



LIVING STREETS 7

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 Living Streets 7.

2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS REQUIRED

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

No Waiting At Any Time

- (i) Arcadia Road, the south-west side from its junction with Knapps Close for a distance of 12 metres in a south-easterly direction
- (ii) Arcadia Road, the south-west side from its junction with Knapps Close for a distance of 26 metres in a north-westerly direction
- (iii) Austin Avenue, both sides from its junction with North Prospect Road for a distance of 10 metres in a south-westerly direction
- (iv) Boxhill Gardens, the east side from its junction with Fountains Crescent for a distance of 8 metres in a northerly direction
- (v) Boxhill Gardens, the west side from its junction with Fountains Crescent for a distance of 7 metres in a northerly direction
- (vi) Clifton Avenue, the east side from its junction with Newnham Road for a distance of 42 metres in a northerly direction
- (vii) Clifton Avenue, the west side from its junction with Newnham Road for a distance of 47 metres in a northerly direction
- (viii) Deer Park Drive, the north-east side from its junction with Taw Close for a distance of 20 metres in a north-westerly direction
- (ix) Elford Crescent, the east side from its junction with Rashleigh Avenue for a distance of

7 metres in a northerly direction

- (x) Elford Crescent, the west side from its junction with Rashleigh Avenue for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
- (xi) Fountains Crescent, the north side from its junction with Boxhill Gardens for a distance of 10 metres in an easterly direction
- (xii) Fountains Crescent, the north side from its junction with Boxhill Gardens for a distance of 8 metres in a westerly direction
- (xiii) George Lane, the east side from the centre line of Longcause for a distance of 43 metres in a northerly direction
- (xiv) Hemerdon Way, the east side from its junction with Lucas Lane for a distance of 14 metres in a southerly direction
- (xv) Hemerdon Way, the west side from its junction with Lucas Lane for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction
- (xvi) Higher Stert Terrace, the east side from its junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 7 metres in a northerly direction
- (xvii) Higher Stert Terrace, the west side from its junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 6.5 metres in a northerly direction
- (xviii) Higher Stert Terrace, the west side from its junction with Laira Street for a distance of 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (xix) Huxley Close, the north side from a point 66 metres east of its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 36 metres in an easterly direction
- (xx) Huxley Close, the north side from a point 132 metres east of its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 21 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxi) Knapps Close, the north-west side from its junction with Arcadia Road for a distance of 11 metres in a south-westerly direction

- (xxii) Knapps Close, the south-east side from its junction with Arcadia Road for a distance of 9 metres in a south-westerly direction
- (xxiii) Laira Place, both sides from its junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxiv) Laira Place, the east side from its junction with Laira Street for a distance of 5 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxv) Laira Street, the north side from its junction with Laira Place for a distance of 4 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxvi) Laira Street, the north side from its junction with Higher Stert Terrace for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxvii) Laira Street, the south side from its junction with Laira Place for a distance of 4 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxviii) Laira Street, the south side from its junction with Higher Stert Terrace for a distance of 5 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxix) Longcause, the south side from its junction with St Maurice Road for a distance of 41 metres in a westerly direction
- (xxx) Lucas Lane, the south side from its junction with Hemerdon Way for a distance of 13 metres in a westerly direction and 15 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxi) Peacock Close, the east side from its junction with Newnham Road for a distance of 15 metres in a northerly direction
- (xxxii) Plymouth Road, the north side from a point 130 metres west of the junction with Coypool Road to a point 75 metres east of the junction with Woodford Avenue
- (xxxiii) Rashleigh Avenue, the north side from its junction with Elford Crescent for a distance of 18 metres in a westerly direction and 10 metres in an easterly direction

- (xxxiv) Rashleigh Avenue, the south side from its junction with Clifton Avenue for a distance of 14 metres in a westerly direction and 31 metres in an easterly direction
- (xxxv) Wolseley Road, the south-east side from a point 13 metres south-west of the western boundary of No. 857 Wolseley Road for a distance of 33 metres in a south-westerly direction
- (xxxvi) Wolverwood Lane, the east side from its junction with Ridgeway for a distance of 13 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxxvii) Wolverwood Lane, the east side from its junction with Wolverwood Close for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction and 12 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxxviii) Wolverwood Lane, the east side from a point 70 metres south of its junction with Wolverwood Close for a distance of 29 metres in a southerly direction
- (xxxix) Wolverwood Lane, the west side from its junction with Ridgeway to a point 12 metres south of its junction with Higher Park Close

Limited Waiting To 2 Hours No Return For 1 Hour Mon-Fri 8am-4pm

- (i) Greenway Avenue, the south side from a point 5 metres east of its junction with Woodford Green to a point 31 metres east of its junction with Woodford Green
- (ii) Greenway Avenue, the south side from a point 41 metres east of its junction with Woodford Green to a point 68 metres east of its junction with Woodford Green

Limited Waiting To 2 Hours No Return For 2 Hours Mon-Fri 8am-6pm

- (i) Seymour Road, the north side from a point 25 metres west of the extended western kerbline of Dingle Road for a distance of 56 metres in a westerly direction
- (ii) Seymour Road, the south side from a point 25 metres west of its junction with Dingle Road for a distance of 35 metres in a westerly direction

No Loading/Unloading At Any Time

Colebrook Road, the west side from a point 60 metres south of the southern boundary of No. 1 Cliff Cottages for a distance of 17 metres in a southerly direction

No Stopping At Any Time on Footway or Verge

Tintagel Crescent, all sides for its entire length

REVOCATIONS

No Waiting At Any Time

- i. Clifton Avenue, the east side, from its junction with Newnham Road for a distance of 22 metres in a northerly direction
- ii. Clifton Avenue, the west side, from its junction with Newnham Road for a distance of 29 metres in a northerly direction
- iii. George Lane, the east side, from the centre line of Longcause for a distance of 37 metres in a northerly direction
- iv. Higher Stert Terrace, the east side, from the junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 17 metres
- v. Higher Stert Terrace, the west side, from the junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 13 metres
- vi. Huxley Close, the north side, from a point 66 metres east of its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 40 metres in an easterly direction
- vii. Huxley Close, the north side, from a point 128 metres east of its junction with Strode Road for a distance of 24 metres in an easterly direction
- viii. Laira Place, both sides, from its junction with Embankment Road for a distance of 17 metres in a northerly direction
- ix. Longcause, the south side, from its junction with St Maurice Road for a distance of 31m in a westerly direction
- x. Plymouth Road, the north side, from a point 130 metres west of the junction with Coypool Road to a point 105 metres east of the junction with Woodford Avenue

Limited Waiting To 3 Hours No Return For 2 Hours Mon-Fri 8am-6pm

- (i) Seymour Road, the north side, from a point 25 metres west of the extended western kerbline of Dingle Road for a distance of 56 metres in a westerly direction
- (ii) Seymour Road, the south side, from a point 25 metres west of its junction with Dingle Road for a distance of 35 metres in a westerly direction

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Proposals

The proposals for the Living Streets 7 TRO were advertised on street, in the Herald and on the Plymouth City Council website on 12th December 2024. Details of the proposals were sent to the Councillors representing the affected wards and statutory consultees on 03rd December 2024.

There have been 13 representations received relating to the proposals included in the Traffic Regulation Order.

There have been two comments received relating to the Plymouth Road proposal

Consultation	Comment
I would absolutely like to offer my full support to the removal of the double yellow lines on Plymouth Rd, Marsh Mills, with the endeavour to assist the residents with improved parking, which ultimately the double yellow lines are prohibiting.	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>
I would like to offer my full support to the removal of the double yellow lines on Plymouth Rd. This will improve parking for the residents and visitors to the houses currently affected by the lines as they are now.	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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 one comment received relating to the Tintagel Crescent proposal

Consultation	Comment
<p>Proposals: Restrict pavement and verge parking to allow access, prevent obstruction to residential properties and prevent damage to verge and footway.</p> <p>No stopping at any time on footway or verge. Tintagel Crescent - all sides for its entire length.</p> <p>Further to the recent council meeting when the above proposals were suggested, I wish to comment as a resident of Tintagel Crescent.</p> <p>I have lived in Tintagel Crescent for almost 40 years and parking has become more problematic over recent years. The main reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents with more than one car per property • Work vans being brought home and parked in the street • Residents from St Pancras Ave parking in Tintagel Crescent due to lack of parking in St Pancras Avenue <p>There is also a SORN vehicle parked outside on Tintagel Crescent for some time which has been reported by at least 4 residents but no action has been taken.</p> <p>It was noted in the minutes that these proposals are to allow access, prevent obstruction to residential properties and prevent damage to the verge and footway. Parking on the verge/footway does not affect access to the properties in St Pancras Ave as the steps are always left accessible and therefore there is no obstruction caused. As a note, the 8 houses opposite mine that run down from St Pancras Ave-Tintagel Cres have a total of 12 cars and only pedestrian access to their properties.</p> <p>I appreciate the frustration that the grass verge is damaged during wet (muddy) weather but the only people who walk on that side of the road (apart from drivers accessing their vehicles) are dog walkers (who very often fail to clean up after their pets).</p> <p>I fail to see how restricting parking along the length of Tintagel Crescent footway/verge is going to make a difficult parking problem any easier.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</p> <p>The public consultation is now taking place, and the statutory consultees are consulted at the same time.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>The Ward Councillors will also review the comments you have made before any decision is made.</p> <p>I can confirm that I have also reported the SORN vehicle.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

<p>Where are residents (and their visitors) going to park their cars? There is already a big parking problem along the bottom of St Pancras Ave (from the chip shop down towards Honicknowle Lane) meaning cars park on the footpath and pedestrians having to walk in the (busy) road.</p> <p>Surely a much better solution (in terms of parking and neighbourhood relations) would be if the council could tarmac a metre or so of the grass verge and allow pavement parking as has been done for many years in Shakespeare Road, Honicknowle. This would allow residents to park safely and maintain some green space for residents/dog walkers.</p> <p>It is disappointing to see that consultation prior to the council meeting was undertaken with various bodies including BBC, CityBus, NHS and the police, but no residents were consulted. I (and other residents) would be happy to discuss this matter with our local councillors (Evan's/Taylor/Tuohy) before a final decision is made, but I would urge the council to consider other options before agreeing to this proposal to prevent causing distress and bad feeling between the residents of Tintagel Crescent and St Pancras Avenue.</p>	
---	--

There have been three comments received relating to the Wolseley Road proposal

Consultation	Comment
<p>I fully support this improvement of road safety in my area, although, I would like to suggest an amendment that I believe would make the area even safer. Currently there is a white 'SLOW' sign in the road to warn motorist of the on coming dangerous bend in the road, however, this warning is negated by the fact that cars park over the sign such that it can not be seen. This will still be the case with the new proposed yellow lines starting 13m south west of 857. May I suggest that the new yellow lines go say two metres towards number 857 from this white slow sign which would allow motorist to clearly see the warning sign and take appropriate action before reaching the dangerous corner.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>At this stage of the Traffic Order process Plymouth City Council cannot add further restrictions to this proposal, we can only reduce or abandon the proposals.</p>

	<p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I have seen the proposed No waiting or parking restriction on the bend a short distance from my property.</p> <p>During the 10 years I have resided here I have never witnessed an accident or heard of one on the bend. That said I have always believed that there should have been some form of parking restriction on the bend.</p> <p>My reason for writing is to request that the proposed restriction distance line of 33 metres could be reduced to 25 metres.</p> <p>This would enable a couple more vehicles to park but still provides (I believe) a safe area on the bend. The southern side of the road is a long row of terraced houses that have no garages and are unable to have any off-road parking.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>1) A waiting restriction of 25 metres rather than the proposed 33metres would provide a sufficient safety improvement while still allowing residents parking spaces.</p> <p>2) In terms of safety on this corner, driving speed is a major factor for cars travelling in both directions and a reduced speed limit to 20mph seems like a sensible approach.</p> <p>3) If the proposed restriction is imposed, I think that a residents parking zone up to this point should be considered in addition.</p> <p>4) From a personal point of view, my wife is registered disabled (has a blue badge and in receipt of the higher mobility element of PIP). A restriction on parking spaces would at times make parking close to our home difficult and significantly increase the distance she has to walk to the house.</p> <p>My grounds for these suggestions are that I have not been aware of any collision at this corner in the 2.5 years I've been resident here. I have been witness to cars being driven too fast towards this blind corner on numerous occasions.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</p> <p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>

There have been seven comments received relating to the Wolverwood Lane proposals

Consultation	Comment
<p>I'm writing to object the parking in wolverwood lane, it's hard enough to park as it is around here, and with doing that there will be absolutely no where to park and be a nightmare for people living around here, there is no need to stop the parking here.</p> <p>I have 3 children so doing this is going to make it super unsafe for me, not being able to take shopping into the house easily. I think this is a really stupid decision and cannot see the point of it so would appreciate if you did not do this, I know the neighbours feel the same. Thanks</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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 residents of Lotherton Close, directly adjacent to Wolverwood Lane, though we knew something would have to be done to improve safety due to the inconsiderate parking along Wolverwood Lane, my wife and I think that the proposed measures are extreme.</p> <p>Having lived here for nearly 20 years, we cannot remember any accidents on this stretch, although we have witnessed a number of near misses. My wife and I are both in our 70's and have mobility issues, both finding it difficult to walk too far and carry shopping. We have been able to park relatively close to our home, but don't know what these new restrictions will mean for us. It is unfortunate that so many households have more than one vehicle, and those parking inconsiderately or illegally have been allowed to get away with it, even those contravening the Highway Code.</p> <p>Tuxton Close is already congested, some people from there park their cars on Wolverwood lane. When the temperature drops a lot of cars from the inner hills park on Wolverwood Lane. We do have a garage but it is used for storage and we have never used it for the car, our forecourt is used by a neighbour as he has several vehicles to park. The garage block wasn't convenient to the house, even when we were young, especially for numbers 64-76 Lotherton Close (the Wolverwood Lane end) so it will be a huge inconvenience to us now and will severely limit our mobility and quality of life at a time when we should feel secure. It's a great pity more</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>residents weren't consulted over the issue, other than on social media. We have given a lot to our community over the years since living here and feel quite disappointed and disheartened.</p> <p>There is so much grass in the area which so frequently turns to mud and would be far more useful as parking bays, as the houses built at the top of the road already have.</p>	
<p>I would like to bring to your attention the issues with proposed parking restrictions implanted on this plan, the area that you have highlighted on Wolverwood Lane if goes ahead will leave very limited parking for a large number of residents. Please see attached photo of areas of concern, I have highlight the area used by each housing group. During evenings it is sometimes impossible to park here (reason below) removing parking area will only make the situation worse for local residents.</p> <p>We do have an issue with people leaving vehicles unattended for extended periods of time due to our proximity to the A38. Often vehicles arrive Monday morning and do not move again until Friday evening. A better solution to reduce the amount of vehicles parked in this area would be to introduce permit parking during between hours of 9am - 4pm Monday to Friday, allowing residents 2 free passes per household and a visitor pass. This would allow residents and their visitors to park without affecting them while reducing amount of non resident related parking. Ideally this would be implanted in the area highlighted orange and blue.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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 implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed order for Wolverwood Lane double yellow lines.</p> <p>Myself and my mother are disabled, both holding blue badges. We have a garage, but it is at the bottom of the steep hill and not accessible for us to walk to and from.</p> <p>Parking outside our house on Wolverwood lane has been our only option, and allows us to get to and from the car easily.</p> <p>We understand the need for double yellows, but we were assured by our counsellor that double yellows would be on the right hand side only (if looking down the hill). This is different to what the plans state. The double yellows will take up several spaces used by residents, causing more fighting for spaces. None of the residents that live</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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 implemented.</p>

