

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Officer Decision Record

Decision Maker:	Adrian Gray
Title:	Traffic Order Proposals: Amendments to Parking and Waiting Restrictions and the Introduction of a Cycle Lane in the Aldershot Station Area
Reference:	A2023

Tel: 01962 846892

Email: Adrian.Gray@hants.gov.uk
James.Laver@hants.gov.uk

1. The decision:

1.1. That a traffic order be implemented under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA), the effects of which will be to vary existing parking and waiting restrictions so as to accommodate a proposed cycle lane near Aldershot Station, this will result in the loss of some parking spaces on Arthur Street, which will be redistributed along Victoria Road and Windsor Way. There will also be an additional disabled parking place added to Windsor Way and several textual anomalies present in the original order will be corrected.

2. Reasons for the decision:

- 2.1. Hampshire County Council is in the process of implementing a highway improvement scheme to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility to Aldershot Railway Station and to enhance the public realm in the area around the railway station, under proposals approved by the County Council's Executive Lead Member for Universal Services on 27 November 2023.
- 2.2. The scheme seeks to support the wider regeneration plans for Aldershot, by creating sustainable transport and active travel links between the railway station, the town centre and areas of new housing developments to the north of the town. In part, this will be achieved by the creation of a new cycle facility between the railway station and the Wellesley development, along Arthur Street, Victoria Road and Pickford Street.
- 2.3. This will require the closure of Pickford Street at its northern end at its junction with A323 High Street to motor traffic, to reduce traffic volumes on Pickford Street and create better conditions for cycling on the carriageway. The scheme will also require the relocation of areas of on-street parking on the west side of Arthur Street, to reallocate this carriageway space for use as a new cycle facility. The associated reduction in parking provision on Arthur Street will be offset by creation of additional on-street parking in nearby

locations on Victoria Road and Windsor Way, to ensure that there is no significant net loss of parking amenity in the area.

2.4 13 Objections were received during the period which took place between Friday 23rd February 2024 and Friday 15th March 2024 - details of which are in the Appendix to this report.

2.5. There were changes made to the original presentation of the Traffic Regulation Order in response to bus company Stagecoach's objections. The changes were to increase the length of the bus stop on Victoria Road (at the Arthur Street junction), from its current 17 metre length to a planned 27 metre length. Also proposed was the introduction of 6.3 metre No Waiting at Any Time restrictions in front of the bus stop. These changes required the reduction in length of the planned new Pay & Display spaces on the north side of Victoria Road, down from 4/5 car lengths to 2.

The scheme introduces a road narrowing on Victoria Road, immediately upstream of the bus stop. This is a high frequency bus route for the majority of services out of the town centre and is now the main stop for accessing the railway station. The risk is that there may be occasions where a first bus is still loading passengers when a second bus arrives. On this basis, the second bus will inevitably block traffic on Victoria Road until the first bus clears.

The increased length of bus stop will accommodate 2 buses at the same time and the double yellow section will ensure a bus can properly align with the kerb and then exit the bus stop without being impeded by parked cars to the front. Stagecoach withdrew their objection as a result.

2.6. Due consideration has been given to RTRA 1984 sections 122(1) and 122(2) and any other relevant legislation. In this case the Decision Maker acting on behalf of the Local Authority considers this TRO expeditious, for the convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and (where relevant) for the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off.

2.7. The decision outlined in paragraph 2.3 (above) to exercise the functions of the Local Authority under RTRA 1984 sections 122(1) and 122(2) has been reached on the basis of what is reasonably practicable after due regard has been given to:

- the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises
- the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles

3. Other options considered and rejected:

3.1. None

4. Scheme Funding:

4.1. Capital

5. Conflicts of interest:

5.1. None

6. Dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service:

6.1. None

7. Supporting information:

7.1. Local Members, Councillor Crawford did not object to the proposals

7.2. Executive Member for Universal Services, Councillor Adams-King supports the proposal

7.2. Police – Traffic Management Officer, Jeff Stone, expresses that the police have no objection to the scheme

7.3. Draft Order and Plans

Approved by:

Adrian Gray

Date:

4/4/2024

Adrian Gray, Head of Highways (Traffic and Safety)

On behalf of the Director of Universal Services

APPENDIX

Objector Name, Address	Officer Response
Objection	
Andy Mitchener, Objection	
<p>I am writing this objection in total dismay at your proposal for this cycle lane. Having lived in and around Aldershot for 65 years ,i cannot see where you see the volume of cycles that warrant this vast expenditure for what can only be described as a white elephant with very little use.Surley as a council the money would be better spent on our local roads with all the potholes that now exist . Total waste of money for something that is not required as we do not have numbers using push bikes. kind regards A.B.Mitchener</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
Miss Hilton, Objection	
<p>Regarding the traffic order proposal A2023/MJB. The proposed bicycle route from Aldershot train station to Gun Hill. I feel that this money would be better spent improving Aldershots roads and the transport system. The cyclists do not even use the cycle lanes already in place. Instead of spending £2m on cycle lanes and rearranging the parking and no waiting zones, the county council could improve the safety of the boroughs roads and a permanent bus station instead of having them scattered, it is beyond confusing.</p> <p>The pot holes and general state of the roads is disgraceful and worsening on a daily basis and becoming a hazard on some roads.</p> <p>I am assuming the funding is coming from the £132m the county council welcomed from the Government over the next 10 years to fix pot holes, maintain and improve the roads, otherwise I do not think it would even be suggested, especially at a cost of £2m. Maintaining the roads, with the traffic that travels around Aldershot, should be of a higher priority.</p> <p>I understand that cyclists have a right to able to ride their bikes safely without fear and a cycle lane would facilitate this. But car drivers also have the right to be able to drive without the fear of hitting a major hole in the road that would inevitably cause extreme damage to their vehicles. If the £2m was invested into the roads instead of a new cycle lane, then I feel that both, cyclist safety and driver confidence in the roads, can be achieved. Pot holes are causing drivers to serve to miss them, which will no doubt cause an accident eventually, I myself have had a few near misses, with children in my vehicle.</p> <p>I do not feel that I have been able to get my point across properly. If anything needs to be clarified please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p> <p>In addition, note that the former bus station site is privately owned and outside the control of the County Council. Hampshire County Council, Rushmoor Borough Council and the local Passenger Transport operators are currently working to develop improvements to bus and taxi arrangements in the town centre as part of the wider regeneration works in the town.</p>
Tracey Smeeth, Objection	
<p>I object to the above proposal. It is an utter waste of money apart from the fact that there is no way this should cost £2m</p> <p>It is not needed, as bicycles can cycle on any road anyway with no changes required.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>

<p>Even cyclists think this is pointless. There are so many more worthy causes that need this money please dont waste it on this as you are just angering the town further</p>	
<p>Karen Lynch, Objection</p>	
<p>Good evening. I am an Aldershot resident and I cannot actually believe you are wasting tax payers money on such a ridiculous hare-brained scheme as this. It's a complete waste of money. Who do you imagine wants or needs a cycle lane from Aldershot railway station to Gunn Hill? Do you even know the area? I think not. There is nothing on Gunn Hill apart from Talavera Infant and Junior Schools, children too young to cycle to school and (as a recent ex employee on this site) I am certain that no child travels to school by train and bike. Any child that did this would be well out of the catchment area. Of the residents of Wellesley estate, do you know how many actually cycle to the Railway station? I think not, but I imagine the answer is very few. Few enough not to warrant an extortionate amount of cash being wasted on this. No one actually cycles anywhere much in Aldershot if that means they have to leave their bike because of the likelihood of it being stolen whilst left. The crime levels of this once proud town are very high, we have groups of imigrants running criminal activities right and left and you want to spend a massive amount of our money on a cycle lane that NO ONE will use. The ones already in situ are not used and they actually have a purpose to their route. How about you spend the money on improving the appallingly dim street lighting that aids nefarious night-time acts? Or fix the potholes properly! Or give the police more overtime to actually DO some policing? Or - and here's a good one - reopen the bus station ! Why that was closed in the first place is one of Aldershot's most talked about topics . BUILD SOME AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR THOSE ON THE HOUSING LISTS AND NOT ILLEGAL MIGRANTS ! I could go on until Christmas and list all sorts of things but I think you have likely realised by now what a truly terrible idea I think this is, and I hope you get many more messages along these lines about it. Hopefully you will reconsider and if so put our money to better use. Aldershot is a shadow of the town I grew up in. You have the money and power to make it a better place if you use it wisely and listen to the residents. Maybe someone could travel up to Aldershot and actually have a look at the state of the place. I'm sure you'll see what I mean if you do.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p> <p>In addition, note that the former bus station site is privately owned and outside the control of the County Council. Hampshire County Council, Rushmoor Borough Council and the local Passenger Transport operators are currently working to develop improvements to bus and taxi arrangements in the town centre as part of the wider regeneration works in the town.</p> <p>This response cannot comment on issues raised relating to housing, policing or immigration.</p>
<p>Neil Fletcher, Objection</p>	
<p>you would be better off spending the money to resurface the roads we have rather than build something else that you won't be able to maintain....</p> <p>bikes pay no road tax no insurance... whilst car owners have to pay the lot and pay for all the repairs to their cars because of the state of the roads.</p> <p>You'll find that most cyclists think this is a waste of money, it's a very small distance and the money could be spent filling in the many potholes everywhere that would benefit cyclists and drivers! Who came up with this idea?</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p> <p>In addition, see Decision Day report containing a summary of public consultation that has been undertaken during the development of the project and the background to County Council Executive Member decision making relating to the scheme: PA - Update - Aldershot Station Access-2023-11-27-ELMUS Decision Day (hants.gov.uk)</p>

<p>What do they stand to gain? What research has and will be undertaken to establish whether or not it is required? Who was asked and consulted? Who voted for this?</p>	
<p>Margaret McCann, 29 Whyte Avenue, Aldershot, GU12 4AD</p>	
<p>I object to the proposed cycle lane reference [A2023/MJB]</p> <p>The two roads stated, Arthur Street and Pickford Street are both side roads, not at all busy. Arthur Street has been one way for years. It surely cannot cost 2 million pounds for the work proposed.</p> <p>You finance department should scrutinize more thoroughly the quotes submitted for every thing.</p> <p>Plans may be to link with other cycle paths in the future but, in this present economic climate it is a bad choice of expenditure. It would be safer for cyclist if they did no have to avoid all the potholes in the roads.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Sarah Walton</p>	
<p>Dear sirs,</p> <p>whilst you may be encouraging cycling, the current state of the town does not require a cyclist route from the Aldershot station to Gunhill. There is far more cry for the funds to be used elsewhere. A small suggestion would be to resurface many of the roads that are falling and neglected.</p> <p>A cycle route would not benefit enough people and there currently isn't the demand for one. For the odd two possible three cyclists that you see in a week does not warrant the high value cost of the works that you're proposing.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council need to be made aware that there are far more serious Urgent needs requiring Attention on the roads and this money proposed should be put to far better use. I believe that the safe working team need to work with Hampshire, county Council in addressing some of the issues and putting the spending cap on certain services. Please improve this the infrastructure we currently have rather than trying to introduce more that you will not maintain a good standard.</p> <p>Not only is my opinion, but most live in the area. If I had the funds to be able to move out of the area to a different area, I would. I've just recently had to fork out £350 on two new tires because of the poor state of the roads. Potholes so deep they are damaging. Our vehicles is unacceptable.</p> <p>I have put a claim in. I also have to wait three months for a response if it is accepted. Completely unreasonable.</p> <p>I object the proposal, and ask again that the funds are put to better and more practical use.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Andrew Tatarek, Gower House, Croft Road, Aldershot, GU11 3HR, UK</p>	

<p>Please can I raise my objection to the proposed cycle lane in Aldershot, requesting the scheme to be scrapped as very poor value.</p> <p>As a cyclist myself, I get around Aldershot without problems. Station Road on the station side being one way is a little bit of a nuisance, but I can already cut through Pickford Street, walk the 80 yards or so through Arthur Street, and I'm at the station.</p> <p>I know it is probably well meant, but the lane is very short and quite bitty. I find it difficult to see any significant benefit this would have over cycling on the current roads, and I am very sceptical of any effect it could have in increasing the number of people cycling.</p> <p>The relocation of parking spaces will severely inconvenience the people who will no longer be able to park outside their homes. I'd be interested to know the actual number of parking spaces that will be lost as covered by "no significant loss" – could that not be a precise number, in that somebody must have done that work, and it will be specific people carrying the burden of the scheme? Mothers struggling to find somewhere to park, then having to handle prams, babies and shopping in the rain will be very grateful that their inconvenience is considered "no significant loss". The absence of benefits needs to be weighed against the burden it will put on these residents.</p> <p>If Hampshire Council Council has a budget deficit, cancelling this scheme would seem to be a very obvious way to save money, remembering that any money sunk into it is already lost, and is not an argument for continuing.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p> <p>In addition, note that there is no net loss of resident permit parking spaces as a result of the scheme, those being lost on Arthur Street are being located close by on Victoria Road and Windsor Way. There is a loss of 3 Pay and Display parking spaces on Victoria Road as a result of the scheme and this loss was necessary to resolve concerns raised by the local bus operator, Stagecoach, about how the changes would affect access to the Victoria Road (Arthur Street junction) bus stop. However, there are alternative P&D parking spaces close by (such as in Crimea Road) which mitigate the impact of this loss.</p>
<p>Lorraine Ashley, Objection</p>	
<p>I object to the planned £2 million pound cycle lane for Aldershot, the roads are in a terrible mess with potholes etc , these need to be repaired before a cycle route is put in place for the small amount of use it will get . Total waste of money and pointless.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Lucy Crockford, Objection</p>	
<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Reference A2023/MJB</p> <p>I object to £2 million being spent on a small section of cycle lane from the station to no where. Very few residents feel safe enough to cycle in Aldershot with the high number of speeding cars in the area. Could the money be better spent on speed cameras or traffic calming measures. Spent some money actually making residents feel like cycling could be an option. This cycle path will not stop the cars racing down victoria road and the high street. There will be fatalities. If the cycle path is supposed to benefit Wellesely residents only, what kind of message is this sending to other parts of Aldershot? Living in Aldershot Park ward myself, the idea of cycling to the station along Ash Road is terrifying with the speeds of the cars. I have my heart in my mouth every time I take my children to Manor Park or into town, because it means walking a small stretch of Ash Road with them. I wonder how many residents just don't walk to the park/station/Town for that reason. I've no doubt it's got a lot</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p> <p>In addition, note that the Rushmoor LCWIP identifies other key priorities for pedestrian and cycle routes within the Borough, which may be progressed in future as funding opportunities arise. Borough of Rushmoor Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (hants.gov.uk)</p>

<p>to do with the high levels of obesity and bad health here in this ward. Could the money not be put to better use here?</p> <p>Please re-think. I understand cycling is important and should be encouraged, but we have far more pressing needs here.</p>	
<p>Maria Downs, 1 Smith House, Burke Place, Wellesley, Aldershot, Hants, GU11 4BR</p>	
<p>I write in regard to the proposed cycle Lane at a cost of £2M.</p> <p>I fail to see the logic in spending this amount of money on a cycle route that will only benefit a small proportion of the community. The money would be better spent on the repairs to the numerous amounts of potholes on our roads in Aldershot/Wellesley which I am sure are a cyclist nightmare!</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Lillian Downton, Objection</p>	
<p>This is a waste of money need to fix the roads with all the pot holes and the flooding on our road</p> <p>Totally object to this spend the money on the roads ,also our house road floods help residents with this ,waste of money.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Mrs D Hannah , Lower Farnham Road, Aldershot</p>	
<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I fail to see the value of spending money on this scheme when you would do better to invest the monies into removing pot holes and damaged speed bumps such as those in Boxalls Lane and Grosvenor Road which are potentially causing serious damage to vehicle suspensions, wheels and tyres, and keeping the refuse and re cycling facility open in Ivy Road.</p> <p>I formally oppose the proposed scheme on the grounds that I have never seen anyone using a pushbike anywhere in Aldershot other than on the pavements in the nearby estate and occasionally on Tices Meadow.</p>	<p>See response 1 and 2.</p>

The reasons for objections received can be summarised into the two main points below and a response to each is provided. Where an objection requires additional detail, this is included in the Officer Response text in the table.

1) Insufficient cycle demand to justify the scheme.

Hampshire County Council seeks to promote sustainable transport measures, including walking and cycling infrastructure, to provide a healthy alternative to the car for local short journeys to work, local services, and schools. This approach is integral to Hampshire's new Local Transport Plan 4. In doing so, residents will experience benefits, such as reduction in air pollution, fewer delays, improved road safety and better accessibility for people of all ages and ability. The County Council's walking and cycling strategies aim to make walking the travel mode of choice for short trips and the most popular and accessible means of recreation; and cycling to be a convenient,

safe, healthy, affordable and popular means of transportation and recreation within Hampshire.

It is anticipated that the significant development in Aldershot will increase the number of trips to and from the town on a daily basis. As set out in the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan for Rushmoor, there is demand for walking and cycling journeys in the area, however this is constrained to some extent by the lack of high-quality facilities. The scheme will provide a package of high-quality pedestrian and cycle improvements, which will enable and encourage residents to walk and cycle for local journeys and support the continued development of an active travel network in the area and encourage a modal shift in transport choices, which will ease traffic pressure on the local road network as well as delivering environmental and health benefits.

2) Scheme does not represent good value for money and the funding available should be used on road maintenance instead.

This Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) relates to a scheme which seeks to deliver a package of improvements in the area of Aldershot between the Railway Station, the Town Centre and the Wellesley Development. The TRO is necessary to deliver a high-quality two-way link along Arthur Street, however the wider scheme includes various other planned changes, including

- significant improvements to pedestrian facilities, such as improved crossings on Victoria Road, Arthur Street, Windsor Way and A323 High Street
- traffic management changes on Windsor Way and Victoria Road to reduce vehicle speeds and narrow road widths
- access and environmental improvements around the railway station forecourt to create a more welcoming atmosphere and encourage higher footfall
- significant extents of footway resurfacing in various locations in the local area and carriageway resurfacing on Windsor Way and Arthur Street.

The scheme is primarily funded from Section 106 developer contributions and Department for Transport Active Travel Fund (ATF) grant. The Section 106 agreement seeks to mitigate the impact of the additional travel demands of the significant new development in the local area, and encouraging some of this additional demand to undertake journeys by active travel modes reduces the impact of motor vehicle use on the local area and road network. The ATF funding has been awarded following a successful funding bid from the County Council, specifically to provide improvements for road users who are walking and cycling, as part of a national objective to promote active and sustainable transport for local journeys.

The conditions of use of the Section 106 funding and the ATF grant are such that it cannot be used on routine highway maintenance. However, the opportunity is being taken as part of this project to coordinate the delivery of planned maintenance works in the area, to ensure a high-quality end product and to minimise the impact of additional future highway works on the local community and road network. The scheme includes significant resurfacing works on Windsor Way and the Arthur Street approach to the

railway station; this work is funded from maintenance budgets but is included within the overall scheme cost estimates.