

Document	Ref.	Comments from members	SCC response
<i>General comment</i>	1	Accessibility of maps, colours in papers, use of acronyms and jargon	Noted, will be taken on board for future Steering Group meetings/documents. Glossary to be provided where acronyms/jargon are included in original documents.
	2	Not enough time to digest and/or discuss	Documents where available were shared with a week's notice. We appreciate those shared with less notice did not leave enough time for members to digest in advance of the meeting, and did not allow proper discussion at the meeting in order to come to an agreed Group response. Taking further comment by email did give members time to digest the information but SCC preference is always to share documents with minimum one week's notice so there can be proper discussion at meetings.
2.2.1 Portswood ATZ workshops attendee overview	3	Workshops not representative. Not enough families/children	<p>We tried to make events as accessible as possible. Events were held in term-time; there were events on every weekday including one lunchtime slot. Invite letters were sent to >3k properties in the proposed ATZ areas. Everyone that booked a place, was on the waiting list or turned up without a booking was allowed to take part.</p> <p>Views of local schools/families could be sought via school/parent group representation on the Steering Group or through direct consultation with existing members.</p>
	4	Those unable to attend were not considered	<p>At Steering Group meeting 1 some members requested there should be a way for residents to submit comments if they were unable to attend. This was considered but it was not feasible; the purpose of workshops is for people to work together face to face and work through pros/cons of different options. There is no ideal solution, but others had the chance to comment at previous consultation and will do so on any future [E]TRO.</p> <p>Additional Steering Group representation has also been sought and other un/under-represented groups could be consulted by members, as discussed.</p>

2.2.2 Portswood ATZ workshops summary of feedback	5	Disagree with methodology	<p>The “approval rate” gives a good indication of whether measures which were discussed were overwhelmingly supported, not supported, or prompted mixed views. It is recognised that it is not an exact science as different measures were discussed on different tables, and opinions were recorded in diverse ways (though the level of consensus on each table regarding suggested measures was generally noted).</p> <p>While consideration was of course given to the level of support for each measure, all ideas and suggestions – not just those with a high “approval rate” – received during the workshops were reviewed by Council officers. The proposals per doc. 2.2.4 attempted to strike a balance to meet the needs of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feasible within design guidelines, budget, and trial timeline • overall a good level of support at co-design • calm or discourage traffic, reduce rat running and prioritise people walking, wheeling, and cycling • maintain motor vehicle access for those who live there.
	6	Not representative of the reality of some discussions	The document is considered to be a fair analysis of the overall feedback of the workshops however as it is a summary it does not include the full detail and “colour” of each table’s discussions.
	7	Automatic Number Plate Recognition not included	<p>ANPR is included in the grouped interventions as a type of “traffic filter.” It is not mentioned under “The suggested interventions which were noted by >3 tables and had an approval rating >50%” as ANPR filters had an approval rating of <50%.</p> <p>It should also be noted ANPR filters for the ATZ areas are not feasible to be set up in time for the trial period, and this was made clear to all attendees at the outset in every co-design workshop.</p> <p>Traffic filters (with physical barriers and/or signage) could be delivered under a trial ATZ. Legislation asserts that enforcement e.g.</p>

			via ANPR cameras should only be considered for a scheme where engineering and education have already failed. In addition, the trial budget is unlikely to be sufficient to cover extensive camera coverage across the area and the background work required to manage exemptions.
2.2.4 Portswood ATZ proposals	<i>General comment</i>		
	8	Proposals are not safe	The proposals will be subject to an independent Road Safety Audit and if any issues are raised the designer will need to demonstrate how these are mitigated.
	9	Traffic filters preferred	<p>As stated in doc. 2.2.2 opinions on traffic filters at co-design were divided. The same can be said for individual Steering Group members. Regarding a multiple traffic filter approach, generally people feel either strongly in favour or strongly against, with little middle ground.</p> <p>The proposals per doc. 2.2.4 including a single traffic filter attempted to strike a balance to meet the needs of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feasible within design guidelines, budget, and trial timeline • overall a good level of support at co-design • calm or discourage traffic, reduce rat running and prioritise people walking, wheeling, and cycling • maintain motor vehicle access for those who live there. <p>The impact of all proposed measures under the Portswood Project cannot be fully known in advance, so delivering the scheme initially as a trial allows this to be tested. Depending on the results, measures could be removed, amended or added later.</p>
10	Not enough/strong enough measures for Westridge Rd	<p>Proposal 1 & 3 are intended to calm and discourage through traffic on Westridge (alongside the wider signage plan).</p> <p>The impact of all proposed measures under the Portswood Project cannot be fully known in advance, so delivering the scheme initially</p>	

