

**CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**

**11 June 2012**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Weston (Chairman)  
Tait (Chairman for the meeting) (P)

Godfrey (P)

Humby (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Hiscock

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Nelmes

1. **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That in the absence of the Chairman (Councillor Weston)  
Councillor Tait be appointed as the Chairman for this meeting only.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 21 February  
2012, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Wilson (a resident of King Heads Yard, Winchester) spoke during the public participation period and raised a number of concerns regarding parking in Little Minster Street, Winchester. In summary, since the development of the flats in Kings Head Yard (Mozzetta), vehicles were parking on the single yellow lines making it difficult for Kings Head Yard residents to access their garages. In addition, Mr Wilson highlighted that parking in this area was preventing access to larger vehicles into Little Minster Street, including fire engines. He requested the replacement of the single yellow lines outside the flats with double-yellow lines.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the issue had previously been considered by the Committee at its meeting on 30 January 2008 (Report

CAB1589(TP) refers). At this meeting, residents of the Mozzetta flats had argued against the introduction of double-yellow lines, as it would prevent them parking near their homes (residents of the flats were not entitled to any residents' parking permits). The Committee had decided, on balance, not to approve the introduction of double-yellow lines.

Members noted the comments made by Mr Wilson outlined above and his contention that the level of traffic and anti-social parking had increased since the matter was last considered. Members therefore requested that the Head of Access and Infrastructure revisit the matter and report back accordingly to a future Committee.

4. **EXPERIMENTAL NO ENTRY ORDER – HYDE CHURCH LANE, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB2341(TP) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure emphasised that, if the experimental no-entry order was not approved and made permanent, it would have to be removed. He also stated that it was believed that the introduction of the No Entry had achieved its original objectives of stopping vehicles, particularly large vehicles, from using Hyde Church Lane as a short cut between Worthy Lane and Hyde Street. This has resulted in approximately a 50% reduction in traffic flow and average speeds were now 14mph.

Dr K Parker (a resident of Hyde Church Lane) spoke during the public participation period in favour of making the experimental order permanent. However, she did not consider the measure went far enough to address the traffic issues experienced by residents and requested that the road be designated no-entry access only from Hyde Street. Dr Parker distributed photographs to Members showing the layout of Hyde Church Lane, emphasising that it was very narrow and there was poor visibility at some points. She believed the Lane was often used by taxi drivers as a short-cut to their rank at the hotel on Worthy Lane. Dr Parker stated that residents also had concerns about potential dangers to cyclists and pedestrians (including residents) because of the contra-flow cycle lane.

Councillor Hiscock (a Ward Member) spoke in support of Dr Parker and other residents. He believed that Hyde Church Lane was unsuitable for motorised vehicles as, for example, there was insufficient spaces, at points, for a car to pass a wheelchair user. He requested that the experimental order be extended for another year and a trial residents' only access from Hyde Street be introduced.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the proposal to restrict access to residents only through the introduction of a Prohibition of Driving Except for Access Order had been considered previously, but had not been recommended due to practical difficulties of erecting the necessary illuminated signing at the junction of Hyde Church Lane and Hyde Street. In addition, the likely lack of enforcement of such measures by Hampshire Police would in time lead to a general abuse of the restriction, whereas No Entry restrictions

were usually observed and respected by drivers. He also pointed out that installation of the No Entry at the Worthy Lane/ Hyde Church Lane junction did not mean that Hyde Church Lane had become a one-way street and hence cyclists were not cycling in a contra-flow fashion. It was acknowledged, however, that there were a significant number of cyclists using this route on a daily basis. He stated that he could investigate further as to whether any measures could be taken through the City Council's licencing powers to encourage taxi drivers not to use the route as a short-cut.

One Member drew attention to an email received from Councillor Maynard (a Ward Member) which proposed a road closure at the half-way point along Hyde Church Lane. However, he believed this would cause difficulties of lack of space for vehicles to turn round should this be introduced. The Head of Access and Infrastructure agreed and stated that there was no space to provide a turning area on the public highway and hence this option could not be taken forward. It was also pointed out that any further measures on Hyde Church Lane might result in traffic diverting onto Hyde Close and this would therefore need to be taken into consideration.

Following debate, the Committee agreed the recommendations set out in the Report, but requested a further Report be prepared for a future Committee to examine the possible additional options raised above.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the experimental 'No Entry' Order preventing traffic from entering Hyde Church Lane from Worthy Lane be made permanent.
2. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make the necessary Order.
3. That a further Report be submitted to a future Committee to examine further options for Hyde Church Lane as discussed above.

5. **PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING ARLEBURY PARK, NEW ALRESFORD**  
(Report CAB2340(TP) and Addendum refer)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure distributed an amended plan which indicated the area of the potential future car park extension (Addendum to CAB2340(TP) refers). He confirmed that the Council did have a number of spare car park ticket payment machines which could be utilised for this purpose. Responsibility for maintenance and lining of the car park would remain with New Alresford Town Council, although the City Council would be responsible for providing additional signage.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to:-
  - a) make arrangements with New Alresford Town Council to provide Alrebury Park Car Park, New Alresford as a parking place under Section 33(4) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
  - b) advertise a Parking Places Order, incorporating the provisions summarised at Paragraph 2 of the Report, to enable pay and display parking and associated enforcement to be introduced at Arlebury Park Car Park in New Alresford; and
  - c) subject to no objections being received, make the Parking Places Order.
2. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised to install pay and display charging equipment and undertake the management and enforcement of the car park following the completion of the necessary legal advertisement and approvals.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 10.50am

Chairman