

**CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**

**10 June 2009**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Wood (Chairman) (P)

Coates (P)

Pearson (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Higgins

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 10 February 2009, be approved and adopted.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Messrs P Grant, M Pugliese, A Pyble, T Mawson, J Potter and Mrs E Crawley all spoke regarding Report CAB1846(TP). Their comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

Messrs R Jessop, A de Peyer, Mrs J Grimshaw and Mrs E Cooper all spoke regarding Report CAB1845(TP). Their comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

3. **EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – GREAT MINSTER STREET AND THE SQUARE, WINCHESTER**

(Report [CAB1846\(TP\)](#) refers)

During the public participation period, six people made representations and their comments are summarised below.

Mrs E Crawley (St Swithun's Street and Symond's Street Residents' Association) welcomed the proposals as an initial step to address traffic problems in the area. She emphasised the damage caused to the historic streets by heavy traffic and queried whether further restrictions could be introduced to ban traffic between 9am and 4pm.

Mr P Grant (also a member of the Residents' Association and "Shabby Winchester" group) added that any planned refurbishment of roads around The Square would be short-lived if heavy traffic was continued to be allowed in the area.

Mr M Pugliese (The Vine, Great Minster Street) expressed concern about the potential negative effect of the proposals on businesses in the area, because it could lead to congestion of delivery vehicles outside the museum. He also expressed concern about parking provision for disabled drivers and understood that the museum had not been consulted about the proposals.

Mr A Dyle (La Place, The Square) spoke in support of the proposals and emphasised the economic benefits to Winchester of making this and further improvements to The Square.

Mr T Mawson (Mawson & Co, The Square and resident of Great Minster Street), welcomed the proposals as an initial step. He suggested that further investigation into "greening" the Square with the introduction of planters, instead of bollards, be undertaken.

Mr J Potter (Winchester BID) supported the proposals and advised that the BID organisation would welcome submissions from local businesses for funding for ideas such as planters. He highlighted that the Museum had 150,000 visitors per annum and would benefit from an additional seated area outside its premises. He considered that future consideration be given to fully pedestrianising The Square.

The Chairman thanked those present for their useful contributions.

The Chairman reported that correspondence had been received from Councillor Tait. Councillor Tait advised that although none of the St Michael Ward Members were able to attend the meeting, they had been involved in drawing up the proposals and were supportive of the experimental scheme.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure emphasised that the proposal was for an experimental scheme, which could be amended as necessary in the light of experience. The comments made in the public participation period had been noted and concerns raised would be monitored. In addition, it should be noted that proposals for The Square would be considered further in the context of the Winchester Access Plan, which was due to be consulted upon later in the year. The Plan could consider ideas such as restricting access to the area to certain times.

One Member queried whether the possibility of delivery vehicles being required to off-load onto smaller vehicles to access these streets was being investigated? The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that this idea was still a possibility, although it would require radical changes if introduced and could be considered further under the Access Plan.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That an experimental traffic regulation order be implemented to introduce “No Waiting At Any Time” restrictions, “No Waiting At Any Time and No Loading At Any Time” restrictions, “Loading Only” restrictions as shown on the attached schedules and plans with immediate effect.

2. That the impact of the experimental order be monitored to determine the effect on through traffic, deliveries and parking patterns in Great Minster Street and The Square, Winchester.

3. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make an experimental order as set out in Recommendation 1.

4. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – QUARRY ROAD AND PETERSFIELD ROAD, WINCHESTER**  
(Report [CAB1845\(TP\)](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that the proposals were being put forward as a result of consultation with local residents and concerns about road safety. He noted that some of the objections received had supported the proposals in principle, but also requested parking restrictions on both sides of Petersfield Road. However, such changes could not be introduced as part of this Order and would require an additional Order to be made. He therefore suggested that the proposals detailed in the Report be agreed and the situation be monitored and a further Order be advertised, if considered necessary.

During the public participation period, four people spoke and their comments are summarised below.

Mrs J Grimshaw spoke on behalf of residents of Chilcomb Place, Highcliffe Road in objection to the proposals. She disputed the need for the restrictions on Quarry Road on the grounds of road safety. She also highlighted the impact of the proposals on nearby residents who did not have any entitlement to residents’ parking permits (such as those in Chilcomb Place). She emphasised that, if introduced, such residents would have nowhere nearby to park.

Mr R Jessop supported the proposed restrictions on parking in Quarry Road on the grounds of road safety. He emphasised that in addition to commuters, some walkers used the road to park for long periods of time. With regard to Petersfield Road, he considered that additional parking restrictions along the both sides of the Road should be introduced.

Mr A de Peyer (Highcliffe Community Forum) supported the proposals in principle, but highlighted the potential negative knock-on effects to other roads within Highcliffe. He also expressed concern that the consultation had not included this wider area. He requested that the Order be experimental only at this stage to enable the situation to be monitored.

Mrs E Cooper (St Giles Hill Residents' Association) apologised that the Association's consultation had not included the wider Highcliffe area and was sympathetic to the difficulties of residents' parking. However, the Association supported the Report's proposals as it represented the majority view of residents.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins spoke in general support of the proposals. However, he concurred with views expressed about the requirement to consider the impacts on the wider Highcliffe area. He suggested that it would be preferable if restrictions were imposed on both sides of Petersfield Road. In addition, the proposed parking bays should be for shared use, rather than residents' only parking.

The Chairman thanked those speaking for their comments.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that it was not possible to introduce an experimental order without re-advertising. In addition, the types of parking bays and their location had been introduced as a result of consultation with local residents.

The Committee welcomed the suggestion to consider parking issues in Highcliffe generally, as Members were concerned that imposing these restrictions could shift problems to neighbouring roads. It was agreed that the proposals be supported, but that a further Report be submitted to the Committee six months after the restrictions had been introduced, in order that the situation could be monitored.

The Committee also discussed the issue of parking standards and their impact on new developments within the City. This was also discussed in relation to the Residents' Parking Scheme and its stipulation that developments constructed after May 2002 were not eligible for residents' parking permits over and above the entitlement of previous occupation of the site. The Head of Access and Infrastructure noted the concerns expressed, but also emphasised that the provisions contained in the Residents' Parking Places Order were supported by residents living in properties constructed prior to 2002, who faced increasing pressure on parking spaces..

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That a traffic regulation order be implemented to introduce restrictions as advertised in Appendix D of this report.

2. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make an order as set out in Recommendation 1.

3. That the need for further restrictions in Petersfield Road be monitored and a further Report be submitted to Committee to review the situation in this and nearby roads, six months after the Order's implementation.

5. **PAYMENT FOR PARKING BY MOBILE PHONE**

(Report [CAB1851\(TP\)](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that car park users had responded well to the trials of paying for parking by mobile phones and no negative issues had been raised. He outlined in more detail how the current contractor operated the system.

The Chairman stated that he would not wish car park users to be penalised by the introduction of excessive fees. The Head of Access and Infrastructure noted this point and emphasised that the Chairman, as Portfolio Holder, would be consulted before any award of a contract (as set out in Recommendation 1).

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, to determine an appropriate evaluation model, invite tenders, and award a contract for the provision of pay by mobile phone services, on the basis set out in Section 3 of the above report.

2. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised to extend the current scheme to other suitable car parks in the Winchester District.

6. **FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004: DOUBLE PARKING AND PARKING AT DROPPED KERBS ENFORCEMENT**

(Report [CAB1850\(TP\)](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure emphasised that the Council would take a sensitive approach to enforcement, as set out in Paragraph 2 of the Report. He confirmed that he considered that the new enforcement could be carried out within existing resources.

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

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the consent of Hampshire County Council under the agency arrangements, the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised to implement enforcement of the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 in relation to double parking and dropped footways/ kerbs as set out in this Report.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 11.30am

Chairman