

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**27 September 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Lipscomb (Chairman) (P)

Beckett (P)

Hollingbery (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Beveridge and Learney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Hiscock and Mather

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 19 January 2006 (CAB1326 (TP) refers) be received.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Ms S Foster (resident of St Peters Street, Winchester) stated that, in summary, there were only seven spaces for Zone M permit holders in St Peters Street. These spaces were heavily oversubscribed as residents from four other zones were entitled to use the spaces, along with any other driver using the payment meters between 8am and 6pm. As a consequence, the spaces were rarely available for St Peters Street residents. This problem was compounded as it was often difficult to park in other Zone M areas, that the timing of the metered spaces made them unsuitable for most residents and that the number of dwellings did not equate to the available spaces even before taking into account visitors' parking.

In response to Ms Foster's comments, the Director of Development agreed to investigate her concerns and correspond accordingly.

Ms M Gardiner spoke regarding residents' car parking at Clifton Terrace (Zone J). In summary, she suggested that the parking spaces at Crowder Terrace should be made available to residents in the evenings, once employees of the businesses that use the spaces had left.

In response to Ms Gardiner's comments, the Director of Development agreed to investigate her concerns and correspond accordingly.

Mr Bradfield spoke on Report CAB1305 (TP). He suggested that the proposed discount for environmentally friendly cars could not be justified, as the raison d'être of the parking permit charges was that they were self financing and were not a means to encourage the use of more environmentally friendly cars. The charge for the permits

should therefore be related solely to the costs of the scheme, regardless of the type of vehicle it was applied to. He also added that, when parked and not in use, the emissions of a vehicle were irrelevant.

The Committee agreed to consider Mr Bradfield's concerns during their consideration of the Report, as set out below.

3. **PROPOSED INCREASE IN RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMIT FEES, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB1305 (TP) refers)

Councillor Hollingbery declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as the owner of a car, although he did not live in one of the parking zones and benefit from the scheme.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney spoke with regard to this item as one of the Ward Councillors for Littleton and Harestock. She underlined the importance that the scheme should remain self financing, as she considered it unfair if residents outside the parking zones were asked to subsidise a scheme that prohibited them from parking in Winchester. She was therefore concerned that the proposed increase in the charge to £22 from the current charge of £20 (as opposed to the £24 charge that had been recommended by the previous administration) could be insufficient to make the scheme self financing.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Beveridge spoke as one of the Ward Members affected by the Scheme. Councillor Beveridge also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as a residents' parking permit holder. He spoke in support of the principle that the scheme should be self-financing and that the increase should be to the £24 charge. He explained that the greater increase could mean that the scheme would not require reviewing for a longer period. Councillor Beveridge also spoke in support of the discount for environmentally friendly vehicles and suggested that these could be based on engine size, which often equated to smaller cars that were less intrusive to Winchester's narrow streets.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Development confirmed that the £22 charge had been recommended, rather than the earlier officers' recommendation of £24, because of a re-calculation of the parking budget. As the Report had been written further into the financial year, officers had been able to more accurately estimate the budget in regard to money received from Penalty Charge Notices and renewals of residents' permits, in addition to a reduced expenditure from lower than expected staff costs. It was from this re-calculation, that officers assured Members that it was likely that the £22 charge would self finance the scheme. However, the Director also stated that if the scheme did fall into deficit, Members would be advised to adjust the charge accordingly. It was noted that if the budget returned to the original estimate, the £22 charge was likely to result in a £10,000 deficit over the £24 charge.

During debate, the Committee agreed that the smaller increase to £22 as set out in the Report should be applied. Members acknowledged that although the increased charge was not excessive in comparison with the yearly cost of running a car, the percentage increase of the £24 charge had been of concern to some residents.

The Committee therefore agreed that, since the purpose of the scheme was to be self financing, an increase above that which was predicted to balance the budget could not be justified.

The Committee also discussed in detail the issues raised by Mr Bradfield and noted that, although the scheme was intended to be self-financing, the overarching

Corporate Strategy encouraged sustainability and improving the air quality in Winchester which justified the discounts for environmentally friendly vehicles.

RESOLVED:

1. That the fee for residents' and visitors' first parking permits be increased from £20.00 per annum to £22.00 per annum.
2. That discounts for environmentally friendly vehicles in Vehicle Excise Duty Bands A and B of 75% and 50% respectively be introduced as advertised.
3. That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the necessary Order.

The meeting commenced at 2.30pm and concluded at 3.20pm

Chairman