

**CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**

**5 June 2007**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Coates (P)

Hollingbery (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Saunders

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Higgins

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 30 January 2007 be approved and adopted.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Five members of the public spoke at the meeting and their comments are summarised under the relevant items below.

3. **PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS, BEREWEEKE WAY, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1444(TP) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure explained that the proposals resulted from a request on behalf of Peter Symond's College (the developers). The proposed development was for five units of housing which, if planning permission was approved, would front directly onto existing parking bays. In his opinion, the existing parking bays would not be useable if planning permission was granted. However, he clarified that if planning permission was not granted by the Council, the proposed revision to the Traffic Regulation Order would not be implemented.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure responded to questions from Members on the proposals. He advised that the proposal would result in a change from a parking bay for five vehicles to a bay that allowed parking for three or four vehicles. He confirmed that it would be possible to investigate whether additional parking bays could be provided, for example on the opposite side of the road, but to introduce these would require the advertisement of a new Traffic Regulation Order. In his opinion, he did not consider that the proposal would cause problems regarding sightlines. In addition, he suggested that there did not appear to be a parking problem in the road, particularly as all properties had their own off-street parking available.

Miss R Blundell spoke on behalf of a number of residents of Bereweeke Way in objection to the proposals. In summary, she considered that the proposal would reduce the parking bays by two spaces and stated that the current bays were well used, particularly on a Saturday. In addition, the road had already been subject to a number of planning applications and if any were to be granted, this would put more demand on the number of on-street parking places. Of the current residents, ten had on-street parking permits and six had visitors scratch cards. Residents believed that the proposed relocation of the bay towards the corner of the road could lead to safety issues as children currently played in the cul-de-sac. Miss Blundell also queried whether a proper and transparent process had been followed regarding determining the Traffic Regulation Order prior to a planning application.

As a Ward Councillor, Councillor Saunders also objected to the proposals and supported the comments made by Miss Blundell. She considered that the planning application should have been determined by the Council before the Traffic Regulation Order was considered. She did not consider that it was fair to deprive residents of two parking spaces in favour of a potential development. Councillor Saunders also made a number general points regarding the possibility of encouraging Peter Symond's College to agree better parking strategies.

In response, the Head of Access and Infrastructure clarified that if permission was granted for any new developments in the area which were situated on a site where there was not currently a dwelling, the new residents would not be entitled to apply for on-street parking permits.

During debate, the Committee expressed concern that the current proposal appeared to be to the detriment of residents of Bereweeke Way. One possible solution would be to investigate the possibility of providing additional replacement bays on the opposite side of the road to that proposed. However, it was not considered appropriate to undertake this work prior to any planning application being submitted. The Committee therefore agreed that the proposed waiting restrictions, as set out in the Report, be not approved.

The Committee also queried whether it was possible for the Council to discuss further with Peter Symond's College the general issues raised concerning students driving to college and parking in nearby streets. The Head of Access and Infrastructure agreed to investigate the student parking issues raised.

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 Bereweeke Way, Winchester be not approved.

4. **PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS, ST PAULS HILL, WINCHESTER**  
(Report CAB1445(TP) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure confirmed that the proposals had resulted from requests from residents of the St Paul's area. In addition, the original proposals had been amended to take account of concerns received from businesses in the Stockbridge Road area. If agreed, the revised Traffic and Regulation Order would now allow for the larger existing echelon parking bay on the north-east side of St

Paul's Hill to remain available for non-permit holders for a maximum limited period of two hours. The Head of Access and Infrastructure also advised that the Order would enable a number of small anomalies regarding the current parking restrictions to be corrected.

Four members of the public spoke regarding this Report and their comments are summarised below.

Mr B Parnell objected to the proposals as it reduced the number of parking spaces available to non-residents. He also disputed the current location of the single yellow line parking restrictions on the plans and suggested that the length of parking bays be increased on the north-east side as compensation for the loss of two-hour parking on the south-east side. He considered that the road was wide enough to allow this.

Mr Sharples (a St Paul's Hill resident) welcomed the proposal to increase resident only parking permits restrictions. However, he considered there was still insufficient parking available for residents and it would be more appropriate if the bay at the south-east of St Paul's Hill continue to allow two-hour waiting instead of the bay at the north-east side.

Mr Forni (a St Paul's Hill resident) generally welcomed the proposals. However he expressed concern that the St Paul's Hospital development had put additional pressure on parking in the area. In addition, he highlighted that residents and businesses within Alison Way could apply for parking permits which allowed them to park in St Paul's Hill. The removal of short term on-street parking in other locations within the town centre had also increased pressure on the use of the existing two-hour waiting spaces in St Paul's Hill.

Mrs Ferguson spoke on behalf of her business in Stockbridge Road (Happy Feet Chiropody) and another business (Rapport Hairdressing). She stated that although the Stockbridge Road shops did have a one-hour parking bay located at the front of the premises, some customers had appointments lasting over one hour. Therefore, the businesses relied on the two-hour waiting bays at the bottom of St Paul's Hill. She also mentioned that although the businesses were entitled to apply for parking permits, these cost £50 each for an annual pass.

In response to comments made, the Head of Access and Infrastructure clarified that the proposed revision would not remove any of the on-street parking available to residents, but would hopefully make more parking spaces available. He was recommending that the bay at the north-east side of St Paul's Hill remain two-hour waiting because it was the largest bay and also due to its proximity to local businesses. With regard to the suggestion to extend the current parking bays, the Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that this might cause difficulties by reducing the road width and therefore potentially restricting access for emergency vehicles.

The Committee agreed to introduce the proposed revision as set out in the Report and review the requirement to increase the size of parking bays in a few years time.

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 St Paul's Hill, Winchester be approved such that the existing 'Echelon Parking 2 Hours Limited Waiting with Permit Holders Exemption Monday to Saturday' waiting restrictions remain unchanged but that the order be amended to reflect the corrected schedule and the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make the necessary order.

2. That the proposed revision to the Traffic Regulation Order in St Paul's Hill, Winchester be approved such that the existing '2 Hours Limited Waiting with Permit Holders Exemption Monday to Saturday' waiting restrictions be changed to 'Permit Holders Only 8am to 10pm Monday to Saturday' and the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make the necessary order.

5. **EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER, CROMWELL ROAD, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1446(TP) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the emergency experimental order remains in force and that the situation continues to be monitored.

2. That a Report be brought back after the experimental order has been in place for a minimum of six months to decide whether to make the order permanent.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.05am

Chairman