

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

RECORD OF DECISIONS taken by the Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation, Councillor Lynne Stagg at her meeting held virtually on Thursday, 29 October 2020 at 4pm.

Present

Councillor Lynne Stagg
Councillor Simon Boshier
Councillor Graham Heaney

28. Apologies (AI 1)

No apologies were received.

29. Declarations of Members' Interests (AI 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

30. Chairman's Announcements - Transforming Cities Fund Investment for Portsmouth and South East Hampshire. (AI 3)

Councillor Stagg announced that the council had secured £56m funding from the Department for Transport plus additional money from stakeholders including the bus companies and Network Rail; bringing the total to £101m.

A Bus Rapid Transit Network will be created with five corridors: Portsmouth to Havant, Portsmouth to Waterlooville, Portsmouth to Fareham, Portsmouth to the Isle of Wight and Fareham to Gosport. This will involve bus lanes, gates (giving buses priority at lights), improved junctions, smart ticketing and an improved East to West cycling route. These measures will reduce journey times, safer cycling, increased bus frequency and smart ticketing.

Transport for the South East is working on improvement plans for two major rail routes:

- Radial - between the South Coast and London, and
- Orbital from East to West along the South Coast

It is hoped that all these improvements will lead to a 29% increase in public transport use.

31. School Crossing Patrols Resources (AI 4)

Pam Turton, Assistant Director, Transport & Regeneration introduced the report and in response to questions explained that the list of priority sites for pedestrian crossings and the details of how long vacancies for School Crossing Patrollers will be sent to members.

The Cabinet Member noted the report.

32. Solent Connectivity: the Network Rail Solent Continuous Modular Strategy Plan (AI 5)

Hayley Chivers, Strategic Transport Lead introduced the report and with James Nevell, Public Transport Officer in response to questions from members clarified the following points:

After the pandemic, more information on travel demand patterns will be available and the options will be reassessed.

- New infrastructure will be required to facilitate the proposed service improvements.
- More terminal capacity will also mean more robust train timetables and better punctuality.
- Solent Transport is working with the Department for Transport and Network Rail to secure inclusion of the necessary infrastructure measures in the Rail Network Enhancement Programme.
- The detailed modelling is yet to be done.

DECISIONS

1. **Noted the contents of this report**
2. **Endorsed the CMSP recommended train service specification:**
 - **Portsmouth – Southampton: additional 2 trains per hour giving 4 trains per hour; and**
 - **Portsmouth – Eastleigh: additional train per hour giving 2 trains per hour.**
3. **Supported in principle the following CMSP recommended infrastructure measures that will be required in Portsmouth to facilitate the new services:**
 - **Agreed the reinstatement of track in platform 2 at Portsmouth Harbour station, bringing the platform back into use; and/or**
 - **Agreed the provision of an additional platform at Portsmouth and Southsea station, adjacent to the low-level platforms 3 and 4.**

33. TRO 51/2020: Proposed parking restrictions and amendments (AI 6)

Kevin McKee, Parking Team Manager introduced the report.

Members noted that effective enforcement would be essential.

DECISIONS

Under TRO 51/2020:

1. **April Square: the proposed 66 metres of double yellow lines within the northern arm (alongside No.41 and outside Nos.42-52) are reduced to 26 metres on the west side, alongside No.41 only;**
2. **Bransbury Road: the double yellow lines are extended by 6 metres in front of the dropped kerb as proposed;**
3. **Althorpe Drive / Holcot Lane: the double yellow lines are installed at the junction of these roads as proposed;**
4. **Woofferton Road: the proposed 7 metres of double yellow lines are reduced to 5 metres and installed;**
5. **Haslemere Road: the proposed extension of the single yellow line by 4 metres is deleted and not implemented;**

6. The remaining 10 proposals under TRO 51/2020 are implemented as advertised, due to support and/or no objections

34. TRO 49/2020: Proposed MG Festing Grove area residents' parking zone. (AI 7)

Kevin McKee, Parking Team Manager introduced the report

Councillor Matthew Winnington gave a verbal deputation in support of the recommendations. Councillor Luke Stubbs also gave a verbal deputation.

