

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**26 July 2016****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Byrnes (Chairman) (P)
Miller
Pearson

Other invited Councillors:

Clear

Deputy Members:

Councillors Humby and Weston (Standing Deputies for
Councillors Miller and Pearson)
Councillor Achwal (Standing Deputy for Councillor Clear)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Berry, Pearson and Weir

1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Humby declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Councillor respectively. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

Councillor Weston stated that she had previously attended meetings regarding the proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order in Swanmore, but she remained open minded regarding the decision to be taken at this meeting (Report CAB2819(TP) refers).

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held 10 February 2015, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Seven local residents spoke regarding Report CAB2818(TP) and two local residents spoke regarding Report CAB2819(TP) and their comments are summarised under the minutes below.

4. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – WEEKE AREA, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB2818(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) outlined the background to the proposals, which had developed over a period of years following discussions with Ward Councillors and consultation with residents and businesses in the area. The final proposals were formally advertised on 8 May 2016 and all residents and businesses in the affected areas were advised (involving over 1,000 separate notifications). The formal notice resulted in 15 objections, 4 of which related to Mount Close which it was not possible to include as part of this proposal as no restrictions had previously been advertised. However, a new proposal for this area was being pursued to address residents' concerns. The Assistant Director emphasised that this left only 11 unresolved objections following the extensive consultation.

The Assistant Director advised that new restrictions should be consistent with other restrictions in the city as if there was too wide a variety then it can cause confusion for the public, become difficult to enforce and would be vulnerable to objections. He highlighted that the proposals aimed to strike a balance between the requirements of residents and businesses in the area. If approved, the impact of the new restrictions would be monitored and further adjustments could be made if required.

Seven local residents/representatives of local businesses spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Tim Fell (a resident of Bereweek Avenue) did not support the proposed parking bays in the road and believed that residents should have been offered the option of single yellow lines rather than just the alternative options of "2 hour limited" parking bays or double yellow lines. He considered that single yellow lines would address the problems caused by inconsiderate parking in a less onerous manner.

Rachel Bailey (on behalf of herself and other family in Kynegils Road and Lynch Close) spoke in support of the proposals and highlighted the difficulties and inconvenience caused by inconsiderate parking and driving in the area, she believed by students attending Peter Symonds College. She also emphasised the requirement for regular enforcement of restrictions for them to be effective.

Robin Owens (a resident of Bereweek Mews) asked for clarification on the proposals and also highlighted the difficulties for local residents and others caused by inconsiderate parking. He suggested in the future, consideration be given to introducing a 20mph speed limit in the area. In addition, he

suggested that, subject to the agreement of residents, it might be possible to replace some grass verges with parking bays in Bereweek Avenue. Problems have been made worse by loss of off-street parking.

Mr Brockway (a resident of Stoney Lane on the corner with Woodlea Close) stated that some homes in Stoney Lane have access via Woodlea Close which was a very narrow road and, due to inconsiderate double parking by students, it was impossible for larger vehicles (such as refuse collection vehicles) to access. He believed that Stoney Lane residents had not been included in the consultation regarding Woodlea Close, despite it affecting some of them. He considered the restriction proposed should be altered to a single yellow line along one side of the Close.

Mr Martin (a resident of Woodlea Close) concurred with comments made by Mr Brockway and emphasised that vehicles were currently parked right up to driveways, preventing access, and blocking the turning bay. He also believed a single yellow line should be introduced instead of the current proposals.

Mr Cooper (a resident of Woodlea Close) also agreed with previous comments and did not believe the proposals would prevent student parking in the morning from 8am until midday (as the restrictions only came into force from 10am and allowed two hour waiting). He believed that Peter Symonds College should be asked to address the issue and suggested that a new Park and Ride service be introduced.

Adrian Martin (representing Waitrose) emphasised that Waitrose were not opposed to parking restrictions. However, there should be consideration of the adequacy of parking available for its employees in the area and there was currently a shortage of any parking (including pay car parks). It was currently difficult to recruit employees to the Weeke store and a new Park and Ride service would assist this. In response to questions, Mr Martin stated that, depending on the day of the week, some parking in the Waitrose underground car park was made available to employees on a "first come first served" basis. Employees were encouraged to car share where possible.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Weir and Berry addressed the Committee as Ward Councillors and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Weir thanked the Assistant Director and Team for their work in bringing forward the proposals and balancing the number of different interests involved. However, she noted the ongoing concerns expressed above and emphasised that the impact of the proposals would have to be monitored carefully, including the future effect of the Barton Farm development. She requested that the Council encourage Cala Homes to bring forward the Park and Ride at Barton Farm as soon as possible. In addition, the Council should contact Stagecoach regarding possible improvements to bus connections to the area. Councillor Weir also recognised the issues relating to Waitrose staff parking and suggested the company work with the Council to seek to address this.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Weir for her comments and agreed to discuss further the points regarding the Park and Ride at Barton Farm outside of the meeting (as he was also Chairman of the Barton Farm Forum).

Councillor Berry also thanked Officers for their work in developing the scheme which she welcomed. She noted the issues caused by student parking in the area and also the difficulties for staff at Aldi and Waitrose to find parking. She believed that the proposals would address the most pressing issues, such as parking in Bereweke Avenue and Fromond Road. She also agreed with residents' comments that Park and Ride should be improved and discussions should be held with the College.

