

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**10 February 2015****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Southgate (Chairman) (P)
Warwick (P)
Weston (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Achwal (P)
Gosling

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Pines (for Councillor Gosling)
Councillors Hiscock and Tait

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors J Berry and Nelmes

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held 8 September 2014, be approved and adopted.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Six local residents spoke regarding CAB2650(TP) and their comments are summarised under the minute below.

In addition, the Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 60 members of the public.

3. CHESIL EXTRA CARE SCHEME, TRAFFIC & PARKING REGULATION CHANGES

(Report CAB2654(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) advised that the planning application for the Chesil Extra Care Scheme on the Chesil surface public car park had been approved by Planning Committee on 5 February 2015. He confirmed that no representations had been received as a result of the public

notice advertising the revocation of the parking places order covering the surface car park nor the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the scheme.. However, a number of the comments received as a result of the related planning application had referred to the proposed closure of the car park. The Assistant Director confirmed that, if approved, the closure of the car park would not take place until necessary to allow commencement of building works of the Extra Care Scheme.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Tait addressed the Committee in his capacity as Portfolio Holder for Housing in support of the development of the Extra Care Scheme. As a Ward Councillor for St Michaels, he requested that Officers give further consideration to mitigate the effect of the closure of the surface car park on nearby residents. He highlighted that there were already a number of new housing developments in the vicinity which did not include any parking entitlement. He suggested that the possibility of additional parking spaces on green spaces in the grass area off Wharf Hill adjacent to Wolvesley Terrace be investigated to be funded from the estates improvements budget. He queried why the additional on-street bays in Wharf Hill had not been located on the other side of the road and also whether some land opposite the Black Boy public house, currently blocked by bollards, could be utilised for additional parking. Finally, he queried whether the existing parking bays in Barfield Close were fully used.

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) responded that all but three of the Barfield Close spaces were utilised by season ticket holders. The three remaining would be converted to general use parking. The Assistant Director (Environment) explained the reasons for the Wharf Hill parking bay location and advised that conversion of the area of land opposite the Black Boy, referred to by Councillor Tait, would require agreement from County Highways and would require fairly substantial works to be carried out in order to make them usable due to the steep gradient of the bank.

In response to further queries raised by Councillors regarding possible mitigation for local residents, the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) highlighted that, as in many parts of the town, demand for residents' parking permits exceeded supply. However, the proposals would transfer all existing parking rights in relation to the surface car park to the Chesil Multi-Storey Car Park (the MSCP). In addition, eight additional parking spaces have been provided in Wharf Hill. It was envisaged, residents would chose to park on the ground and first floor of the MSCP and work are ongoing to improve the lighting, general decoration and CCTV coverage. No car crime or personal crime had occurred in the MSCP over the last few years.

In response to further questions from Councillors, the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) confirmed that it was a condition of the related planning permission that the details of the proposed pedestrian safe route through the MSCP be approved prior to commencement of building the Extra Care Scheme. The Park and Ride bus stop would be relocated to ensure buses were fully accessible to all users.

The Assistant Director confirmed studies had indicated that the MSCP had sufficient capacity and that additional measures were put in place to deal with peak demand, such as over the Christmas period.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report. The Committee also noted the concerns raised regarding the possible impact on residents' parking in the area and agreed that a future review be undertaken at an appropriate time.

RESOLVED:

That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the necessary Orders as detailed in the Schedules and Orders (Appendices 3, 4 and 5 of the Report) in accordance with the implementation programme for the Chesil Extra Care scheme.

4. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – COURTENAY ROAD AREA, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB2650(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) summarised the reasons for the proposals outlined in the Report and emphasised the difficulties caused for local residents by inconsiderate parking. This included restricted or blocked individual access to properties, together with buses, road sweepers and refuse vehicles being unable to access the roads on occasions. An informal consultation with residents from approximately 200 properties had resulted in return rate of around 75% and of those who responded, 99% were in support of the proposals.

The Assistant Director (Environment) drew attention to a number of email representations that had been received since the Report had been published and had been made available to Committee Members.