Nikki Musson, Senior Transport Planner and Kevin McKee, Parking Team Manager clarified the following points in response to members' questions:

There are double yellow lines all along Highland Road. This proposal continues the thread raised during the residents' parking programme of consultation decision meeting. Some residents were concerned about having to walk up to 1km to the nearest on-street parking space within their allocated zone. The properties on the North side of Eastern Parade are included in the MG zone. The South side continues to have free parking.

Therefore they were included in the Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) opposite. The North side is included in the MH Residents Parking Zone with these exceptions and the South side in MG. The Dr Surgery in Highland Road already has limited waiting and this would not be changed by this proposal.

A resident can only apply for a parking permit if their vehicle is registered with the DVLA at an address in that parking zone. This cannot be changed to allow residents to apply for permits in different zones.

The properties in the North of Eastern Parade are included in the MG zone. The South side continues to have free parking.

The Southsea parking zones overlap in terms of timings to make it easier to enforce and to make it harder for drivers to move around the area to find free parking.

Businesses operating within RPZs can apply for business permits.

If you have a zone boundary running down the centre of the road, the council could designate the bays on both sides of the roads to the two zones. Residents would only get a permit for one zone, but be able to use parking bays on both sides of the boundary road. The first example of this will be considered at this meeting later this year.

Councillor Boshier argued that the people who did not say whether they were in favour or against the proposal and those who were in favour but opposed the timings could be classed as objecting.

Councillor Stagg informed members that she had instructed officers to look at several areas where the residents have waited a long time for surveys to be carried out.

DECISIONS

That the MG Festing Grove area parking zone proposed under TRO 49/2020 is implemented as advertised, with the following caveats:

- (i) That the double yellow lines proposed in Culver Road are deleted and not introduced (Part D2 of the public proposal notice); instead the residents' parking bays are extended in their place;**
- (ii) That the intention is noted to include the properties listed below in this parking zone (MG Festing Grove area), instead of the adjacent proposed MH Westfield Road area parking zone, for practical reasons and in response to residents' concerns:**
 - Odd-numbered properties 279-291 Highland Road**
 - 1-12 Highcourt, 293 Highland Road.**

35. TRO 50/2020: Proposed extension to MF Craneswater area residents' parking zone (AI 8)

Kevin McKee, Parking Team Manager introduced the report.

Councillor Matthew Winnington gave a verbal deputation.

Councillor Simon Boshier read a deputation from CM Shaw.

Kevin McKee read out a deputation from Harry Bush.

In response to questions from members, Nikki Musson and Kevin McKee clarified the following points:

In the letters to residents about proposed RPZs a reminder could be included explaining that residents with dropped kerbs are not required to apply for permits if they park their vehicles on their driveways or in front of the dropped kerb.

Festing Road residents have been entitled to a MF permit since the zone was introduced. Now that this road is having its own restrictions, further capacity is opened up

Parking remains unrestricted on the South side of Eastern Parade and St Helen's Parade under this proposal.

As the rolling programme of RPZs progresses, the team is looking at how this can be best resourced.

DECISION

The extension of the MF extension Craneswater area parking zone proposed under TRO 50/2020 is implemented as advertised.

36. TRO 48/2020: Proposed additional permit eligibility for KD parking zone (AI 9)

Kevin McKee introduced the report and in response to questions, clarified the following points:

The closure of Castle Road and the introduction of a cycle lane in Elm Grove are temporary measures. If they work, there might be a desire to make them permanent; in which case a consultation would be carried out

DECISION

The proposal is implemented as advertised, meaning the remaining odd-numbered properties on the west side of Grove Road South are eligible to apply for KD zone permits (Castle Road area). This would maintain a consistent approach to permit eligibility within RPZs across the city.

37. Concessions of Care Homes in Residents Parking Schemes (AI 10)

Kevin McKee introduced the report.

Councillor Matthew Winnington gave a verbal deputation.

In response to a question, he explained that visitors can purchase essential visitors permits for £30 to park outside the care homes.