The Assistant Director (Environment) responded to comments made. He emphasised that because of the size of the area and the number of people involved in consultation, it would not have been feasible to offer too many different options/permutations of restrictions (for example, introducing single yellow lines in some areas) as this would be impractical and could cause confusion. Previous experience in other areas of Winchester where parking bays had been introduced suggested this should address the current difficulties and white bar lines could be additionally used to delineate access to drives etc. Any alternative proposal to introduce single yellow lines, as requested by Mr Fell, would need to be consulted upon again and the response to the previous consultation had been in favour of introducing parking bays.

The Assistant Director explained that once an Order had been formally advertised it was not possible for proposals to be altered to introduce any more onerous restrictions. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that the definition of "onerous" could change, for example, between different residents and/or local businesses.

With regard to specific comments made about Woodlea Close, the Assistant Director advised that due to the narrowness of the road, if yellow lines were to be introduced along one side, there might not be adequate road width to enable bays to be marked out on the other side. In addition, he confirmed that introducing yellow lines along Woodlea Close would require the proposals to be re-advertised. However, he stated that if the proposed measures were introduced as set out in the Report, Officers would review the situation and could take further action to address issues if required.

With regard to comments made in relation to Waitrose staff parking, the Assistant Director emphasised that the proposed parking restrictions would not apply on Saturdays which should help the situation. In addition, business permits were available to allow some staff parking on nearby roads. The Chairman suggested that a further meeting be arranged between the Council and representatives of Waitrose and other businesses in the area to ascertain whether other solutions were available.

The Assistant Director advised that the introduction of a reduced speed limit for the area was a matter for the County Council.

During discussion, Members noted the large size of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order and thanked Officers for their work in reducing the number of objections received. In response to questions, the Assistant Director advised that the Order would result in some displacement of parking into other nearby areas and this would be monitored.

The Chairman highlighted that there was a mid-term review off parking currently ongoing which, whilst primarily focussing on off-street parking, would examine future use of Park and Ride.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the waiting and parking restrictions be introduced as proposed subject to the revisions as detailed in the amended plan (Appendix D to the report).
2. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the necessary Order as detailed in the Statement of Reasons and Schedule as amended (Appendices B and E to the report).

5. **PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – VARIOUS ROADS, SWANMORE**

(Report CAB2819(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) outlined the background to the proposals, as summarised in the Report. The proposal as advertised had resulted from concerns raised by Councillor Pearson (as a Ward Member) and had the full support of the Parish Council, Ward Councillors and the County Council. However, 90 people had objected with a good number raising concerns about the principle of introducing yellow lines in a village setting. Following a further meeting with Councillor Pearson, it was suggested that the minimum of yellow lines be introduced by junctions where there were the worst problems with visibility. In addition, it was proposed that the school zig-zags be reintroduced (as requested by the Primary School).

During public participation, two local residents spoke and their comments are summarised below.

Alec Dirks emphasised the large amount of objections to the original proposals which he believed had been proposed at the request of Councillor Pearson without local support. He said that he had only received information regarding the new proposals 13 days ago but did not feel any yellow lines

were necessary as the Highway Code already restricted parking close to junctions and this can be enforced as required. He requested that only the zig-zag markings outside the school be introduced.

Mark Johnson also spoke in opposition to any yellow lines being introduced as he also believed the Highway Code offered adequate restrictions. He also did not believe the proposals had local support and were a waste of money. He stated that he had submitted a Freedom of Information request which had shown that there had been no previous complaints over a five year period. He did not oppose the introduction of zig-zag markings if these were supported by the School.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Pearson addressed the Committee and in summary, stated that he had made the suggestion in order to deal with problems with inconsiderate parking throughout the village, particularly at school pick up and drop off times. People parked opposite the junctions at Vicarage Lane, on the brow of the hill and blocking entrances. He emphasised that various residents had raised concerns with him, but as these were not in writing they did not appear under a Freedom of Information request. However, he acknowledged that local residents opposed the introduction of yellow lines. Consequently the proposal had been amended to minimise their introduction (amended parking restrictions set out in Appendix C of the Report). He thanked the Assistant Director and Team for their work on the proposals.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director advised that the Highway Code was only advisory. The Police could issue parking notices if a vehicle was causing an obstruction but they did not generally have the resources required to enforce. Consequently, the proposal was to introduce double yellow lines at certain junctions as this offered clarity and did not require additional signage. These restrictions could be enforced by the Council.

The Assistant Director advised that the Parish Council had been fully involved throughout and, although they had initially agreed to the proposals, they had responded to the consultation to object to the extent of what was proposed and suggested a completely different scheme. However, the Assistant Director emphasised that it was not likely anything other than the minimum suggested in the Report would be acceptable to local residents so it was not recommending this alternative be pursued.

During discussions, Members supported the reduced introduction of double yellow lines, as proposed in the Report, to address safety concerns in the area. They also emphasised that, due to the number of objections received, the revised proposals had been dramatically reduced from that originally proposed.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the revised waiting and parking restrictions be introduced as detailed in the amended plan (Appendix C to the report).
2. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the necessary Order as detailed in the Schedule as amended (Appendix F to the report).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.35am

Chairman