

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE

9 November 2016

Attendance:

Councillors:

Byrnes (Chairman) (P)
Miller (P)
Pearson (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Clear

Deputy Members:

Councillor Green (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Porter

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Weston

1. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Byrnes stated that he was a Ward Member for Micheldever Station but clarified that he had had no prior involvement in the proposal, aside from his duties as Portfolio Holder, with responsibilities for parking matters, which had involved him authorising the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order. He highlighted that the proposals in the Report had been drafted prior to his becoming the Portfolio Holder and he did not consider he had any prejudicial interest or that he had predetermined the scheme.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held 26 July 2016, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Nine members of the public and/or representatives of Micheldever Parish Council spoke regarding Report CAB2845(TP) and their comments are summarised under the minute below.

4. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – VARIOUS ROADS, MICHELDEVER STATION**

(Report CAB2845(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) outlined the background to the proposals, emphasising that residents first raised issues caused by on-street parking over 10 years ago. Various restrictions had been introduced in response to these concerns over the years, including white line access protection markings across driveways along Overton Road. However, these markings were only advisory and residents had experienced continuing inconsiderate parking along the road, resulting in access difficulties to/from their properties and other road safety concerns. The Assistant Director advised that Micheldever Parish Council had also requested additional measures to control parking.

The Assistant Director (Environment) emphasised that in drafting the proposals, attempts had been made to balance the concerns of residents against those of rail commuters using Micheldever Train Station who wished to continue to park on-street. Consequently, the proposals did retain some on-street parking and would result in a reduction from approximately 50 on-street parking spaces to 30 spaces (i.e. a reduction of around 20 parking spaces overall).

The Assistant Director confirmed that the Council had taken account of its duties under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Act 1984 and the proposals attempted a balance between the different requirements. The proposals aimed to secure and maintain reasonable access for residents to their homes and also to protect local amenity. In response to questions, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that Officers were content that Section 122 had been followed and the required level of consultation had taken place in line with the regulations.

Nine members of the public and/or representatives from Micheldever Parish Council addressed the meeting and their comments are summarised below.

John Botham (Micheldever Parish Council and resident of Micheldever Station) spoke in support of the proposals which he believed were urgently required to address traffic safety concerns. In addition, local residents regularly were unable to park outside their homes and had experienced difficulties with delivery lorries being unable to gain access. When residents had asked commuters to move their vehicles, they had on occasions been met with an aggressive response. He expressed disappointment that commuters objecting to the proposals had not attended Parish Council

meetings where measures to address the issue (such as a sponsored mini bus collecting train commuters from neighbouring villages) had been discussed.

Felicity Botham (resident of Micheldever Station) also supported the proposals and highlighted the worsening difficulties caused by increasing numbers of rail commuters' inconsiderate parking in the village. She believed some people travelled from Winchester and Basingstoke in order to access free parking on roads surrounding the Station. She highlighted the alternative options of car sharing or being dropped off at the station and suggested the commuters should put pressure on South West Trains (SWT) to provide additional parking. In response to questions, Mrs Botham clarified that 75 car parking "permits" had been made available on a voluntary donation basis by the Parish Council at the Warren Centre, although on average only 10 cars were parked daily. However, no parking was available there on a Wednesday as the Centre was in full use and there was no further parking available on other days.

James Maclay (local resident and commuter) expressed concern about the lack of consultation on the proposals with the wider community outside of Micheldever Station village itself, suggesting that there should have been information displayed on Parish Notice Boards and public meetings. With regard to Overton Road, he suggested residents' problems with restricted access could be solved by moving the parking to the other side of the road and introducing traffic calming measures to reduce traffic speed. He did not believe that there were practical alternative solutions for commuters and that, in particular, car sharing was not a viable option.

David Wandless (Micheldever Parish Council and Overton Road resident) spoke in support of the proposals and emphasised the length of time residents had been campaigning for their introduction. He did not believe the Council should have regard to the objections from commuters as the proposals were urgently required on safety grounds. He did not consider Mr Maclay's suggestion to move parking to the other side of Overton Road was practical. Mr Wandless also expressed disappointment that rail commuters had not attended Parish Council meetings to discuss alternative solutions.

Mike Smith (Brunel Close resident) spoke in support of the proposals, but considered restrictions should be extended further into the entrance of Brunel Close as this was currently a pinch point. In addition, he believed additional restrictions should be included around the entrance to the Train Station as there had been a number of near misses in this area. Finally, he stated that he had written to Micheldever Tyres regarding their practice of parking customers' cars in the area.