DECISION

Agreed a charge of £100 for up to three business permits issued registered care homes in residents parking zones and that these permits are flexible and do not specify a registration number. Fourth and subsequent permits will be charged at the standard rate.

38. On-Street Residential Charge Point Scheme - Phase 1 mid-point review (AI 11)

Hayley Chivers introduced the report and in response to questions, clarified the following points:

If a charge bay is not marked, anyone can park in front of the charge point. Both line marking and signage are required to make the electric vehicle parking bay enforceable.

The monthly usage figures are monitored and if a bay is not being used, the council will follow it up to find out the reason. If the resident who requested it has since moved away or no longer needs it, the team will try to find out if someone else nearby would benefit from using it. If this is not successful, the markings will be removed but the charge point will remain as there is a requirement to retain them for three years.

DECISION

The Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation noted the report.

**39. Electric Vehicle On-Street Residential Charge point scheme (ORCS)
phase 2 - TRO 75/2020 (AI 12)**

Hayley Chivers introduced the report.

Councillor Payter-Harris gave a verbal deputation.

Hayley Chivers read out written deputations from: Jay Cockerill, David Whalley and Jason West and in response to questions from members explained that:

Normally one charge point is installed per request.

The nature of the objections is considered for each individual site with proposals also considered in an area-wide context where there are several existing and/or proposed charge points nearby. The final recommendation is done on a site by site consideration.

These bays are not for the sole use of one resident they are available for use by any electric vehicle which is plugged into the charge point.

Councillor Stagg noted that some residents object because they are concerned that they will lose a parking space when this not the case.

DECISIONS

The Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation provided formal consent for the installations of the designated electric vehicle charging bays detailed in Appendix A with the following 19 exceptions:

- ☐ **De Lisle Close, West side adjacent to Nos.7-19 does not proceed**
- ☐ **Eastfield Road, South side, outside No.73; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Fordingbridge Road, East side, outside No.60; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Gladys Avenue, East side, outside no.76; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Glasgow Road, North side, outside No.28; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Goodwood Road, West side, outside No.17; does not proceed**
- ☐ **High Street, Old Portsmouth, South-east side, outside No.17; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Highland Road, South side, outside No.24; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Laburnum Grove, South side, outside No.226; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Lindley Avenue, South Side, outside no 36; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Lumsden Road, South-east side, within the layby, front of 32-44; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Lyndhurst Road, East side, outside No.146; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Malvern Road, West side, outside Nos. 19/21; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Montague Road, North side, outside No.33; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Oxford Road, East side, outside No.52/54; does not proceed**
- ☐ **St Ronan's Road, East side outside No. 80 does not proceed**
- ☐ **Taswell Road; East side, outside No.32; does not proceed**
- ☐ **Waverley Grove, South side outside No.2 does not proceed**
- ☐ **Wykeham Road, South side, outside Nos. 81 does not proceed**

Noted the policy and guidance on the use of trailing cables to charge electric vehicles from off street power sources by residents is being developed and

will be brought for a decision in a separate paper.

40. Solent Future Transport Zone (AI 13)

Hayley Chivers introduced the report and in response to questions, clarified the following points:

All the projects across the Solent area are listed in the report.

Detailed information was prepared in preparation for the bid stage and has been reviewed to consider the impact of the pandemic. A break down of the forecast project costs could be circulated if required but would not necessarily be on a geographical level.

A Mobility as a Service (MaaS) platform is planned to be introduced which would be available where the user could pay for different forms of transport with one app for example.

The Department for Transport rejected the council's bids for the Higher Education Institute Consolidation Project, which involved deliveries to the university and for a combined Dynamic Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) and Freight Multi-purpose vehicle project. However, the DDRT standalone trial was accepted.

Councillor Stagg explained that in Mansfield the bus company and big companies worked together to produce a DDRT app to enable staff to book transport from the end of their road at a requested time. There is no set route.

DECISION

The Cabinet Member noted the report.

The meeting concluded at 6.40pm.

.....
Councillor Lynne Stagg
Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation