

**CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE****19 January 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Knasel (Chairman) (P)

Evans (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bennetts, Berry, Higgins, Hiscock, Jackson and Saunders

---

1. **PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS, LYNFORD AVENUE AND LYNFORD WAY, WINCHESTER**  
(Report CAB1167(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Berry spoke with regard to this item as one of the Ward Councillors for St Barnabas. She emphasised the difficulties caused by parked cars preventing access for larger vehicles, including emergency vehicles. In particular, that commuters/students tended to park on the corner of Lynford Way and Lynford Avenue which was potentially very dangerous. As such, she supported the requirement for restrictions, but questioned whether they were necessary on a Saturday?

In addition, seven members of the public spoke and all expressed support for the requirement for some form of measures to deal with the problems caused by cars parking in these roads. Their comments are summarised below.

Mr Goodland (a resident of Lynford Avenue) advised that he had undertaken a survey of residents which had indicated that the majority of households in Lynford Way did not oppose the proposal to introduce a single yellow line, but a significant number believed this alone would not solve the problem and that a residents' parking scheme should also be introduced. Of the residents of Lynford Avenue polled, the majority favoured a residents' parking scheme without a single yellow line. In addition, a number of residents' expressed concern that Peter Symond's College should be requested to take action to reduce the numbers of students parking in the area. It was suggested that the College should be linked to Park and Ride, better college transport introduced and the College should consider restricting students from outside of Winchester unless they travelled by public transport.

Mrs King (a resident of Lynford Avenue) highlighted the difficulties caused because larger vehicles were unable to gain access to these roads. She also reported that cars regularly parked around the corner of Lynford Way.

Mrs Southall (a resident of Lynford Way) agreed with the comments previously expressed and also mentioned that people parking in the area sometimes drove too fast and without taking adequate care. She stated that she had on occasions been blocked in by cars parked opposite and very close to her driveway. In summary, she stated that although she had requested a residents' parking scheme, she would welcome the introduction of a single yellow line as an initial step.

Mr and Mrs Burroughs stated that they supported the comments made by Mrs King above. In general, they would prefer the introduction of a yellow line around the inner kerb-line of the road.

Mr Pomeroy (a resident of Lynford Avenue) agreed with the Council proposal to introduce a single yellow line. He did not consider that a residents' parking scheme would solve the problem as people would still be able to park on either side of the road. Mr Good added his support to the comments made by other residents.

The Director of Development stated that he considered that single yellow lines were necessary as proposed in the Report to ensure adequate vehicular access. The access difficulties outlined above and in the Report would not be solved by the introduction of a residents' parking scheme alone. He suggested that the single yellow line should be introduced as set out in the Report and a further review be undertaken on the areas not covered by the restrictions at a future date.

The Director confirmed that the Council were in ongoing discussions with Peter Symond's College regarding student transport and the College's aim was that students should be discouraged from using cars. In response to comments made in the public participation period above, the Director advised that the Council had no power to control the College's admission policy. He confirmed that the access difficulties outlined, including cars parking on the corner of Lynford Way and the obstruction of emergency and refuse collection vehicles, would be addressed by the measures proposed in the Report.

The Director advised that if following the introduction of the single yellow lines, residents of Lynford Avenue and Lynford Way still wished to introduce a residents' parking scheme, they would be required to demonstrate support from two thirds of the households in these roads. He confirmed, that if included within the scheme, residents from within the same Parking Zone would be able to park in these roads.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed revision to the Traffic Regulation Order in Lynford Avenue and Lynford Way, Winchester be approved such that the existing 'No Waiting 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday' waiting restrictions be extended as advertised and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the necessary order.

**2. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT – PARCHMENT STREET, WINCHESTER AND SURROUNDING ROADS**

(Report CAB1166(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Saunders, Higgins, Jackson, Hiscock and Bennetts spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Saunders spoke in objection to the proposal as outlined in the Report. Her reasons included the detrimental effect on the traders in Parchment Street and concern that a decision could not be made without accurate and current air quality data. She stated that the air quality data provided in the Report indicated that pollution levels had increased and requested that the decision be deferred until the

findings of the next Air Quality Informal Member/Officer Working Group could be reported to Cabinet.

Councillor Jackson spoke in objection to the proposal and supported the comments made by Councillor Saunders. She stated that the information contained in the Report was insufficient for an informed decision to be taken at this stage. She believed the proposal unduly benefited the residents of Parchment Street to the detriment of other Winchester residents. She mentioned the inconvenience caused by drivers having to travel the extra 1½ miles around the one way system when travelling from the north to the south of the town. Finally, she did not believe that the proposed improved signage to Parchment Street would be sufficient to encourage more shoppers to cross the busy St Georges Street into the road.

