

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**3 November 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Knasel (Chairman) (P)

Learney (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Hiscock

1. PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS, OLD GARDENS, WINCHESTER

(Report CAB1127(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, three members of the public spoke regarding the proposed waiting restrictions. Mr Fowler spoke on behalf of his elderly aunt, Mrs Newman who lives at 13 Park Road but whose property had sole vehicular access via Old Gardens. The relevant letter of objection was contained within Appendix F to the above Report. Mr Fowler explained that Mrs Newman objected to the restrictions as currently outlined as it was believed it would make the situation worse for his aunt as it would concentrate more parking opposite her garage. No objection had been raised to the proposal when it was originally advertised as there had been some confusion about the exact section of road to be covered. In addition to concerns about access to property, Mr Fowler also stressed the difficulties caused for any emergency vehicles wishing to access the area.

Mr Morgan also spoke in support of Mrs Newman's objections to the proposals, emphasising the difficulty experienced reversing out her garage because of the cars parked opposite.

Mrs Gardner advised that she was a resident of Old Gardens and wished to speak in support of the proposed restrictions as set out in the Report. She emphasised the long standing nature of the problems experienced by parking in this cul-de-sac and mentioned that the residents had policed the area themselves by asking drivers not to park there. She expressed sympathy for the difficulties experienced by Mrs Newman, but suggested the Committee should approve the proposals as outlined and then consider extending the double yellow lines at a future date.

Councillor Hiscock spoke as a Ward Councillor for the area and emphasised that the difficulties caused by vehicles parking in Old Gardens had been ongoing for a number of years. He expressed sympathy with the points raised on behalf of Mrs Newman, but considered that the proposals should be agreed as outlined in the Report. The Committee should then undertake to consider extending the double yellow lines as soon as possible.

The Director of Development confirmed that it was not legally possible for the proposed restrictions to be extended beyond that which was advertised. Therefore

the options available to the Committee were either to agree the proposal as advertised, to reduce it, or to reject it and start the process of advertising the extended proposed restrictions again.

In response to questions, the Director of Development advised that there was a waiting list of Traffic Regulation Orders outstanding and the budget for 2005/06 had already been fully allocated. However, he suggested that consideration of extending the double yellow lines in Old Nursery Gardens could be included within the general Parking Review that was currently being undertaken. Any Order that was required could then be advertised at the same time as other changes to reduce costs.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed with the recommendations as set out in the above Report. However, an additional recommendation should be agreed that the possibility of extending the double yellow lines further round Old Nursery Gardens, to address the concerns expressed on behalf of Mrs Newman, be considered as part of the Parking Review. The Director of Development advised that it was expected that the Review would be completed by April and the Order could be advertised after this time. If there were no objections, it could be implemented by May 2006.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed revision to the Traffic Regulation Order in Old Gardens, Winchester be approved such that the existing 'No waiting 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday' waiting restrictions be amended and 'No waiting at any time' waiting restrictions be introduced as advertised and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the necessary order.
2. That the concerns raised by the residents of Old Gardens and nearby properties be noted and that a review of parking problems in Old Gardens be included within the Parking Review to take place in Spring 2006.

2. **PAYMENT OF PARKING CHARGES BY MOBILE PHONE (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB1120(TP) refers)

The Director of Development advised that since the Report was prepared, the companies outlined in the Exempt Appendix were offering different terms than those included within the Report, in order to try and attract more customers to this new technology. He explained that the first three companies (outlined in paragraphs 1.2 to 1.4 of the Report Appendix) all relied on using an RFID reader. However, the fourth company (outlined in paragraph 1.5) did not require an in-car system and consequently cost less. The cost to the Council involved rental of a BlackBerry Unit to allow internet access and the costs involved in processing credit/debit card payments. Therefore he estimated the cost to the Council would be between £500 and £1,200 per annum, dependant on customer take-up.

During discussion, Members commented on the potential risk to the Council's reputation if the system failed and for example, a driver was issued with a parking ticket in error. In addition, Members expressed concern that the system was new and untested and consequently one suggested that the companies involved should offer

payment to the Council to trial the system for them. Overall, Members concluded that the benefits to the Council and the potential risks did not warrant a trial at this stage. However, the Committee requested that Officers monitor the development of such systems and report back if appropriate at a future date.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed trial of accepting payment of parking charges by mobile phone, as set out in the above Report, be not agreed at this stage.

3. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Payment of Parking Charges by Mobile Phone – Exempt Appendix) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).)) Any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 9 to Schedule 12A refers).

4. **PAYMENT OF PARKING CHARGES BY MOBILE PHONE - EXEMPT APPENDIX**
(Report CAB1120(TP) refers)

The Committee noted the exempt information contained in the Appendix to the Report.

The meeting commenced at 2.30pm and concluded at 3.20pm

Chairman