During public participation, six local residents addressed the Committee and their comments are summarised below.

Lyn Marriott (a Courtenay Road resident) stated that she had acted as neighbourhood liaison for roads affected by the parking and highlighted the frequent nuisance caused to residents by inconsiderate parking which disregarded the white lines denoting "no parking" across driveways etc. She believed commuters were using the area to park, causing particular problems on weekdays between the hours of 8am and 6pm. She requested that the proposals be implemented as soon as possible.

Dee Flower (Abbotts Road resident) highlighted the potential safety issues caused by car parked close to junctions etc. Local residents were reluctant to move their cars during the day as they were unlikely to find a parking space on return. It also caused problems for residents' visitors, including carers and referred to a letter received from an elderly resident outlining the difficulties caused to her by inconsiderate parking. A recent request by the County

Council to not park to allow gully clearance had been ignored by those parking in the area and consequentially the road was not able to be cleaned. Finally, she highlighted that there were public parking spaces available nearby.

Sally Pasche (Courtenay Road resident) also drew Members' attention to the potential dangers caused by inconsiderate parking in the area, including for pedestrians. Pavement parking also restricted access for those in wheelchairs or with pushchairs etc. She agreed with comments raised above about refuse vehicles gaining access at times and highlighted that emergency vehicles might also be unable to gain access (this last point was supported by another speaker, Jane Kingdom).

Chris Sealey (Park Road resident) spoke in opposition to the Report's proposals as he sympathised with a number of the objections raised by commuters parking in the area about the inadequacy of existing parking provision and public transport into Winchester. He believed that a compromise should be sought which dealt with residents' concerns but also retained areas where no parking restrictions applied.

Julie Mitten spoke in support of the proposals as a local resident and stated that as a registered nurse she had attended an accident in the area where an elderly man had been knocked off his bike. She concurred with comments made above regarding health and safety concerns caused by the current levels of inconsiderate parking. She did not consider it appropriate for any unrestricted parking to be made available in the area as it was not currently provided in other areas of Winchester close to the centre, such as Hyde or Fulflood. Finally, she drew the Committee's attention to the large numbers of local residents in attendance in support of the Report's proposals.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock addressed the Committee as a Ward Member for St Bartholomew and in support of the proposals. He emphasised that the Council's Parking Strategy did not include provision for unrestricted parking in residents' areas and also recognised the requirement for residents' parking permits. He believed that it would not be workable for the proposals to be amended to allow a small number of all day parking spaces.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director (Environment) stated that if it was decided to amend the proposals to retain a small number of unrestricted parking spaces this would result in the requirement for an amended Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised. In addition, he did not consider it would offer a workable solution in practice that would address the residents' concerns highlighted above. Such a measure would be likely to introduce even greater competition for such spaces.

The Assistant Director (Environment) advised that he did not have detailed information regarding the current people parking in the area, although the objections received appeared to suggest it was mainly commuters working in Winchester or parking for the Railway Station.

The Assistant Director confirmed that the Police had no objections to the proposals.

A Councillor commented that the problems with all day parking in this area of Winchester raised broader issues including access public transport (buses) and other forms of parking which required consideration and this was acknowledged by the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Transport.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report. In addition, Members acknowledged the Report and discussions had raised wider issues regarding parking displacement, the adequacy of parking provision and general transport policies in terms of encourage walking and cycling which should be addressed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the waiting restrictions detailed in the Statement of Reasons and Schedule (Appendix B to the report) be introduced as proposed, subject to the amendment of references to "Coley Road" to read "Colley Close".

2. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the necessary Order.

5. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER PROGRAMME 2015/2016
(Report CAB2650(TP) refers)

One Councillor raised the urgency of the Parkway Phase 2 scheme in Whiteley. The Committee acknowledged the various issues relating to parking in the Whiteley area which has increased over the years and suggested that further community lead discussions could take place with the Town Council together with local businesses and town centre to seek to address this.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Traffic Regulation Order programme for 2015/2016 be approved as detailed in Appendix A of the Report.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.05am

Chairman