the moment everyone is feeling the pinch and struggling to make ends meet. Having to buy a permit every year at £45 is abit excessive. And for someone to visit another £22 and once that book has gone another £22 with a limit of 3 a year.</p> <p>Some households have more than one vehicle meaning extra £45 a year to find. We all pay our council tax and road tax surely this is enough.</p> <p>There are vehicles where I live that are in excessive of the quoted 5.5m in length ie motor homes and large lorry's where are they to park if the whole area is permit parking.</p> <p>Having looked at the proposal map some residents will even be losing their parking space outside their house this is going to cause everyone to move down and could potentially cause issues with neighbours. As quoted in the proposal not everyone who has to buy a permit will be guaranteed a place and they could land up parking miles away. I would not be happy to pay £45 and have to park miles away.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and comments towards the proposals 2023.2137313 – Keyham Refuse Scheme.</p> <p>I can confirm the proposals are to restrict the back lanes and around the junctions to help access for refuse vehicles.</p> <p>There are no plans within this scheme to add permit parking to this area.</p> <p>Please see attached deposit documents. Plans are at the back of this document.</p> <p>If you would still like to object/make comments to this scheme please do let me know.</p>

<p>I have a disabled parent who can not walk more than 3 metres yes they have a blue badge but if parking is not guaranteed where are they to park.</p> <p>One of the main issues with parking in Keyham is that every week day Babcock workers park up their cars between 0700 and 0800 and head into the dockyard, leaving their cars outside residents houses until 1700, causing residents to find else where to park. There is a multi storey built specifically for them to use but they don't.</p> <p>The schedules published and the relevant plans are also not clear. The plans only show the access lanes to be 'no waiting at any time' and the areas 5 or 10 m from junctions.</p> <p>On the controlled parking zones list found on Plymouth gov page I leave in zone EE which states hours will be mon to sat 2pm - 6pm. Again I can't see how these times will ease the situation.</p> <p>Surely a simpler solution would be to put double yellow lines down the access lanes and around the junctions.</p>	
<p>I wish as a resident of 2 Ocean Street Keyham to object to this scheme.</p> <p>I object on the basis of several reasons detailed below:</p> <p>1. That the notice provided is inadequate and poorly detailed</p> <p>Mentioned in the report in relation to Ocean Street are :</p> <p>Renown Street Lane East Ope</p> <p>Vanguard Terrace Lane</p> <p>Royal Navy Avenue Lane</p> <p>Are these a figment of the Councils imagination - I have lived in 2 Ocean Street for 38 years and do not recognise these. No search engine I can find recognises any of these, so it is impossible to identify where you are proposing changes.</p>	<p>I am sorry that you do not find the notices helpful. Our notices are produced in line with the requirements of the Road Traffic Act and Traffic Management Act and the on-street notices are designed to inform that we are consulting on some potential changes and directing residents to our website where the changes are outlined in detail, or where the proposals can be viewed in the council office.</p> <p>We use the National Street Gazetteer to ensure that we correctly name all streets and lanes in accordance with their registered designation, you can view this source on the following link:</p> <p><u>Map - FindMyStreet</u></p> <p>This is the approved website for all local authorities to use when undertaking any road related issues,</p> <p>The list of organisations which we have included as consultees are known as 'Statutory Consultees' and are written to separately for any highway or</p>

<p>Thus, it is impossible to note with confidence what is being proposed. You have a duty to make this clear?</p> <p>2. Consultation.</p> <p>A very impressive list of organisations has been published. Not one single resident of one single address that will actually be affected by these changes is in your consultation.</p> <p>Thus, a complete waste of time and inadequate. Note please your justification for this is Keyham refuse scheme. Why do the NHS care, why so Plymouth Cycling Care. Why 5 different coaching firms that do not ever enter Ocean Street.</p> <p>There is no bus route along Ocean street so why First Bus. In what way do these organisations have any consultative contribution on the subject of Keyham refuse scheme. Who does care - Rate payers and Road taxpayers of Keyham, but for some reason they do not warrant any inclusion.</p> <p>Thus your "consultation" is not a consultation at all but a whitewash of generally irrelevant people and ignoring in full the most important contributors. I believe you are obligated to carry out proper consultation - you have conspicuously failed to do this in any sort of adequate way.</p> <p>3. Councillors</p> <p>Mr Cotter, Ms Cree Mr Stevens - Ditto above. When, if and how did these councillors interact with the rate paying residents on these issues. Rhetorical question. The answer is never. Thus, their input or acceptance is of no relevance.</p> <p>4. "23 x Domestic RCV's & 6 x Garden Waste RCV's"</p> <p>But a few months ago I wished to apply for Garden waste collection and was informed that it was not available, I was informed that garden waste collections for the area were suspended. I could not have a black bin and I have never seen a garden collection vehicle in Ocean Street</p> <p>5. Claim 460 litres of diesel per month. How is this calculated? Not being able to enter a street does not use fuel - this argument is utterly spurious. If it is calculated using the same process applied to the non-existent 6 Garden waste vehicles it is a direct</p>	<p>planning related proposals. Whether the organisations have any local interest does not impact on whether we consult with them directly, we have to ensure that any plans we have do not impact on any future developments. We have very little control as to who we consult with on this list,</p> <p>As our notice outlines we are undertaking a consultation and invite anyone who has an interest, objection or in favour to write or contact us, this is a statutory consultation, during which time I will review any feedback from residents and once the consultation has been completed, make an informed recommendation to the Leader of the Council. It is at this time that I will formally propose as scheme which may include changes as proposed by residents or other consultees.</p> <p>This process is again following legislation laid out in the Road Traffic Act.</p> <p>The proposals put forward have emanated from a number of routes and the ward councillors have over past few years received numerous complaints regarding missed bin collections with the route cause being lorries unable to access the lanes.</p> <p>A site visit was undertaken with the ward councillors in early 2023 to allow me to fully understand the issues.</p> <p>I have also been provided with the data relating to missed collections in the affected streets and again the associated video images clearly showing restricted access.</p> <p>This not only means we are unable to provide a statutory service, but generates a significant revenue cost for repeat visits to collect the missed bins.</p> <p>Plymouth City Council operate a chargeable service for garden waste and residents can only sign up once a year and make the required payment, the 2024 scheme will be advertised early in 2024 and you should be able to book the service accordingly. Our website will be the best location to get updates on the following link Garden waste scheme PLYMOUTH.GOV.UK</p> <p>As I have outlined previously, when my teams cannot access the lanes, they have to return at a later time/date and this does then generate additional fuel use. This number is calculated using the data for missed bins and the mileage for the return visits.</p>
---	--

<p>factual error and this claim should not be considered.</p> <p>6. Notification of the changes.</p> <p>The Non existing consultation and (I believe deliberate) exclusion of the Rate and Road tax paying residents of the area has meant, that the first I as a resident, become aware of these proposals was because a single non addressed letter was stuck on a lamp post.</p> <p>I know you have the full names and address of every resident on the voters and rate payers list and it would be extremely easy and cheap to create a correspondence and write to every resident. Any vaguely competent IT team would be able to do this. But no, it was not done. The only possible reasons are either complete ignorance and arrogance by Plymouth City Council or they simply know the people that will be affected don't want these changes so they try to not publish clearly what they are doing. PCC is a team of "civil servants" i.e. you serve the civility of which I and my neighbours are a part– not dictate and overrule them.</p> <p>7. No Waiting At Any Time Requirement?</p> <p>Why is no waiting at any time required for any waste collection requirements? When did refuse collection start running 24 hours per day ? The reason given exclusively for these changes is for refuse collection. There is NO justification whatsoever for this period to extend beyond working days and working hours.</p> <p>When outside working days and working hours have you ever had a refuse truck blocked. Please provide time and date.</p> <p>If there are other reasons, then the (flawed) consultation is further invalidated as the reason consulted over is incorrect, thus the process must restart?</p> <p>8. Incorrect detail in the Statement of reasons. You state, "<i>The project involves restricting parking in 34% of lanes in Plymouth where household waste is the collect point.</i>" Ocean Street (and the other Roads in the scheme) are NOT "lanes." They are the residential roads providing primary access and parking to residents.</p> <p>If this scheme was to say that there must be no parking in working hours on working days in the off-street service lanes of the area where the vast majority of bins are located this would be a sensible</p>	<p>As I have previously outlined, the notice on lamp columns, in the local press and our website are our legal requirements when undertaking a consultation.</p> <p>The notice was installed on the 23rd November and the consultation commenced on this date, I note this was the same date on your email and therefore indicates that the signage was visible and met our legal requirements.</p> <p>To date we have had 5 responses from residents.</p> <p>Due to the large numbers of consultations we undertake of this size, it would be impossible to send individual letters and hence the reason that the relevant legislation allows us to use on-street notices to make people aware and direct them to the location of the full details.</p> <p>Plymouth City Council employees are not civil servants, and we primarily are here to ensure that the relevant local government legislation is followed when providing statutory services.</p> <p>Plymouth City Council constantly review the operating hours of our waste service and that of our street cleaning team, therefore the prevent any requirements amend the traffic order in the future should I have to consider a change to the collection day or time, then a No Waiting restriction is the best solution.</p> <p>I will however consider your comments, when I am considering my formal recommendation at the end of the consultation period</p> <p>As is outlined in the consultation, there are no proposals to limit parking in any of the main residential streets, Ocean Street included, there will be no loss of any parking spaces In the residential road, I will be adding a small additional number in Renown Street as I rationalise some historic Double Yellow Lines which are no longer needed.</p> <p>There will some small changes on the access points to the rear lanes to protect the access to the junction, This is commonplace on most junction and follows the Highway Code that you should not park close to a junction. We have however minimised the impact by reducing the length from the recommended 10m to 5m where possible, we have extended the yellow lines outside of the commercial property at the lower end of Ocean Street as they have an approved dropped kerb and</p>
--	--

<p>and viable option. This however is not what is being proposed. Perhaps if you consulted with the residents and not the NHS and a cycling club you would know this?</p> <p>I believe it possible that you plan to put permanent “No Waiting and any time” parking restriction directly outside my home to allow one dust cart a week in - this is overkill, unwarranted and deeply disruptive to me and my neighbours. This is an area where parking is at a permanent premium. I do not want this change and it will also not work. You can have Ocean street as clear as you like – the restrictions need to apply to the parking in the service lanes not the residential streets.</p> <p>If this was a process of proper consultation and partnership we would have clear and detailed maps, and information provided to us. The failure to do this shows lack of competence – it is not unreasonable to then feel the same level of incompetence would apply to the rest of the process.</p> <p>I believe I have raised a series of tangible issues. The scheme is flawed, the consultation is flawed the outcome will be flawed and very disruptive. Please think again and think of the people that are being affected for 460 ltrs of diesel.</p>	<p>therefore will benefit from having access to their property at all times.</p> <p>There will be a net gain of 5 spaces through this proposed scheme, however I will ensure that any restrictions on the corners are kept to a minimum to reduce any negative impact</p>
<p>Shame that the maps are outdated, 'Victory Hall' for example, long gone and replaced by housing.</p> <p>Would now be a good time to consider the re-introduction of residents only parking, and permits?</p> <p>The dockyardies race around the streets in the morning searching for a space. This scheme, though worthy, will only exacerbate this problem.</p>	<p>I am sorry that our map data is a little old, we use a national tool and this does take some time (many years in some cases) to update, particularly for small residential developments, I have however asked my team to escalate this to see if we can exacerbate the change.</p> <p>In terms of your comments regarding a residential parking scheme for Keyham, this was consulted on in 2019/20 however we did not get the required level of support from residents to progress the scheme, I do however note that a recent planning decision has required Babcock to increase onsite parking and also fund a potential residents scheme close to the Dockyard. Whilst this will be outside of these proposals I will ask the Traffic Management Team to seek an update from Councillor Coker as to whether this is being considered.</p> <p>I will endeavour to get an update for you as soon as possible.</p>

	<p>I again thank you for responding and apologise for the delay in my response.</p>
<p>I write regarding the changes you intend to make for the Keyham Refuse Scheme.(2137313) Where are you proposing that residents of these streets are supposed to park if the streets are full ? If you extend the current restrictions and impose no waiting at any time restrictions this will mean that there will be less parking in an already difficult area to park.</p> <p>I understand the reasons why you feel the need to impose the restrictions but the root of the parking issues needs to be resolved before the scheme is put into place.</p> <p>Dockyard workers are parking in these streets which is then causing parking issues which is resulting in people parking in the service lanes etc.</p> <p>This needs to be addressed so that it will free up some space for the residents to park.</p> <p>Speaking to the dockyard workers they have no where to park so they park in our streets so again another issue that you as a council will need to work on to resolve.</p> <p>I also have to ask why you have not written to the residents about these changes and only put up a small notice on a lamp post at the end of the street ?</p> <p>You wrote to us telling us about recent refuse changes do you not think parking is an important factor for the residents of these streets ?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your response to my comments.</p>	<p>I note your concerns over the reduction in parking opportunities and will ensure that these are included within my final considerations.</p> <p>As I have outlined in the proposals, we are receiving a large number of complaints and service requests from householders in Keyham over missed bin collections, I have reviewed these over a number of months and the biggest cause is the inability for our wagons to access the rear lanes, this is either due to the access points being blocked or the lanes themselves being blocked by parked vehicles. This then requires a revisit on a later date which has significant impact on our resources.</p> <p>Therefore in order to alleviate these we have developed the proposals that you have responded to.</p> <p>I do understand the parking pressures in the area, indeed I undertook a formal survey in 2019/20 to seek support for an extension of the residents parking scheme currently in place in Admiralty Street to cover the whole area, however we received insufficient support from residents to allow us to proceed with that scheme, I have however promised ward councillors that they can request this be looked at again should they wish, however we would not normally revisit a scheme for 5 years.</p> <p>In relation to the loss of parking, we have made no reduction in the on-street parking, we have planned to make few amendments to the location of some of the limited waiting parking to provide protection at junctions, however we have ensured that there is a net gain of a small number of spaces in the affected area. Residents will still be able to load and unload in the rear lanes and wash cars etc, but parking will not be permissible under the plans,</p> <p>In relation to the method of consultation, any proposed changes to parking restrictions on the highway are governed by Highway legislation which dictates the manner in which we have to advertise, these limit this to Street Signage, website and the</p>

	<p>local press. The government are currently reviewing these and I will again ensure that I feedback your concerns.</p> <p>As this is a consultation, the next steps will be for me to review all comments and prepare a recommendation report for the Leader of the Council, this will include all comments received including yours and the Leader of the Council will then either agree or ask me to revisit.</p> <p>I hope that this email will reassure you that I am taking your concerns seriously and consider them in my report.</p>
<p>With regard to the attached, which I have read in detail. I think this is a long time coming, but I also feel that the Council already has some of the powers regarding parking and do not do anything about enforcement. I can only say this unless the council starts enforcing the parking restrictions it has this will make no difference and people will just do as they do now and park where they like.</p> <p>I do hope that you do enforce this and all other parking, such as pavement parking and outside schools</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>While I empathise with the challenges faced by the waste collection system, I am deeply concerned about the repercussions the current proposal may have on our community, particularly concerning parking constraints.</p> <p>Currently, our neighbourhood suffers from severe parking scarcity due to multiple factors, including commuters using residential streets for parking when accessing Keyham train station and Plymouth Dockyard. Additionally, the staff of Keyham Barton Catholic Primary School and Drake Primary School contribute to the parking congestion during specific hours.</p> <p>The proposed changes, as they stand, have not been adequately thought through and are poised to exacerbate the existing parking issues for residents of Admiralty St, Fleet St, Victory St, Renown St, and Ocean St. Removal of 40-60 parking spaces from an area already grappling with limited parking</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to respond and I am hopeful that my response will alleviate some of your concerns,</p> <p>The scheme I am proposing is purely to introduce parking restrictions in the rear lanes of Ocean Street, Fleet Street, Renown Street, Victory Street and Admiralty Street, there are no alterations to the general parking rules in these streets. There are a few small sections of double yellow lines to allow for large vehicles to access the lanes, however we have recognised that there is a parking pressure in this area and have therefore kept these to a minimum.</p> <p>We have calculated that there will be no net loss of parking in this scheme with a small section of single yellow line restrictions in Fleet Street and Victory Street removed generating additional space</p>

