

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**17 November 2008****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Allgood (P)

Cooper (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Achwal, Collin, Higgins and Jackson

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Hiscock and Mitchell

1. MINUTES**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 19 February 2008, be approved and adopted.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr A Weeks (Winchester Residents' Association) and Mr A de Peyer spoke regarding Report CAB1740(TP). Canon C Deedes spoke regarding Report CAB1749(TP). Their comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

3. WINCHESTER CITY CENTRE 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT
(Report [CAB1740\(TP\)](#) refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Councillor. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

At Council on 25 June 2008, a Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Higgins regarding the introduction as a 20mph speed limit as follows:

“This Council, recognising the need to increase the safety of the residents of the area and the overwhelming support given by local community groups, calls

on the officers in conjunction with Hampshire County Council to introduce 20mph zones in residential areas in the District.”

The Head of Access and Infrastructure outlined the difficulties of implementing a 20mph speed limit, as detailed in the Report. However, as part of the ongoing Winchester Town Access Plan consultation, the County Council had commissioned Mott Gifford consultants to review aspects of the traffic and transport network for Winchester. It was therefore proposed that further investigation into the possibility of a 20mph speed limit for central Winchester be undertaken once the results of this study were known.

In response to questions, he advised that although it was possible to introduce 20mph speed limits in other locations around the District, there were practical difficulties in doing so. The City Council had no remit to introduce such limits as it was a matter for the County Council. In addition, the overall resources available to the City Council to undertake any wider investigations were limited and usually over-spent; there was also little support from the Police for such speed limits. Therefore, it was suggested that the town area be considered initially.

Furthermore, the Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that there were streets within the central area where it might be difficult to introduce a 20mph limit, namely North Walls and St Georges Street. This was because Department of Transport (DfT) guidance suggested that an average speed of 24mph should be in place before a 20mph limit/zone could be introduced.

The Committee mentioned the possible use of shared space concepts and it was noted that these could be adopted without a 20mph speed limit being introduced so long as the design of such schemes reduced the speed of traffic.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure responded to queries regarding the possible introduction of 20mph limits in Knowle. He advised that the roads were currently unadopted by the Council and, as such, it would be for the developers to consider such limits. It may be difficult to introduce such limits retrospectively without the introduction of speed reducing measures.

During the public participation period, Mr de Peyer and Mr Weeks spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

Mr de Peyer spoke on behalf of Highcliffe Community Action Group and Winnall Community Association. He queried why the Report only referred to central Winchester when most of the residential roads where there were concerns about excessive speed limits were outside of this area (for example, roads in Winnall and Highcliffe). He did not consider it was appropriate to follow the guidelines set down by the DfT regarding existing average speed limits in all cases.

Mr Weeks (Winchester Residents' Association) highlighted the recent introduction of 20mph speed limits in Portsmouth. He stated that pedestrians

should be given priority throughout the town, with wider pavements and single-lane traffic introduced. He also mentioned the implications of the Climate Change Bill and suggested that the Council should be working towards reducing car usage.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Achwal, Collin, Higgins and Jackson addressed the Committee and their comments are summarised below (there was insufficient time for Councillor Mitchell to speak during the period allowed).

Councillor Higgins emphasised that his Motion related to the whole District and, whilst supporting the Report's recommendations, requested that the whole District be included. He suggested that the Council adopt a policy that 20mph speed limits be introduced where requested by residents of an area and where practicable. He emphasised that all three community groups in the St John and All Saints Wards were in favour of such limits. Councillor Higgins also suggested that the County Council was only prepared to introduce lower speed limits where serious accidents had occurred, although this was disputed by Councillor Allgood.

Councillor Achwal stated that through her work as a school crossing patrol person at Whiteley Primary School, she was aware of the increased danger to pedestrians of cars travelling at 30mph, rather than 20mph. She also supported Councillors Higgins' comments that the whole District should be considered, not just the town centre.

Councillor Collin also expressed disappointment that the Report did not refer to the wider District, as had been requested by the Notice of Motion. He believed the Report appeared to suggest that guidance set out in DfT Circular 1/2006 discouraged 20mph limits, which was not the case. The 24mph average speed contained in the guidance was just advice and not an absolute requirement. In summary, he requested that further consultation be undertaken on this issue, in particular with the Winchester Town Forum and Scrutiny bodies. In addition, all Members should be given the opportunity to suggest areas within their Wards where 20mph limits might be appropriate. As a starting point, Councillor Collin suggested parts of the following areas: Highcliffe; Olivers Battery; Badger Farm and the Turnpike Down area of Winnall.

Councillor Jackson also expressed disappointment with the Report. She believed that St Georges Street and North Walls required traffic calming measures to make the areas safer for pedestrians. She mentioned the measures being introduced in Ashford, Kent, such as shared space concepts. In summary, she believed the City Council should be doing more to encourage the County Council to introduce 20mph limits.

In response, the Chairman noted the comments made, but emphasised that Winchester District covered a large area and the resources available to the Council were limited. He emphasised that the City Council was investigating the possible introduction of shared space concepts.