<p>in these houses were consulted or notified until the papers went up on the lampposts, bar from myself who saw it on the councillors facebook page.</p> <p>We looked into the option of a disabled bay but according to your website, we would be refused a disabled bay on the grounds of being near a junction and soon to be parking restrictions.</p> <p>Parking is already a battle, with multiple car residents and cars being dumped for months on end.</p> <p>With these double yellows on this side of the road and not being eligible for a disabled bay, will result in myself and my mother unable to go out. This is causing me immense stress and worry. My mobility is limited as it is, and will now as a result, restrict it even more.</p> <p>We are not against the double yellows, but as stated, were given the impression it would not affect resident parking.</p>	
<p>Good day, I would welcome please your urgent consideration of the need to add a small amendment to this plan.</p> <p>It would be welcome with myself and residents if the portal into Canefields Avenue was marked as no waiting/parking, any time as well.</p> <p>This will prevent dangerous congestion at this junction.</p> <p>Without enforcement people tend to park selfishly and dangerously in this whole area on Wolverwood Lane, the plan seems excellent overall. Especially for improving road safety and of benefit for bus drivers.</p>	<p>Response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>At this stage of the Traffic Order process Plymouth City Council cannot add further restrictions to this proposal, we can only reduce or abandon the proposals.</p> <p>Canefields Avenue can be reviewed as part of the next Traffic Order review.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing further to the Notice of Proposed Order, reference AMD 2024-2137332 Living streets .7 covering Wolverwood Lane, Plympton. I appreciate there has been some inconsiderate parking in this area that has caused road use to be tricky for larger vehicles etc and I appreciate</p>	<p>Response sent: Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</p>

<p>that you are looking to resolve this. However, some of the restrictions will have a severe detrimental effect on some local residents. I will be one of these residents. My property on Wolverwood Close, backs onto Wolverwood lane and the only parking available to me is just past the junction with Wolverwood Close on the south side where you are proposing to place restrictions for 12 meters from the junction in an easterly direction. There are seven properties in this row, all of which have a footpath at the front meaning the only available parking is at the rear of the properties in Wolverwood Lane. The parking there is already at a premium. I suffer from Arthritis in my hips and find walking any distance an issue so am very concerned as to where I may end up parking especially as I work during the day, not returning until between 5pm - 6pm every evening when there are no places available in Wolverwood Close itself. As I said, I accept that something needs to be done in this area, but I am requesting that the restriction length be shortened so that the impact on residents is reduced slightly. I am really concerned about the impact this will have on the houses that line Wolverwood Lane but also the knock on effect it will have for those who live in Wolverwood close where parking is already at a premium. Referred for your urgent reconsideration please. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this correspondence.</p>	<p>Your comments have been logged on our records and will be considered as part of the final decision making process. At the end of the consultation period, a report will be prepared summarising any concerns that have been raised and making recommendations. In line with the statutory process, the decision on whether or not to proceed with these proposals will be made by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>You will be notified if and when the proposals will be implemented.</p>
<p>I am writing to object to the council's decision to stop parking on Wolverwood lane. I regularly visit my son and his young family who live on Lotherton Close. They have no on-street parking next to their house or driveway. With young children I don't know how they are going to manage to find suitable parking close by. I often pick up my grandchildren and always park in a safe manner not to cause a problem to other motorists. Unfortunately others aren't so considerate. If they are not able to park on the side of the road next to their house it will mean, possibly, having to park where they will need to cross a very busy road with very young children. This is potentially a safety risk which I don't think has been considered.</p> <p>I realise it's necessary to make sure the roads are safe for road users but I would ask you to consider the needs of the houses along the section of Lotherton Close without their own on street parking or driveways.</p>	<p>Response sent:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent comments towards the proposals – 2024.2137332 Living Streets 7.</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>Permit parking would be a suitable option. I would ask you to please consider this.</p> <p>I'm sure you have had lots of positive comments for these restrictions and they will outweigh the number of residents who will most severely affected as most of the other residents of this area have the luxury of off-street parking/driveways available to them.</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p>	
--	--

4. RECOMMENDATION

Following public consultation, it is recommended that the proposals for Wolseley Road are reduced from 33 metres of No Waiting At Any Time to 29 metres.

It is recommended that the proposed Limited Waiting opposite numbers 2 - 5 Greenway Avenue is abandoned, and the proposals for Limited Waiting outside the Methodist Church are implemented.

It is recommended that that proposals for Tintagel Crescent are abandoned.

It is recommended that the 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.