Rupert Neville (Micheldever Parish Council, resident of West Stratton and rail commuter) shared concerns expressed above regarding lack of consultation with the wider area and station users. He highlighted that the parking spaces at Warren Hall were not available on Wednesdays and that the option of car sharing was not practical due to different start/finish times of commuters. He

also disputed the statement that only 20 on-street parking spaces would be removed by the proposals.

Steve Carter (resident and Director of the Management Company of Mill Place) emphasised the difficulties experienced by Mill Place residents driving out onto Overton Road due to poor sightlines caused by parked cars. He emphasised that there was a finite amount of spaces available and did not believe that individuals rail commuters wish to park and access the Station should take precedence over the safety of residents of Micheldever Station.

Lucy Bruce Jones (Sutton Scotney resident and rail commuter) stated that she had previously bought a car parking permit for the Train Station car park, but had not purchased this in recent years as she was no longer able to get a space due to the car park being full. Consequently, she was forced to park on street. She shared concerns that the proposals had not been advertised widely enough outside of the Village and stated that she was unaware of the Parish Council meetings referred to by other contributors. She appreciated that a solution was required for the parking issues in the area, but did not consider the proposals offered this. She believed that the proposed restrictions would displace parking to other, less safe areas.

Sharon Bridgland-Gough (resident of Mill Place and rail commuter) had moved to this address so she could access the station and supported the proposals, although she believed they should go further along Overton Road. She also highlighted the dangers caused by lack of visibility from Mill Place onto Overton Road which had led to a near miss which could have resulted fatalities if there had been a collision. She considered sufficient notice of the proposals had been given and had seen notices at the train station itself. She believed that SWT should be urged to provide adequate parking at the station.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director (Environment) confirmed that he had contacted SWT (as referred to in Section 8.11 of the Report) who had indicated that until the new franchise was awarded in February 2017, they were not in a position to commit to any works.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Porter addressed the Committee and, in summary, stated that in her role as a County Councillor she had been involved in a number of meetings with City Council officers and Micheldever Parish Council regarding the issues discussed. SWT had also been involved in discussions in the past and in 2006 had provided a few more car parking spaces at the Station. Councillor Porter emphasised there had been ongoing issues between rail commuters and local residents and the Railway Police had been involved. SWT had been contacted over a year ago to advise them of the proposals contained in the Report. In addition, the County Council had included the requirement for additional car parking spaces when responding to the rail franchise tender documents for the new rail franchise due to commence in 2017. Councillor Porter stated that the school bus collected children from Overton Road and had experienced difficulties. She also highlighted the difficulties for residents exiting Mill Place.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director (Environment) advised that although discussions had taken place, the Council had not formally contacted SWT or the Parish Council regarding any options for alternative proposals for off-street parking in the area. In addition, the Council were not aware of the long term plans of SWT for the Station, should they be re-awarded the franchise in 2017. The Chairman queried what alternative options would be available to rail commuters should proposals be introduced as set out? The Assistant Director responded that it was difficult to say but that they might have to use other train stations or make other travel arrangements if they continued to use Micheldever Station, whilst acknowledging this may not be easy for some. However, he emphasised that this was first and foremost a traffic management issue and considering the relatively small number of vehicles that would be affected and the road safety, access and amenity considerations highlighted in the Report, the proposed response was considered by Officers to be proportionate and balanced (impact on residents and commuters) and officers had, in their assessment, taken into account the matters set out in the Act.

At the request of the Chairman, the Committee adjourned for approximately 20 minutes to discuss with Officers available options in terms of decisions the Committee could make.

Following the adjournment, the Chairman stated that Officers had provided advice on the options available to the Committee, which were in summary: to accept proposals in full (with or without phasing them); to reject in full; to amend proposals based on discussions (subject to limitations); to defer for further information or clarity. Following discussions, the Committee agreed that to make a decision it should first be satisfied that the Council had formally discussed with the Parish Council and SWT the possibility of providing off-street parking locally with a view to increasing the car parking spaces available for rail commuters. The Committee wished to be assured that all options for providing more off-street parking in the area had been explored fully. Therefore it was agreed that the decision be deferred to a date early in 2017.

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

RESOLVED:

That a decision on the proposals outlined in the Report be deferred until a date early in 2017 to enable the discussions with SWT and Micheldever Parish Council referred to above to take place.

The meeting commenced at 4.00pm, adjourned between approximately 5.20 and 5.40pm, and concluded at 5.45pm

Chairman