

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

RECORD OF DECISIONS taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation, Councillor Linda Symes, at his meeting held on Thursday, 10 March 2016 at 4.00 pm in the The Executive Meeting Room - Third Floor, The Guildhall

Present

Councillor Linda Symes (acting on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation)

Councillor Lynne Stagg
Councillor Stuart Potter
Councillor Yahiya Chowdhury

13. Apologies for Absence (AI 1)

The Cabinet Member for Traffic Transportation Councillor Ellcome had sent his apologies for absence due to a family bereavement; therefore the Leader had requested that fellow cabinet member Councillor Symes discharge these responsibilities for this meeting.

14. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of members' interests at this meeting.

15. Local Transport Plan (LTP) Implementation Plan 2016/17 and Traffic Signal Optimisation Programme (AI 3)

A decision on this item was deferred until the Traffic & Transportation meeting on 24 March 2016.

16. Goldsmith Avenue Cycle Lane (AI 4)

A decision on this item was deferred until the Traffic & Transportation meeting on 24 March 2016.

17. London Road Proposals (North End) (TRO 12/2016) (AI 5)

Alan Cufley, the Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support, presented his report which set out the response to the public consultation on the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO 12/2016) on the proposed footway adjustment and installation of parking spaces.

The following deputations were then made, which are summarised:

- (i) Mr Kay - as a long-standing local resident who shopped locally had seen the benefits of the widening of pavements and removal of some parking in 2010, with less pollution from car fumes with more free flowing traffic. He questioned if the new proposals favoured traders and motorists over local residents, pedestrians and cyclists, and gave examples of shopping areas that worked when encouraging other forms of transport. He also felt that the residents should have been directly consulted.
- (ii) Mr Dibben - as local resident who had been actively involved in the previous GIA schemes and the Neighbourhood Forum, he had also chaired the earlier project to make improvements in North End, their first priority had been to reduce heavy goods vehicles, secondly to widen the pavements to reduce traffic and thereby pollution, and their third aspiration of provision of a community hub had not come to fruition. He supported Mr Kay's objections on health grounds to the local community and the lack of public involvement. He would favour promotion of the existing car parks to have free half hour parking, and felt that to remove the previous improvements would be a retrograde step.
- (iii) Mr McGannan - as a local resident and also as a member of the Portsmouth Cycle Forum who felt that the decline in the shops was not due to on-street parking and felt that the Council should ask local residents for their views on what they would like to see for North End shopping centre. As a cyclist he had seen the safety benefits from the widening of pavements. He was concerned that bus wing mirrors may hit cyclists and car doors opening would be hazardous, when there were already high casualty rates for cyclists in the city. Cyclists would need to ride further out, thereby holding up the flow of traffic. He would encourage cars to go down Derby Road to park and at Ashling Lane where half hour free parking could be accommodated.

The opposition spokespersons were then given the opportunity to ask questions and make comment. Councillor Chowdhury commented on the importance of residents' views in North End and not just the traders, as this shopping centre was beneficial to the residents.

The Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support reported that the proposal had been brought forward to respond to a request from local businesses. The Council does not own, and could therefore not control, the car park behind the Co-Operative store. The Council does own the car park in Stubbington Avenue where a half hour tariff had recently been introduced and the facility was now free from 3pm until 6pm for the next 12 months, to encourage use of this local car park. He also confirmed that an offer had been made to the local businesses regarding creating additional parking at the rear of the shops in Ashling Lane. He added that there was already appropriate signage in the area directing motorists to the available car parks.

Councillor Stagg did not believe that this proposal would stem the decline of businesses with the changes in shopping patterns. She explained the background to the previous improvements (and consultation exercise) to counter accidents and felt that the safety of cyclists and pedestrians should be considered, especially with concerns being raised from a bus company. Alan Cufley responded that the officers understood the issues raised by the objectors and representations to the scheme. He confirmed that apart from a section at the north part of the scheme where the carriageway tapers to a width that is 20cm narrower than the present position, the remaining stretch of road will be the same width, i.e. 7.3m that exists now. This will allow buses to pass safely and with 1metre of pavement width being lost on both sides, the footpaths will remain wider than before the previous improvement works.

Councillor Symes asked the Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support to explain the consultation process. Mr Cufley advised that a meeting of local businesses had taken place; the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised in the usual manner with posters on lamp posts displayed locally along with the statutory advert in the News and the scheme had also been advertised to members via the PCC Members' Information Service bulletin. The bus company Stagecoach had raised concerns both to the original proposal (which was for west side only) and to the TRO when advertised, regarding hampering the free flow of traffic. However First bus company, which had more routes in the city, had not raised an objection. The scheme, and TRO, was amended to include the east side to maintain carriageway width.

In response to a question from Councillor Potter it was confirmed that the width of the footpath once reduced was still 2.5m at the narrowest point.

Councillor Symes was mindful that this proposal had been brought forward at the request of the traders who needed assistance to sustain business in the area and noted that the pavements were wider than the prescribed minimum limits.

DECISION: approval was given to widen the carriageway on both sides and reinstall Pay & Display parking on the west side.

18. Wymering Road and Portchester Road one way - results of public notice (AI 6)

Pam Turton, Assistant Director of Transport, Environment & Business Support, presented the report which outlined the response to the public notice. There had been one objection received regarding cycling and against the loss of on street parking.

A deputation was made, as summarised:

Mr Jon Spencer, Portsmouth Cycle Forum, firstly commented on the engaging of the wider public in the TRO consultation process. He supported 2 way cycling and pointed out that when 1 way traffic was introduced the tendency

would be for traffic to speed up so there was the need to have effective measures to slow it down and to help protect the cyclists.

There were no comments or questions raised by members.

DECISION: that the proposed one-way scheme be implemented to the proposed Option 2, i.e. Wymering Road to be made one-way eastbound and Portchester Road to be made one-way westbound.

The meeting concluded at 4.45 pm.

Councillor Linda Symes
Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation