

The **WARWICK AREA COMMITTEE** met at **WARWICK** on the **30<sup>th</sup> JANUARY, 2007**.

Present:-

Councillor Sarah Boad (Chair)  
“ Ken Browne  
“ Les Caborn  
“ Alan Cockburn  
“ Jose Compton  
“ Chris Davis  
“ Eithne Goode  
“ Marion Haywood  
“ Bernard Kirton  
“ Tim Naylor  
“ Raj Randev  
“ Dave Shilton  
“ Mota Singh  
“ John Whitehouse

Also Present:-

Officers: Roger Newham, Roger Bennett (Environment and Economy Directorate), Ian Marriott and Peter Hunter (Performance and Development Directorate).

The Chair welcomed Members and the public and explained the procedure that would be followed that evening. She reminded those members of the public who wished to speak that they would have a maximum of three minutes in which to make their points to the Committee. The Chair gave notice that she would be moving a motion asking for the scheme to be initially reviewed three months after the implementation date.

**1. General**  
**(1) Apologies**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Michael Doody

**(2) Members' Disclosure of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

Personal interests relating to any item on the agenda arising by virtue of the member serving as a Warwick District Councillor were disclosed by Councillors Les Caborn, Alan Cockburn, Jose Compton, Chris Davis, Michael Doody, Eithne Goode, Bernard Kirton and Dave Shilton.

In addition the following Councillors disclosed the following personal interests:-

- (a) Councillor Sarah Boad – member of Leamington Town Council.
- (b) Councillor Alan Cockburn – member of Kenilworth Town Council.

- (c) Councillor Jose Compton – Warwick District Council representative on the Joint Member Working Group on decriminalisation of parking enforcement in Warwick District.
- (d) Councillor Eithne Goode – (i) member of Leamington Town Council and (ii) husband was a blue badge holder.
- (e) Councillor Marion Haywood – resident in Smith Street, Warwick.
- (f) Councillor Bernard Kirton – member of Whitnash Town Council.
- (g) Councillor Dave Shilton – member of Kenilworth Town Council.
- (h) Councillor Mota Singh – member of Leamington Town Council.

## 2. Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement

The Committee considered the report by the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy.

Roger Bennett gave a brief summary of the report. He said that it was anticipated that the Government would legislate to make all authorities in time introduce decriminalisation. He then drew attention to two minor changes that had been made to the proposals as shown on revised plans circulated at the meeting:-

- Plan 6a – Clarendon Street, Sherbourne Terrace (amended) – replacing Plan 6.
- Plan 12a – Tachbrook Road Service Road (amended) – replacing Plan 12.

### (1) Parking Permits

#### ***Lisa Cooper – resident Lakin Road, Warwick***

She was concerned about the proposed restrictions running to 8 p.m. and the limit on visitor permits to one. She had more than one visitor.

#### ***Ruth Bidnell – resident Queens Road, Kenilworth***

Peter Hunter read out a written submission questioning the justification for charging £25 for a second resident permit when the first was only £15, as it was only supposed to cover administration costs.

Roger Bennett said that the proposal for the restrictions to run from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. on a daily basis instead of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Mondays to Fridays, was added protection to residents. If the 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. hours were adopted, a non-permit holder could park at 3 p.m. and need not move the vehicle until 11 a.m. the following day. Under the proposals the earliest a non-permit holder could park and leave a vehicle overnight was 6 p.m. The proposals had received pretty broad support across the District. He acknowledged that there were a lot of issues about the number of permits allowed per household and confirmed that the situation would be monitored and it might be possible to review those proposals in the light of experience. The members of the Working Group had different views about the level of charge that should be made for

permits but it had been decided that £15 should be charged for a first permit and £25 for a second. It was essential that income covered costs.

## **(2) Kenilworth Proposals**

### ***Ruth Bidnell – resident Queens Road***

Peter Hunter read out a written submission questioning the need to change the hours to 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily when there was no problem in Kenilworth. She was aware that this was to stop non-permit holders parking between 3 p.m. and 11 a.m. but this was not happening anyway. The County Council's consultants had found that there was spare capacity in Kenilworth and that illegal parking was modest. The proposals had adopted a blanket approach and took no account of differences between the towns. The situation could be reviewed if it worsened.

Roger Bennett said that he had commented on this point earlier but he agreed that she did have a point in connection with Kenilworth. However there were problem areas in the town, as with Barrow Road and the Talisman Theatre where there was support from residents for the proposals.

Councillor John Whitehouse had some sympathy with the resident's comments but considered that at this stage the proposals should be implemented but kept under careful review. The proposals were moderate, limited in scale and the right approach. There was a popular nursery school in Bertie Road that had been suggested for one of two children centres. There was likely to be traffic issues to be addressed as a result of the development in Kenilworth but this was not required immediately.

Councillor Dave Shilton supported those comments and emphasised the importance of the issue of the impact of the nursery school on Bertie Road. He said that parking on the Stoneleigh Road had reduced traffic speeds, resulting in a reduced accident numbers. He welcomed the extra wardens as they would prevent parking on double yellow lines.

Councillor Alan Cockburn agreed with the comments of Councillors John Whitehouse and Dave Shilton. He said it was important that flexibility was shown.

## **(3) Whitnash Proposals**

Roger Bennett referred to the revised plan 12a. The existing parking restrictions on the service road along Tachbrook Road had been needed when AP was a big employer in the area in order to stop employees parking there. An original proposal for a residential parking scheme along the whole of the service road had received roughly equal support and opposition. What was now being proposed was a ban on parking on the Tachbrook Road side of the service road and unrestricted parking on the residential side, apart from existing areas of no waiting at any time that will be retained.

Councillor Bernard Kirton confirmed that there were two diverse views about the proposals among the residents. Residents did not see why they should have to pay for parking outside their homes. He felt that the proposals should go ahead. It was necessary to stop illegal parking in the turning heads.

#### **(4) Leamington Spa Proposals**

##### ***Fr John Cross – St Peters Dormer Place***

He questioned the validity of the information about parking patterns as it was collected mid-week on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> November 2004 and therefore did not reflect the position on Sundays. Catholics were obligated to attend mass on every Sunday throughout the year. The proposal to restrict parking would mean that parishioners would have to pay £1.60 to park when currently they could park free. He saw it as discrimination against freedom to worship. The proposals had not been discussed between the Church and the County Council. He had a petition against the proposals containing 485 signatories. He asked that his parishioner be allowed to park free of charge when attending Church.

##### ***Mr. John Ireson***

He supported Fr Cross. Housebound parishioners were given lifts to the Church and it was not possible for them to travel by bus. The proposed parking outside the Church was insufficient. He asked that consideration be given to parishioners being allowed to park free of charge in the multi-storey car park.

##### ***Claire Simmons – Clarendon Street***

She objected to the Sunday restrictions, not on religious grounds but family ones. When members of the family visited they would have to get up by 8 a.m. to move their cars.

Roger Bennett had sympathy with what had been said, however, Sunday was one of the busiest days of the week with almost as much traffic as any other day. Blue Badge holders would be exempt from time-limited restrictions and pay and display. There would be unrestricted parking in York Road, north side, and time-restricted parking in Archery Road. He could not comment on the request to use St. Peters car park free of charge by those attending the church because the Warwick District Council controlled this.

The Chair pointed out that there were other religious denominations affected by the proposals and it was important that all should be treated similarly.

##### ***Liz Iles - Brunswick***

She both lived and worked in the Brunswick area. There was a problem with commuters parking, as it was only a five-minute walk to the train station. She asked that Brunswick Ward be considered because Tachbrook Road and Bury Road were heavily affected by traffic.

***David Allen – on behalf of the Chairman of the Maltings Residents Association***

The Maltings was an award-winning development and the residents were keen to keep the area residential. It was only two streets away from the restricted parking area and there was concern that the displaced traffic would park in Lillington Avenue and also across driveways on the County Council access road into the Maltings. There were no parking restrictions on Lillington Avenue and so it could become fully parked on both sides. Experience had shown that when Lillington Avenue was fully parked, it was dangerous to make a right turn into it from the Maltings.

***David Bruno – Leamington Plant Hire, Wood Street***

He said that there had been a lack of consultation with local businesses. The Committee should remember that businesses needed staff to operate and they would have to park in the residential streets. As the County Council were voluntarily introducing the proposals, he asked that they take time to consider all options.

***Mr. Wood – Church Street***

He supported recommendation 2(i)(d).

***Robert Wise – Maxstoke Gardens, Tachbrook Road***

Vehicles were parked on both sides of the road from 7 a.m. until late. Action needed to be taken before someone was killed on Tachbrook Road.

***Doris Hall***

She queried why there were charges for using the car parks while shoppers using the Royal Priors car park were able to park free of charge.

Roger Bennett said that it was not expected that any of the anticipated 500 cars displaced would park in the Brunswick area. It was acknowledged that there were parking issues on Tachbrook Road, Bury Road and Kingsway and he confirmed that it was intended to look at that area to see what further restrictions might be needed. In light of the concern about the displacement of traffic onto Lillington Avenue, the situation would be monitored closely to enable any appropriate action to be taken. The possibility of providing a loading bay in Wood Street to serve the businesses would be investigated. There had been very close consultation with the Chamber of Trade and the Chamber of Commerce over the proposals. He believed that although the Warwick District Council managed the Royal Priors car park it was owned privately.

Councillor Tim Naylor paid tribute to the steering group and officers for carrying out what was virtually an impossible task as most people wanted the right to drive and park where they liked. He had a particular concern relating to Russell Terrace that he had raised at the meeting of the Committee in November. That related to the disparity of the treatment of Russell Terrace under the proposals as compared with Leam Terrace. He wished to see the traffic movement figures for both roads. He also sought reassurance that echelon parking would be safe as vehicles would back out on a high-speed road.

Councillor Eithne Goode was pleased that the officers were aware of the ripple effect of the proposals on parking in Lillington Avenue as this formed part of a busy route through the town. It was essential that flexibility was shown in the proposals.

#### **(5) Warwick Proposals**

##### ***Mary Bywater, Wathen Road***

She was concerned at the loss of the disabled bay outside her home. Cars were parked bumper to bumper along Wathen Road and an unofficial car park opposite her house was also full. She needed to park outside her home as she could not walk far.

##### ***Wendy Miller – on behalf of Stephanie Burdett, Stand Street***

Stephanie Burdett had been disabled for a long time and in the previous year had a leg amputated. She had the assistance of a walking dog and was unable to walk far. It was essential to retain a disabled parking bay outside her home.

##### ***Lisa Cooper, Lakin Road***

She asked that the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. timing should be reduced to fit in with family living and visitor permits should be increased from 1 to 3.

##### ***Jane Rostron, Cherry Street***

There had been no consultation with residents and no one had tried to find out how many of the residents wanted the proposals for Cherry Street. Most were out at work all day and many had two cars. They would not be happy to park a distance from their homes. She asked for the removal of the double yellow lines from the proposals.

##### ***James Mackay, Warwick Society***

The Society supported the principle of proper enforcement. It was considered that some opportunities had been missed, because the Society favoured parking in marked bays only. There was a need to improve the situation with the parking bays on the Coten End cycleway. There was a disparity in that charging would take place on a Sunday when there were surplus parking spaces while there was no control during the evenings when there was a shortage. Many more permits would be issued compared to the spaces available. Members were being asked to agree the proposals without a business plan or knowing the financial impact or risk.

##### ***Sue Butcher, Chamber of Trade***

There had been concern at the original implementation date of October. It was important to businesses that the revised date of August was not allowed to slip.

##### ***Pat Sabin, Guy's Cliffe Terrace***

Concerned that she would have nowhere to park if the disabled bay was removed.

***Dave Butler, Woodhouse Street***

He was pleased with the proposals because of problems from visitors to the Castle and the Races parking in the area. He asked whether lines could be drawn across the front of driveways to prevent access to them being blocked by parked cars. He was, however concerned about the plight of Stephanie Burdett. He then referred to a service road in Queen's Square that was used by refuse collection vehicles and suggested that parking was prevented there.

Roger Bennett said that the provision of disabled parking bays outside homes were informal arrangement that were generally observed by most drivers. Unfortunately, it was not possible to incorporate informal markings in the formal markings required to enable the scheme to be enforced. It was County Council policy not to provide individual formal disabled parking bays for the many hundreds of blue badge holders because they were very expensive in resources and bureaucracy to create and, when they were no longer required, to revoke. However, it was recognised that this was a serious issue and it was proposed to take a report through the Environment Overview and Strategy Committee to Cabinet with a view to reviewing that policy.

He was aware that the proximity of the railway station to Cherry Street led to problems. There were too many cars in Lakin Road, Woodcote Road, Guy Street and Cherry Street to provide on-street parking. The possibility of maximising the potential for on-street parking in the area by introducing a one-way system would be investigated. He recognised the Warwick Society's strong desire to have a controlled parking zone in the town and he was happy for this to be considered after it had been discussed through the Warwick Forum. He was keen to work with the Forum on this so as to find a consensus view. As a prerequisite of obtaining approval to the scheme, the County Council had to ensure that all traffic orders within the area affected were enforceable and so would be carrying out a full review and this would cover the Coten End cycleway and parking bays. It was not possible to prepare a business plan until a decision was made on the details of the scheme. However, the scheme should break even on the set up costs within three years. It was expected that the proposed new Traffic Management Act would create a new offence of parking in front of dropped kerbs accessing driveways. He would investigate the position of the service road in Queen Square. He was very optimistic about an implementation date of 6<sup>th</sup> August 2007.

It was noted that the cost of the scheme would be in the order of £500,000.

Councillor Raj Randev asked that he be given details of the streets covered within the three residential parking zones. He also asked that any parking metres/ticket machines be located so that they did not cause obstruction to pedestrians. He welcomed the proposal that there should be a review after three months in view of unresolved issues in Wathen Road. He considered that Cabinet should reconsider the policy of not providing individual disabled parking bays outside homes. He favoured the restrictions being between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. rather than 8 p.m. He supported Mr. Butler's requests.

Councillor Alan Cockburn was quite concerned about the loss of disabled parking bays and supported the Working Group considering this matter as soon as possible with a view to incorporating those bays in the formal scheme.

Councillor Marion Haywood favoured the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. She noted that officers were happy to consider the proposals of the Warwick Society through the Warwick Forum.

Councillor Ken Browne supported the reference of the issue of disabled parking to the Working Group and proposed that the Area Committee authorise the officers, so far as it was able, to implement any solutions identified by the Working Group without having to bring a further report to the Committee.

The Chair said that she would take the recommendations in sections so that each section could be voted on separately .

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

- (i) That the Warwickshire County Council (Various Streets, District of Warwick) (Resident's Parking Places, On-Street Parking Places and Waiting Restrictions) Order 2007 be made as advertised subject to the following amendments:-
  - (a) The pay and display arrangements in Newbold Terrace, Leamington Spa, to be from 8am to 6pm (rather than 8am to 8pm)
  - (b) A reduction in the length of limited waiting on the west side of York Road so that it commences at a point 48 metres north of its junction with Avenue Road (rather than 9 metres)
  - (c) The omission of the proposals for Archery Road, Clarendon Crescent and the northern length of Grove Street, Leamington Spa (subject to the revised proposals in 2 below)
  - (d) The omission of the proposals for Tachbrook Road service road



- (e) Eligibility for permits to park in Zone L2 to be limited to residents of Willes Road, Leamington Spa (excluding Lansdowne Crescent) between Clarendon Crescent and Cross Street only

It was then Resolved with Councillor Tim Naylor withholding support for subparagraph (L), Russell Terrace proposals plan 10:-

- (ii) That the following proposals be advertised (Plans in appendix D):-

- (a) **Leamington Spa**

- (A) Archery Road - both sides, waiting limited to 4 hours, no return for 8 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No. 1.
- (B) Augusta Place – both sides, waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No 2.
- (C) Beauchamp Avenue – north side, waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No 3.
- (D) Church Street – west side waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No 4.
- (E) Clarendon Crescent – revised proposals as shown on Plan No 5.
- (F) Clarendon Street (Sherbourne Terrace) – both sides waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No 6a.

- (G) Grove Street – revised proposals as shown on Plan No 7.
- (H) Oxford Street – revised proposals as shown on Plan No 8 with eligibility extended to residents of Zone L2 and Chandos Street, Guy Street, Guy Place East, Guy Place West, Oxford Place and Oxford Street.
- (I) Regent Grove – inclusion of waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours 8am to 8pm, daily as shown in Plan No 9.
- (J) Residents of 55 and 57 Regent Grove to be eligible for permits to park in Zone L2.
- (K) Residents of Nos 3-5 and 2-12 Regent Street to be eligible for permits to park in Zone L3.
- (L) Russell Terrace – north side, waiting limited to 2 hours no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 8am to 8pm, daily as shown on Plan No 10.
- (M) Residents on the west side of Wood Street to be eligible for permits to park in Zone L4.

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

(b) **Warwick**

- (A) Coten End - north side, waiting limited to 2 hours, no return for 4 hours except for permit holders, 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday as shown on Plan No. 11.
- (B) Residents of 35-41 Percy Road to be eligible to park in Zone W3.

- (C) Residents of 13-19 West Street to be eligible to park in Zone W1 (rather than W2).

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

(c) **Whitnash**

- (A) Revocation of the 2 hour waiting limit at the northern end of Tachbrook Road service road as shown on Plan No. 12a.

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

(d) **Visitor Permits**

- (A) Registered Guest Houses to be allowed to apply for additional "Visitor" permits.

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

(e) **On-Street Parking Charges - Warwick**

- 30 minutes – 20p (as previously advertised).
- Up to 1 hour – 90p (rather than £1 previously advertised).
- Up to 2 hours - £1.50p (rather than £1.60p previously advertised).

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

- (iii) That further consideration be given to the issue of Business Permits, Customer Permits and Community Worker Permits.

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

- (iv) That an initial assessment be carried out three months after implementation.

It was then unanimously Resolved:-

- (v) That the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy and the Strategic Director of Performance and Development, acting in consultation with the Working Party, be authorised to take any steps available to the Warwick Area Committee, including making or modifying road traffic orders, to ensure the continued availability of individual parking places for persons with disabilities when the above Order is implemented.

Councillor Ken Browne suggested that the Committee record its thanks to officers for their efforts in producing the scheme and it was accordingly Resolved unanimously:-

- (vi) That the Warwick Area Committee record its thanks to officers involved in producing the scheme for decriminalisation of parking enforcement in the Warwick Area and in particular to Roger Bennett, Strategic Projects Team Leader, Traffic Projects Group, Environment and Economy Directorate, for his professionalism and highly skilful negotiating ability.

.....  
Chair of Committee

The Committee rose at 8:26 p.m.