

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE

2 February 2017

Attendance:

Councillors:

Warwick (Chairman) (P)
Griffiths (P)
Weston (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Clear (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Burns, Byrnes, Godfrey, Learney, Porter and Weir

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Elks

1. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Burns declared a personal (and prejudicial) interest in respect of CAB2891(TP) as a nearby resident to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order in Hyde Street. She remained in the room in order to speak under the public participation procedure and then left prior to the debate and decision on that item.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held 4 January 2017, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Eleven members of the public and/or representatives of local organisations spoke regarding CAB2890(TP) and their comments are summarised under the minute below. In addition four members of the public spoke regarding CAB2891(TP) and their comments are summarised under the relevant minute below.

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

(Report CAB2890(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) advised that since the deferral of the decision on CAB2845(TP) at a previous Committee meeting on 9 November 2016, a meeting with major stakeholders (including the Council, South West Trains and Network Rail) had been arranged by Steve Brine MP. Various options were under consideration by SWT and Network Rail, but there were no firm proposals to provide any additional parking at the Station at this time. Lining in the existing car park should be refreshed but this won't provide additional spaces. Discussions had also been held with Micheldever Parish Council which had indicated they were unable to provide any additional parking on their land.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director confirmed that the rail franchise was due for renewal in spring 2017 and it might be appropriate to resume further discussions at that time, possibly with the assistance of the local MP.

The Assistant Director advised that enquiries had indicated that the Sutton Scotney estate land owned by Zurich was currently under offer which limited any discussions as to potential use for car parking until ownership had been resolved.

The Assistant Director outlined the background to the proposals, as summarised in the Report. Currently approximately 50 vehicles parked on-street in the area and the proposals would remove approximately 20 to 25 parking spaces. The continued use and viability of Micheldever Station was recognised but had to be balanced against the obligation to mitigate the impact of inconsiderate parking on local residents and safety of highway users.

During public participation, eleven members of the public addressed the Committee as summarised below (six opposed to and five in support of the proposals in the Report).

James Drewer, Dougal Kerr, Simon Young, James Maclay, Ewan Worthington and Rupert Neville all opposed the proposals as they were users of Micheldever Train station who lived in local villages requiring them to drive and park at the station. In summary, points raised included the following:

- Differing journey times for individual commuters meant there was no easy alternative to driving and parking at the station;
- The station car park was regularly full by 9am or earlier on weekdays and the proposals would therefore prevent access to the station outside of these hours;
- The proposals were badly timed due to the renewal of the franchise being due shortly;
- There had been a lack of consultation with the wider community on the proposals;

- The proposals could result in people parking on roads further away from the station which were more rural in nature and unlit, with potential safety consequences;
- Commuters had sympathy with residents' concerns but believed the proposals were a disproportionately excessive response, weighted in favour of people living in the village and not evidence based;
- Alternative options such as traffic calming and speed cameras should be considered instead;
- A belief that there was appropriate land available for Network Rail to provide additional car parking;
- If the proposals were approved, there was no incentive for Network Rail and/or SWT (or a new franchise holder) to make improvements to parking provision.
- Alternative parking availability at Warren Centre was less than stated by the Parish Council meaning more vehicles would be impacted by the proposals.

John Botham (Micheldever Parish Council), Felicity Botham (Warren Centre Management Committee), Derek Whardle, James Walker and Steve Carter all spoke in support of the proposals as local residents of Micheldever Station. In summary, points raised included the following:

- The Parish Council had offered to provide a free minibus picking up from other villages within the Parish three times each morning, but had only received six replies. Commuters had not engaged with the Parish Council regarding parking issues in the village;
- The proposals were vital to ensure residents' safety and avoid accidents (there had been near misses). This was a long standing issue which had been ongoing for many years. Drivers currently sped up to clear long lines of parked cars along Overton Road;
- Currently, some residents were prevented from parking outside and/or gaining access to their own homes due to inconsiderate parking by rail commuters. Deliveries were also being affected and there were instances where vehicles were parked for days or weeks at a time;
- Photographs were distributed by Mr Whardle indicating the difficulties accessing his property along Overton Road due to the current on-street parking;
- A suggestion that once the proposals were implemented, parking season tickets at the Station only be issued to those who lived closer to Micheldever Station rather than Winchester or Basingstoke rail stations.
- Disagreement with statements made by those in opposition to the proposals that they had not been widely consulted upon.
- Not opposed to parking in the village in general, but the proposals were essential to restore the balance between the requirements of residents and commuters.

In response to questions, Mr Botham stated that the Parish Council could only operate a minibus service if there was sufficient take-up to justify its provision.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Porter, Byrnes and Godfrey addressed the Committee as summarised below.

Councillor Porter emphasised that discussions had been ongoing for a number of years, including with SWT and Network Rail. She believed there were solutions available to SWT (or any new franchise holder) to provide additional parking near the station. She highlighted the speed of traffic along Overton Road and the fact that it was regularly used by heavy good vehicles. She mentioned that the number of unadopted roads in the area had created additional difficulties for the Council in implementing appropriate measures and had required the use of residents' permits.

Councillor Byrnes stated that he had chaired the previous meeting where this matter had been considered and highlighted the difficulties in balancing the conflicting interests of local residents and commuters. He had also attended the meeting with the local MP and Network Rail and other key stakeholders which he had found productive and suggested there would be merit in holding a further meeting. He expressed some concern that the proposals would have a negative impact on usage of the train station and its overall viability which would have a consequential negative impact on the village as a whole. However, on balance, he believed the proposals in the Report should now be implemented and the parking situation be kept under review.

Councillor Godfrey highlighted that Micheldever Station village had more than doubled in size in recent years and rail usage had also doubled over the same period. The Parish Council, City Council and Local MP had all worked together over many years in various attempts to address parking problems. He would not wish for Micheldever Station to become a parkway rail station and the consequential increase in development around the village that could follow. On balance, he believed the proposals in the Report should be approved and the situation be kept under review.

The Assistant Director clarified that speed cameras could only be introduced with the agreement of Hampshire Constabulary and this could be investigated further if Members wished. At the current time, the area included only a limited number of parking restrictions with the majority being advisory only. If the proposals were approved, the Council would undertake to enforce the restrictions.

During discussion, Members noted the length of time discussions had been ongoing to attempt to seek a solution to the parking issues in the village and the additional steps taken since the matter was considered at the meeting in November 2016. In addition, they commended the Parish Council for their offer of a free mini bus and hoped that rail commuters might take this up. Committee Members supported the TRO as set out in the report, acknowledging the balance between public safety and the requirements of station users, but concluding that the situation could not continue as was, and action was required to tackle dangerous and inconsiderate parking. It was also considered that speed cameras would not offer an alternative solution. The requirement for the Council to continue discussions with Network Rail

and other key stakeholders in order to try and find an alternative solution in the longer term was emphasised.

Therefore, the Committee agreed with the proposals outlined in the Report, which were justified on traffic management grounds, and further requested that the situation be monitored and that the Council remained engaged with key stakeholder meetings in the future.

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. (Appendix E to the Report).
3. That the situation be kept under review a further Report be submitted to Members if required.
4. That the Council remain engaged with key stakeholder meetings regarding the provision of additional parking for rail commuters at Micheldever Station.

5. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – HYDE STREET, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB2891(TP) refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) advised that the Report had been submitted to Committee at the request of Councillor Burns, who was a local resident and also a Ward Councillor. He outlined the background to the current proposals, as summarised in the Report. However, following continued objections from some local residents, he suggested that it might be possible to include an additional kerb build-out located on the east side of Hyde Street, just north of its junction with Silchester Place. This was not subject to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) but would require approval from the County Council and initial consultations had informally indicated they would support this measure. This additional build out was on the opposite side of the road to the one included within the Report and could complement it. If the proposals were approved, the impact of the TRO would be monitored.

The Assistant Director advised that County Council statistics indicated that the traffic flow along Hyde Street had increased from 1,400 vehicles per day in 2006 to 2,400 vehicles per day in 2013. Traffic speed had remained fairly consistent at an average of approximately 24mph.

In response to questions regarding the impact on the overall design and appearance of Hyde Street, the Assistant Director stated that kerb build-outs would require signage, but the Council could consider the use of appropriate materials for the area, as it had in other historic streets in the centre of Winchester.

Four local residents spoke during public participation and their comments area summarised below.

Martin Wilson spoke as resident of Egbert Road who travelled along Hyde Street on foot, by car and cycling. Speeding vehicles are an issue in this road. He welcomed the decision to move the parking bays but did not support the kerb build-out proposal which was in the wrong place and should be located on the other side of the street. It would hinder cyclists waiting behind the build out to let traffic pass because of the gradient of the highway at this point. He believed the primary concern should be to reduce the speed of traffic travelling from the direction of Worthy Road. He also highlighted the narrow pavements along the east side of Hyde Street being dangerous for pedestrians.

Deirdre Wood emphasised that Hyde Street was a residential street which was experiencing noise and pollution from the volume and speed of traffic travelling along it, in both directions. The new bays were blamed for all problems but other bays would remain and residents required parking. She considered additional double yellow lines risked increasing speed of traffic and that more investigation should be undertaken into installing safer crossing points and enforcing the existing 20mph speed limit. She mentioned that she had collected 49 signatures supporting the proposal that traffic should be restricted along Hyde Street.

Anne Russell spoke as a resident of Hyde Street for over 30 years and highlighted the dangers for pedestrians due to the volume and speed of traffic, (which had increased over the years) together with the narrow pavements. She believed that the parking bays had reduced traffic, expressed concern about the current junction with King Alfred Place and favoured the proposals for two kerb build-outs. She considered it was necessary to examine the whole street as a package but was supportive of the proposed TRO and build outs.

Mrs Robertson spoke as a resident of Clarendon House, off Hyde Street and expressed concern that the current positioning of the new parking bays restricted visibility. She welcomed the proposals for a kerb build-out and also suggested an additional measure at the entrance to Hyde Street (from Jewry Street) to reduce speed of traffic exiting the traffic lights (she commented that the speed limit was not currently adhered to).

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Burns, Hiscock and Mather addressed the Committee and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Burns expressed concern about the volume and speed of traffic travelling along Hyde Street (speed limit not adhered to) and highlighted that

the narrow pavements and low kerbs at places meant that traffic sometimes mounted pavements (she mentioned a particular area of concern outside the Hyde Tavern). She welcomed the proposal for an additional kerb build-out but considered that wider traffic calming measures should also be considered to address speed issues and improve the ability of pedestrians to cross the road whilst emphasising the residential nature of the street. She did not believe the kerb build-out detailed in the Report was in the correct location as it was located on an uphill bend and traffic would be forced onto the wrong side of the road. In addition, she highlighted that because all the parking bays were located on the west-side of the road, motorists sped up to pass. Councillor Burns left the meeting after addressing Committee.

In response, the Assistant Director highlighted that the proposed new kerb build-out would be less than the equivalent of one car in length and allow more opportunities for traffic to pull in than the current parking bays. He acknowledged that ideally parking bays should have been located on both sides of the road, but this would be difficult to address at this stage. The proposal for an additional build-out on the east side of Hyde Street should slow traffic in both directions and potentially deter drivers from using the road as a cut through.

Councillor Hiscock thanked the Assistant Director and team for their work in bringing forward the various proposals to date in an attempt to address all concerns received and welcomed the suggestion of an additional kerb build-out. He requested that the measures be introduced without further delay.

Councillor Mather agreed that the parking bays be removed but highlighted that local residents remained divided regarding the proposed introduction of kerb build-outs. She queried whether build-outs had been shown to reduce the speed of traffic when introduced in other roads in Winchester, such as St James Lane and Sparkford Road. She also highlighted that the County Council were currently working on a Worthy Lane corridor study and suggested their Officers be engaged in an attempt to find a more holistic approach to the current problems. She suggested that the decision on the kerb build-outs be deferred to enable further discussions with the County Council.

The Assistant Director noted comments regarding linking with the Worthy Lane scheme but highlighted that this might not be implemented for some time and residents of Hyde Street required a more timely solution. He did not consider that the pavement outside the Hyde Tavern would be wide enough to allow bollards to be installed. He confirmed that residents would be consulted prior to the introduction of the additional proposed kerb build-out.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the proposals be introduced, together with the additional kerb build-out (subject to consultation with residents and County Council approval). It was noted that the situation would be monitored and further measures proposed if required.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the waiting restrictions be introduced as proposed (Appendix G to the Report) subject to the construction of the kerb build-outs as detailed in Appendix I to the report and outlined above. The additional proposed kerb build-out on the east side of Hyde Street was supported and would be subject to consultation with residents and would require County Council approval before it could be provided.

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 (Appendix F to the report)..

6. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER PROGRAMME 2017/18**
(Report CAB2892(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Weir and Learney addressed the Committee as summarised below.

Councillor Weir thanked the Assistant Director (Environment) and team for their work in introducing the new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Weeke and Teg Down and welcomed the inclusion of the review of the scheme in the TRO Programme. However, the introduction of the new measures had displaced parking issues to other areas to the north of Winchester, such as north Weeke and Harestock. She believed that parking issues in the area would increase following the development of Barton Farm and also highlighted the difficulties caused by Peter Symond's College student parking. Therefore, Councillor Weir suggested that the Council take a holistic approach to addressing traffic issues to the north of Winchester, including more car parking provision at the edge of town, extension of the 20mph zone and consideration of public transport provision. As Chair of Winchester Town Forum she hoped that she could work together with the Council executive to achieve this.

Councillor Learney also thanked the Assistant Director and team for implementing the new residential parking schemes in St Barnabas. However, she agreed that the new restrictions had displaced parking issues elsewhere. She therefore welcomed the inclusion of the Teg Down/Weeke area review as a high priority in the TRO Programme for 2017/18.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed Traffic Regulation Order Programme 2017/2018 be formally approved. (Appendix A to the report) and that

delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director (Environment) to revise the programme with the agreement with the Portfolio Holder for Environment.

2. That the split of the Winchester City Council District for traffic management work be noted (Appendix B to the report).

The meeting commenced at 4.00pm and concluded at 6.10pm

Chairman