Councillor Higgins spoke in support of the Report's proposals. However, he expressed concern about the findings indicating that the number of vehicles entering the town had increased and also the proposal for a contra-flow cycle lane along Parchment Street as he did not believe the road was wide enough.

Councillor Hiscock also supported the proposals emphasising the benefits to the Parchment Street residents since the traffic flow had been reversed. He did not consider that drivers automatically had a right to the shortest route, to the detriment of all others. He expressed sympathy with the traders of Parchment Street and supported the proposals to improve signage to the area. However, he did not agree that they should rely on traffic queues outside their premises (as occurred before the traffic flow was reversed) to encourage business.

Councillor Bennetts spoke in opposition to the Report's proposals at this stage, as he considered the measures should be considered as part of a wider review of traffic in the town Centre. In particular, the requirement to address the lack of a satisfactory route between the north and south of Winchester. In addition, he also believed that the current proposals benefited the residents of Parchment Street to the detriment of other residents of Winchester.

At the invitation of the Chairman, thirteen members of the public spoke regarding the proposal outlined in the Report and their comments are summarised below.

Four people spoke in opposition, Mrs Gibson, Mr Radford, Mr Pomeroy and Mr Webb.

Mrs Gibson (a resident of North Walls) expressed concern that the Council's consultation had been inadequate, and in particular had omitted a number of residents of Union Street and Friarsgate. The experimental order had resulted in longer queues along North Walls and she disputed that the effects of this congestion had been adequately measured. In summary, she considered that the proposal favoured Parchment Street residents and ignored the majority of respondents who had opposed the order. Mrs Miller, a resident of Olivers' Battery, supported the comments made by Mrs Gibson.

Mr Radford, a resident of Micheldever, believed that the meeting was not adequately advertised, a decision had already been made by the Council to reverse the flow of traffic, and the consultation was consequentially of little purpose. He considered the proposal favoured Parchment Street residents against the majority of residents of Winchester and also expressed concern about the lack of conclusive air quality data.

Mr Pomeroy expressed concern about the impact on traders in Parchment Street. He suggested alternative options should be considered, such as directing traffic from the Leisure Centre out through Abbots Barton. He also believed the road was too narrow to allow a contra-flow cycle route.

Mr Webb spoke on behalf of a resident of Parchment Street and supported the requirement for a review of traffic in Winchester generally. He considered that difficulties had arisen since traffic was prevented from turning right from the Upper High Street into Southgate Street.

Six people spoke in support of the proposal: Canon Walker, Mrs Backhouse, Mrs Walker, Mrs Couper-Johnstone, Mrs Sirl and Mr Jarvis.

Canon Walker believed that the improvements to the quality of life to Parchment Street residents should be considered paramount to the requirements of others.

Mrs Backhouse advised that she was currently a resident of Parchment Street but had previously run a business there for 20 years. She considered that the queues of traffic that occurred before the experimental order increased difficulties for businesses in the road.

Mrs Walker (a resident of Parchment Street) emphasised that before the experimental order, 3,200 vehicles had driven along the road every day and this had been reduced to 560 vehicles under the new traffic arrangements. She stated that vehicles often used to speed down the road and parked cars were regularly damaged. She also emphasised the impact on residents' having to keep front windows shut to reduce fumes and noise levels. Mrs Walker also mentioned that the Parchment Street traders had not submitted proof of any negative impact on their businesses despite being requested to do so by the Council.

Four other residents of Parchment Street also spoke in support of the proposal to reverse the traffic flow permanently. Mrs Couper-Johnstone and Mrs Sirl emphasised the significant benefit to residents and improvements in their quality of life. Mrs Sirl considered that the road could now accommodate an un-segregated contra-flow cycle lane. Mrs Mirchandani highlighted the disproportionate number of vehicles that travelled along the street prior to the experimental order. Mr Jarvis stated that he considered the road to be much safer now and although quieter, the number of pedestrians walking past did not appear to have reduced. All residents welcomed the suggestion to improve signage to the road to assist traders.

Mr Pitkin queried whether the traffic flow should be reversed along St Peters Street to allow it to be a one-way route from North Walls to St Georges Street (and Parchment Street should also remain one-way from the direction of North Walls). He believed St Peters Street was wider and less residential than Parchment Street, although he acknowledged visibility difficulties for traffic emerging onto St Georges Street would have to be addressed, possibly by the introduction of traffic lights.

The Director of Development reported that the purpose of the experimental order was to gather evidence on how the reversal worked in practice and then for a decision to be taken weighing up the interests involved. He considered that the order had significantly benefited the residents of Parchment Street and Middle Brook Street and had not had an unduly detrimental impact on traffic flows around the town. However, the Committee must make their decision by assessing the relative balance on all town centre residents, motorists and traders in the area.

The Director continued that the City Council were engaged in discussions with the County Council with regard to the impact of the second Local Transport Plan (LTP). This review would aim to reduce traffic in Winchester generally and include consideration of the north to south route through the town centre and the proposed introduction of a Park and Ride site to the south of the town. However, he did not

consider that it was reasonable for a decision on this Report to be deferred until this larger review had been completed.

Councillor Knasel advised that he and Councillor Campbell (the Leader of the Council) had met with the traders and the City Centre Manager and Director. At this meeting, the traders had indicated that they would not submit their trading accounts. Their main concerns related to signage, pedestrian footfall and the ability for customers to easily collect and drop off goods. The traders were advised of the above Report's proposals to address their concerns and therefore indicated that neither they nor the City Centre Manager wished to attend this meeting and make further objections.

The Committee noted a consultant's report on the Council's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) was expected shortly. As an element of the AQAP it was proposed to conduct a review of the whole traffic management system, hopefully to commence in 2006/07. The review might recommend alterations to traffic flows around Winchester to reduce congestion and improve air quality, and could include reconsideration of traffic flow along Parchment Street.

In response to questions, the Director confirmed that it was proposed to introduce an *un-segregated* cycle contra-flow in Parchment Street as there was insufficient space for a segregated lane.

The Committee welcomed the proposals to improve signage to this area and noted that suggestions included a sign across the entrance to Parchment Street from St Georges Street and also visual improvements to the Council owned Casson Block (situated on the corner of this junction). Members also welcomed the introduction of a contra-flow cycle lane. The Committee all agreed that on balance, the Report's recommendations should be approved and noted that a wider review of traffic in Winchester would take place through both the AQAP and the LTP within the next few years.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the experimental order relating to Parchment Street and Middle Brook Street be made permanent and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the necessary order.
2. That the introduction of contra-flow cycling in Parchment Street be investigated.
3. That the revision to waiting restrictions be investigated to optimise the parking bays in Parchment Street and Middle Brook Street.
4. That additional signage be provided from the High Street for 'secondary' shopping areas.

3. **REVIEW OF RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMIT SCHEME**  
(Report CAB1191(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins requested that the wording of Recommendation two of the Report be amended (additional wording shown in italics):  
"That proposals should be progressed for extending the permit restriction times from

6pm to 10pm, where requested by residents *where adversely affected by the evening economy.*"

The Director of Development reminded Members that the starting point of the review was to achieve a cost-neutral scheme. He confirmed that the current proposals would leave a deficit but the situation would be reviewed again in a year's time. More information would then be available on, for example, take-up of visitors' scratch cards in preference to permits.

During discussion, the Committee reiterated the view that the aim should be for the scheme to be cost-neutral and believed that in general the service offered good value for money to residents. Members agreed to the suggested amendment put forward by Councillor Higgins.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposal for the first annual permit charge per household to be increased from £20 to £24 per annum from July 2006 be advertised and that the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to publish the appropriate notice.

2. That proposals should be progressed for extending the permit restriction times from 6pm to 10pm, where requested by residents where adversely affected by the evening economy.

3. That requests for adding or removing areas from the residents' parking scheme should only be considered where they are supported by at least two thirds of the households in that area.

4. **DISCOUNTED PARKING FOR LOW EMISSION VEHICLES**  
(Report CAB1183(TP) refers)

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the discounts for pay and display season ticket holders using low emission vehicles should be 50 per cent for vehicles in Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) Band B, and 75 per cent for vehicles in VED Band A.

2. That the same level of discounts should apply to residents' parking permit holders with low emission vehicles.

3. That detailed investigations should be progressed on the same level of discounts being offered on pre-paid Park and Ride tickets.

5. **BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT**  
(Report CAB1193(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins expressed some concern that the proposals in the Report were being considered in advance of what was required in

Winchester. However, he did support the suggestion that these restricted areas should be enforced properly.

The Director of Development advised that there were three locations in Winchester where bus-only roads were widely used by other vehicles. However, the suggestion in the Report was for initial investigations to be undertaken at this stage. He confirmed that if introduced at some future date, any enforcement would utilise photographic evidence and fixed penalty notices, similar to speed cameras.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That further investigations be carried out on the feasibility of taking on the powers to carry out bus lane enforcement including a financial assessment of anticipated income and expenditure.

2. That a further report be prepared for this Committee before there is any commitment to take on bus lane enforcement.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12 noon

Chairman