<p>begs the question: where will these displaced vehicles find parking?</p> <p>While we understand the importance of facilitating efficient waste collection, the potential disruption caused by the proposed changes would impact residents round the clock, every day of the year.</p> <p>Imposing fines on residents seeking parking near their homes seems unjust. Moreover, the proposed changes unfairly burden the elderly, who would be required to walk longer distances to access their vehicles and condone non-residents taking up limited residential parking.</p> <p>We strongly advocate exploring alternatives such as parking permits to mitigate non-resident parking in our area. The council must engage in a meaningful consultation with us, the council tax-paying residents, to address these concerns.</p> <p>We acknowledge the challenges posed by reduced council budgets, yet implementing these changes will only compound the frustration of already discontented residents. Solving one issue at the expense of creating a larger problem for many local people is counterproductive.</p> <p>We would like the council to consider the immediate and long-term impacts of the proposed changes and sincerely request an open dialogue with the affected residents before any decisions are finalized.</p>	<p>to compensate for any losses near the junctions of the rear lanes.</p> <p>In terms of the process for the development of a Residents Parking Scheme in the area, we were asked by your ward councillors to consider this in 2019, we undertook a consultation with residents in 2019 and unfortunately there was insufficient support from residents to allow us to complete the scheme. We would not normally review this for at least 5 years, however I have asked your Ward Councillors to consider requesting this be revisited in 2024.</p> <p>Again for clarity there is no proposed loss of on street parking spaces, we are purely considering the access arrangements for rear lanes. I can also confirm that the restrictions will not prevent loading and unloading in the rear lanes or hinder activities such as washing your car.</p> <p>I hope that this will provide reassurance, however as this is a formal process, I will add your feedback to the consultation document and ensure that your comments are considered in the final report.</p>
<p>Thank you for your recent email dated 11-12-2023. I acknowledge receipt and will provide a comprehensive response once I've had the opportunity to reflect fully on its contents.</p> <p>I wish to address the time allocated for considerations and objections raised. There is concern regarding the date stamping of notices on 24-11-2023, yet their placement on local lampposts occurred only from 24-11-2023 to 28-11-2023. The allotted time for objections until 15-12-2023—a mere three weeks—is notably brief, especially considering this busy time of the year for local residents. Such a timeframe appears unfair and lacks thorough consideration. It raises questions about a rushed process and the adequacy of incorporating feedback into a final report to address valid concerns or issues raised.</p> <p>I anticipate providing a comprehensive response to your email in the near future.</p>	<p>I can confirm that the time period for the consultation is set by legislation, we do not unfortunately have the ability to change this time period.</p>

<p>Thank you for your reply dated 11-12-2023, although I must note this response is crafted under considerable time constraints imposed on residents for making appropriate objections.</p> <p>I understand from your email that the consultation period is governed by legislation and may not be altered. Could you kindly provide a reference to this legislation for our reference?</p> <p>Regrettably, your email does not offer sufficient reassurance, and I seek further clarification on a few crucial points. Will the consultation document, or final report, be made accessible to the residents?</p> <p>Upon reviewing the proposed changes outlined on pages 8 to 16 and the marked alterations on pages 19 and 20 of the plan, it appears that the scheme significantly modifies the general parking rules across all streets. Could you confirm if this understanding is accurate?</p> <p>The delineated plans on pages 19 and 20 exhibit a considerable increase in double yellow lines and restricted parking zones across all streets, rather than limited sections. Could you share the calculated figures outlining the areas of parking loss and gain with the residents? The purple sections depicted on the plans seem inadequate in compensating for the substantial loss of parking spaces.</p> <p>Is the assumption/calculation that the few additional spaces highlighted in purple on Fleet St and Victory St's north end will compensate for the parking spaces lost in Admiralty St, Renown St, and Ocean St (as indicated in red, bright yellow, and blue)?</p> <p>Referring to the statement of reasons on page four, while acknowledging the council's concerns regarding costs and emissions, paragraph two seems misleading. Could you clarify whether the calculation of emissions is solely based on the Keyham area (Admiralty St to Ocean St) or encompasses the entirety of Plymouth?</p> <p>Moreover, the first paragraph indicates a significant reduction in CO₂e, which is commendable for the council in terms of cost savings. Could this reduction be juxtaposed against the additional CO₂e potentially produced by residents driving around multiple times a day, searching for parking</p>	<p>Any changes to traffic orders are governed by the following legislation, I have attached links to the relevant legislation to allow you to review at your convenience/</p> <p><u>Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984</u> (legislation.gov.uk)</p> <p><u>The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996</u> (legislation.gov.uk)</p> <p>Once the consultation has closed and I review all of the comments, I will then prepare a report for the Leader of the Council or their designated deputy,</p> <p>The decision to proceed, amend or abandon Traffic Regulation Orders lies with the Portfolio Holder for Transport. The decision can be viewed on the Plymouth City Council website</p> <p>This is not accurate, the majority of the Double Yellow Lines are being considered in Rear Lanes of the streets, there are no plans to impose large sections on Double Yellow Lines in the main streets,</p> <p>There are no net losses for on-street parking, rear lanes are not designed for parking and therefore have not been included in net loss or gains.</p> <p>There is no reduction in on-street parking with the exception of double yellow lines being installed to protect junction access points, these areas should always be kept clear for safety and unless protected by Double Yellow Lines are the responsibility of Devon & Cornwall Police, by installing small sections of Double Yellow Lines we are able to enforce these under the Traffic Management Act,</p> <p>Where I have added additional lines on some junctions I have simply moved the available parking along by the same distance by reducing some double yellow lines.</p> <p>The emissions are calculated purely on the impacted streets in Keyham.</p>
---	--

<p>spaces, which might negate the purported environmental gains?</p> <p>I appreciate your attention to these concerns and eagerly await your comprehensive response.</p>	<p>As I have outlined we are not imposing a reduction in available parking, we have a statutory responsibility to collect household waste and the behaviour of some residents prevents our waste teams from doing this by blocking the rear lanes and preventing our waste wagons from accessing to undertake their statutory function and thus having to revisit on a number of occasions in order to fulfil our obligations.</p> <p>Residents of the streets were canvassed In 2019 by Plymouth City Council and your local Councillors (Councillor Stevens led on this scheme) to seek approval to implement a residents only parking scheme in the streets, this was also communicated by a small number of residents through the Keyham social media pages, unfortunately less that 20% of residents responded to the survey and therefore we were unable to progress, should this have been supported this would have negated the need for residents to drive around looking for spaces.</p>
<p>I am emailing with regards to the proposed amendment order 2023.2137313 Keyham Refuse Scheme and the associated parking restrictions. Whilst in principal I fully appreciate that vehicles should not be parking in such an inconsiderate manner as to cause an obstruction or block access to the entrances to the lanes, I believe the plan to introduce additional no waiting restrictions on the northerly and southerly entrances to the lanes in both directions and both ends will result in a reduction in the overall number of parking spaces available.</p> <p>It is not clear from the traffic order whether any loss of parking in these areas would be slightly offset by the revocation of no waiting along part of Fleet Street and Victory Street, but in my opinion this scheme should aim to strike a better balance between providing the required improved access and maximising the number of parking spaces available, as otherwise any saving in CO2 emission from the waste collection vehicles could be over shadowed by vehicles driving around searching for somewhere for a parking place which would further reduce local air quality.</p> <p>Firstly, on the basis that the vast majority of waste collections happen on a weekday, could the traffic order not be amended to just over Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm, thereby providing increased parking at the weekends when people are more</p>	<p>Thank you for your email dated 15th December, regarding the proposals for the Keyham Refuse Scheme Traffic Order.</p> <p>I can confirm that outside of the rear lanes, there will be no net loss of parking, as a part of the plan I am removing a number of parking restrictions and reducing the number and size of double yellow lines to ensure that for every space I remove for Yellow Lines, these will be replace.</p> <p>From my calculation we will be generating an additional 5 spaces through this scheme.</p> <p>I understand your comments on the placement of lines on both sides, however these will provide an adequate swing point for the large wagons and allow for line of sight for the anyone exiting the lane.</p> <p>Thank you for the suggestion to only implement the restrictions on weekdays, I will consider this as a part of the report, however it is good practice for safety and access for emergency vehicles to keep these clear. Residents will however still be able to load and unload in the lanes and undertake activities such as washing the car.</p>

<p>generally at home. Secondly, is it absolutely necessary to restrict the parking on both sides of the entrance to each lane at both ends. I would suggest that there would still be sufficient room and visibility for the waste collection vehicles to manoeuvre at the junctions if the parking restrictions were only introduced on one side at both ends, but carefully arranged as to optimise the waste collection route, making it as efficient as possible.</p>	<p>I again thank you for taking the time to respond and will ensure that your comments are included within the final report.</p>

4. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended to proceed 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.