With regard to the request for wider consultation, the Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the Winchester Town Access Plan would be submitted to a future Winchester Town Forum for consideration.

In his role as County Councillor, Councillor Allgood responded to questions regarding the County Council's actions in this area. He advised that the 30mph village programme had so far introduced 30mph speed limits in 49 villages across the County. 20mph limits had also been introduced in 20 areas so far.

Following further debate, the Committee concluded that the possible introduction of 20mph limits in the wider District might be appropriate in some locations and should be considered in relation to particular needs and available resources. Such requests would have to be put to the County Council for consideration as part of their annual works programmes formulation. It was also noted that 20mph speed limits/ zones and the shared space concept was an important consideration in relation to the design of new developments and hence the City Council should continue to promote such thinking through the planning process.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the implementation of a 20 mph speed limit/zone for central Winchester be considered once the findings of the County Council's Traffic Management Study have been reported.

2. That the Council continue to encourage developers at Knowle and other new residential developments within the Winchester District to consider the shared space concept and 20 mph zones in the design of road layouts.

4. CONSIDERATION OF RESIDENTS' SEASON TICKET HOLDERS DISCOUNT

(Report [CAB1749\(TP\)](#) refers)

Canon Deedes spoke during the public participation period and his comments are summarised below. As a resident of Chesil Street, he had parked at Chesil Street Multi Storey car park for 16 years and had no objection to paying a reasonable price for a permit. However, he emphasised that the Council had increased the costs of permits dramatically as part of its policy to encourage use of Park and Ride. He therefore welcomed the proposed reduction for residents of 30 per cent.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins queried who would be entitled to apply for the discounted permits and which car parks they applied to. In particular, were multi storey car parks included?

The Head of Access and Infrastructure clarified that the concessions would apply only to pay and display car parks due to the practical difficulties of including pay on foot car parks. Residents of new developments who did not qualify for a residents' parking permit would not qualify for the season ticket concession. He confirmed that the policy would be reviewed after 12 months.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That discounted season tickets be made available to residents who would qualify for a Winchester City residents' parking permit, at a discounted rate of 30% of the normal annual price to park within a pay and display car parks, on condition of certain criteria being satisfied.
2. That conditions apply that the season ticket displays the vehicle registration number and a valid proof of a vehicle being registered to the address of the applicant is supplied by way of documentation to be identified by Parking Services.
3. That the Head of Legal Services is authorised to amend the Parking Places Orders accordingly
4. That the scheme be reviewed after 12 months.

5. **WINCHESTER RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME REVIEW**
(Report [CAB1751\(TP\)](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins queried whether the Parking Office would supply visitor scratch cards with the residents' name and address pre-printed? He welcomed the proposals regarding Quarry Road and Fivefields Road. However, he requested clarification regarding St Catherines Road and Ebdon Road, Highcliffe as he emphasised that the area experienced difficulties with commuter parking.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the visitor scratch cards would be issued with the residents name and address pre-printed. The Committee noted that there were problems caused by commuter and student parking on the outskirts of the town centre, but the possibility of extending the residents' parking scheme had to be balanced against the views of all residents affected.

The Committee discussed the particular problems experienced in some areas of Stanmore and the various issues involved. The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the requirement that two thirds of residents of a given area agree to the introduction or alteration to a scheme was to ensure fairness and also protect the Council's limited resources.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That parking restrictions be kept under review and that a more strategic review of the extent of the scheme be undertaken once the effects of the new South of Winchester Park and Ride scheme have been established and as part of the emerging Winchester Town Access Plan. Such a review would include the cost of permits and possible concessions for low income groups.

2. That waivers and dispensations for tradesmen etc be reviewed as part of the annual car park charges review and reported to Cabinet in due course.

3. That visitor scratch cards be amended to include the address of the property to which they apply and that the purchase of scratch cards by residents living within the zone who are not permit holders be permitted (up to a maximum of 20 (days parking) per annum) and that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to amend the parking places Orders accordingly.

4. That any future extensions/ amendments to parking restrictions should be considered on their particular merits and reflect local issues and circumstances and as such future departures from the current zone restrictions may be appropriate.

6. **PAY ON FOOT PAYMENT SYSTEMS, WINCHESTER TOWN CENTRE**
(Report [CAB1750\(TP\)](#) refers)

One Member raised the problems of flooding currently being experienced at Tower Street car park.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure stated that the City Council was working closely with the County Council to try and resolve these issues. However, difficulties were likely to continue until the building was made water tight again, predicted to be in early 2009. At this stage, the City Council would use the funds already allocated to it to make improvements to this car park. He advised that any claims from users of the car park for damage to their property were being dealt with by the County Council.

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

RESOLVED

1. That the current arrangements for payment of parking at Tower Street and Colebrook Street car parks, be extended until the completion of refurbishments works at Tower Street car park and the new proposed CCTV centre at Winnall is up and running (likely to be 2010).

2. That a further review be undertaken once the CCTV control room has been relocated.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.10am

Chairman