			as a trial allows this to be tested. Depending on the results, measures could be removed, amended or added later.
11	Scheme does not address existing parking issues on Westridge		<p>The residents parking policy requires that a representative community request be submitted before we will investigate a request for a new resident parking zone (RPZ). This is usually done via a petition signed by a representative number of residents, from a resident's association.</p> <p>Residents on Westridge Rd have previously been surveyed and a RPZ was rejected. In areas with large student populations there is generally little appetite for parking restrictions.</p>
12	Buildouts not safe/desirable for cyclists		Cycle bypasses have been added to the design (proposal 4) and will be considered for proposal 3.
13	Buildouts/calming could increase air pollution		<p>Air quality will be monitored and evaluated as part of the trial.</p> <p>“Even where congestion increases local air pollution, the health impacts are likely to be negligible and outweighed by the health benefits of slowed traffic.” [Speed, emissions & health, TfL, June 2018]</p>
<i>1. 20mph limit for the area, with Vehicle Activated Signage</i>			
14	20mph limit extent should be extended up Highfield Lane to Highfield Rd		<p>Whilst this request is reasonable, the 20mph area as proposed is being implemented directly linked to the bus gate trial, and is being fully justified as a mitigation measure linked to the bus gate trial. An extension of the area would lead to greater costs, and is likely to attract more feedback and objections, which could jeopardise the overall implementation.</p> <p>Extension of the 20mph area could be considered at a future date as part of the city-wide 20mph roll out.</p>
<i>2. Gateway on Highfield Lane</i>			
15	Highfield Lane gateway should be at Highfield Rd/closer to the Avenue		The gateway should remain at the proposed location in order to achieve maximum calming effect in advance of Brookvale Road, and the existing zebra crossing on Highfield Lane. This is in line with the

		<p>key feedback from the co-design workshops. The gateway is also linked to the start of the 20mph limit at this location.</p> <p>The point was made that the proposed location is not the entry to Highfield, unlike the example given (Gover Road, the entry point to Old Redbridge). However, this should not be an issue as gateway features need not include “Highfield/Welcome to Highfield” signage.</p>
16	Remove unrestricted parking on Highfield Lane	<p>On-street parking can function as traffic calming by narrowing the carriageway; it is not desirable to remove this effectively widening the carriageway (and potentially increasing vehicle speeds).</p> <p>This section of Highfield Lane is a significant distance away from the bus gate trial. Any removal of the unrestricted parking would not be linked to the trial, and hence should not be considered as part of trial mitigation measures.</p>
3. <i>Buildouts with wooden planters on Belmont Rd (north of Osborne Rd South junction) and on Brookvale Rd (north of Winn Rd junction)</i>		
17	Red HFS needless expense	Agreed this is not a priority and unlikely within trial budget. We will not be proceeding with HFS here within the trial.
4. <i>Traffic calming on Brookvale Rd, between Highfield Lane and Oakmount Triangle</i>		
18	Traffic calming not needed as this is already achieved by congestion at peak times	There is already a significant amount of through-traffic using Brookvale Road at peak times, regardless of any congestion. Strengthened traffic calming should discourage additional drivers using Brookvale Road as a cut-through at peak times in order to avoid the Broadway bus gate, and improve the environment for walking, wheeling, and cycling.
19	Consider cycle lane instead of echelon parking/alternating give way	Amended proposals retain the traffic calming effect of an alternating give-way system but include cycle bypasses to maintain cycle flow and improve cycle safety.
5. <i>Trial traffic filter somewhere on Russell/Abbotts between either end Brookvale Rd</i>		
20	Divisive opinions on traffic filters at co-design yet one is included	As stated in doc. 2.2.2 opinions on traffic filters at co-design were divided. The same can be said for individual Steering Group members. Regarding a multiple traffic filter approach, generally

			<p>people feel either strongly in favour or strongly against, with little middle ground.</p> <p>The proposals per doc. 2.2.4 including a single traffic filter attempted to strike a balance to meet the needs of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feasible within design guidelines, budget, and trial timeline • overall a good level of support at co-design • calm or discourage traffic, reduce rat running and prioritise people walking, wheeling, and cycling • maintain motor vehicle access for those who live there. <p>Like the bus gate on Portswood Broadway, the traffic filter on Russell Place will be delivered under an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). This allows it to be trialled for up to 18 months, and means it is more easily modified or removed than under a permanent TRO. It also will be open to public consultation during the first 6 months.</p>
<p>2.3 General Arrangement</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>Opposition to change of restrictions at St Denys Rd spur. Move the bus gate start north to the main junction</p>	<p>There are valid technical arguments for and against changes to restrictions at the spur road, but the Cabinet decision was taken in January to undertake the trial in accordance with what was agreed, including reducing the length of the bus/taxi/cycle only section of road to be from Westridge Road to St Denys Road spur.</p> <p>HGVs delivering to businesses south of the bus gate would cause traffic problems and potential safety issues turning into Westridge Road or attempting a multi-point turn trying to avoid the bus gate. In order to mitigate this, northbound HGVs (vehicles over 7.5 tonnes) are permitted through the bus gate. Loading within the bus gate is not encouraged as this could impact bus journey times and as such there is no dedicated loading facility on the Broadway. The spur road loading area provides a loading facility which can be accessed by HGVs 24/7 from both directions. Allowing southbound HGVs access</p>

			to enter the bus gate would mean more vehicles entering the restricted zone which could impact bus journey times and encourages loading whilst the bus gate is operational.
22	Provide a dedicated delivery bay on the Broadway		Northbound HGVs (vehicles over 7.5 tonnes) are permitted through the bus gate. There is no dedicated loading facility on the Broadway, delivery vehicles can however stop on double yellow lines to load. Providing a loading bay would explicitly encourage loading within the bus gate extents and potentially impact bus journey times. A 24/7 loading bay is provided on St Denys Road spur.
23	Continue bike lane across St Denys Rd spur & tighten junction		<p>The junction has been tightened with the addition of the contraflow cycle lane northbound however needs to remain sufficiently wide for right-turns in by lorries from Portswood Rd south of the spur.</p> <p>The bike lane can be continued up to the signalised crossing zig-zag markings, which stop halfway across the spur road.</p>
24	Will get splashed with bus stop facing the way shown		New shelters are oriented per current arrangement: south side open to the road, north side open to the pavement. This is to maximise available footway width around the shelters.
25	Risk of “left-hook” for cycles continuing south on Portswood Rd through Highfield Lane junction, also at the spur		<p>This is an existing risk; the advisory cycle lane allows cyclists to access the Advanced Stop Lines and take primary position at the lights, however if cyclists do not move into the right hand lane to continue straight on as marked for all traffic there is a risk left-turning drivers could cut across their path.</p> <p>Members are concerned about a potential increase in drivers turning left onto St Denys Road during bus gate hours which could increase the risk of “left-hooks.” Cycle symbols will be added across the junction to increase driver awareness of cycles continuing straight and encourage people on bikes to take “primary position.”</p>

	26	Bus stops are excessive in length- could be additional disabled parking or double yellows	The bus stops are the same size as existing layout and deemed sufficient/necessary to allow multiple services to pick up/drop off at once and provide the required capacity for bus operations.
	27	Concern at removal of disabled parking on Broadway	The marked disabled bays outside Kate's Cafe will not be usable during bus gate operating hours and are being replaced with double yellow lines. However, outside of bus gate hours blue badge holders will still be permitted to park here, on double yellow lines. New marked disabled bays are being added on the Broadway opposite Westridge Road, and on St Denys Road spur; there will be a net increase in disabled parking from the current arrangement.
2.4 Signage Layout Plan	28	Significant increase in road signage/markings not desirable	Some of the new signage is mandatory for bus gate enforcement (as discussed/shown on plans at meeting 1), some is recommended. Whilst it is desirable to avoid excessive additional signage and in particular new pavement clutter, a certain amount of new signage is required to make sure restrictions/routes are clear to all road users. Where possible signage is mounted on existing posts or replaces existing sign faces.
	29	Signage not clear/confusing	All signs are designed to the national guidance set out by the Department for Transport (DfT). On top of the mandatory signage some optional signage has been included to make sure routes/restrictions are clear, however it is desirable to avoid excessive additional signage and in particular new pavement clutter.
	30	Shouldn't ALL arrows be only pointing the way of the route vehicles are meant to be going?	There are a number of distinct types of signs used as part of this scheme - advanced warning of restrictions, direction signs, etc - but all are designed to the national guidance set out by the DfT. The standard across all UK signage is that an arrow points towards the restriction/hazard etc, that is being warned of.
	31	Most signage does not show timings	While we can include the times it would increase the size of the signs, which are already substantive.
	32	TS6 Sign south of Waitrose directs all "other traffic" into Highfield increasing through traffic on local roads. Suggest "local traffic"	Using "local traffic" would suggest some restriction on traffic through Highfield, which is not proposed within the trial. Regardless, "local traffic" cannot be used as all signs are designed to national guidance,

			and "other traffic" is the wording suggested in the guidance provided by the DfT. Ultimately turning left into Brookvale is the route for general traffic that has not followed advanced signage prior to reaching this point during the bus gate times of operation.
33	TS12 Sign on Avenue south of Burgess Rd – do HGVs know how to access A335 (or will they use Winn/Westwood). There do not appear to be signs to the A335 either at Lodge Road or Charlotte Place.		<p>The proposed signage is considered to be a minor improvement as it states the alternative route rather than just directing down The Avenue with no further signage. It is true that there are not signs to the A335 at Lodge Rd or Charlotte Place junctions but adding/changing these would be costly and would likely require temporary road closures.</p> <p>The existing sign is a type which was discontinued in 1994 and should have been removed by 2015.</p>
34	TS14/TS15 “Invites” traffic to turn onto Broadway. No indication where/what A 335 is		The signs warn of the upcoming restriction. Direction signs on Lodge Road and Portswood Road include reference to the A 335 which can be followed if road users are not already familiar with the designations.
35	“Bus gate ahead” sign on the Avenue?		The bus gate is signed at appropriate diversion points in advance.
36	TS7 - Local traffic to Portswood; All other routes or Through traffic (not Eastleigh)		Wording such as "through traffic" is not permitted on this type of direction sign.
37	TS14/15/10 mention “alternative route” without indicating alternative route to where. If Portswood you don’t need an alternative, if not Portswood then surely you are “through traffic” or “other routes”?		It is an alternative route to using Portswood Rd - this could be to multiple places, so it is difficult to identify one for the signage. “Through traffic”/ “other routes” is not permitted on the signage.
38	“Invites” traffic to turn onto Broadway. No indication where/what A 335 is		The signs warn of the upcoming restriction. Direction signs on Lodge Road and Portswood Road include reference to the A 335 which can be followed if road users are not already familiar with the designations.
39	Possible confusion between TS9 to Westridge car park & TS3 & 4 - they need to clarify that bus gate restrictions apply AFTER Westridge Rd & its car park.		The bus gate signage (shown on doc 2.3) makes it clear where the bus gate applies from.

	40	No mention of turning right into The Avenue from Winn or Westwood. The lights at end of Winn need to be reconfigured to facilitate right turning	The signals to the north of Winn Road are a toucan crossing. These cannot facilitate right turning movements.
2.5 Portswood Project KPIs v2	41	Still unclear of possible scenarios at the end of the trial	At the end of the trial period, a decision will be made by the Council on how to proceed; this could mean making the bus gate permanent, amending the scheme and extending the trial period, or removing the scheme. Any decision will be made taking into account to what extent the project achieves its objectives, as measured by an independent consultant, and considering recommendations of the Portswood Project Steering Group.
	42	Performance indicators should be measurable/SMART (not just objective = achieved or not)	We recognise this point. The objectives apply to both the trial and any permanent scheme. The achievability of each objective differs between a trial or a permanent scheme, making assigning specific targets difficult. To be considered for v3.
	43	Delivery of the scheme on time and in budget should be listed as a KPI	This is being measured, we will consider how/whether this is included in a future version of the document.
	44	Additional KPI to measure impact of scheme on local main roads e.g. A335	This is being measured, we will consider how/whether this is included in a future version of the document.
	45	Include impact of removal of on-street parking (measure under KPI1)	Accessibility of businesses for customers – including availability of nearby parking spaces – is being measured through business surveys for the baseline report. These will be repeated for the scheme impact report.
	46	Should have specific objectives for measures in the ATZ area	The objectives are intended to measure the impact of all measures within the project, which includes both the bus gate/Broadway and ATZs.
	47	Priority ranking not useful	Agreed at meeting 2 not to use the priority rankings in future. The “priority” was a combined measure of each objective’s achievability and desirability from low to high. They were never intended to give different weightings to the objectives. All objectives will be measured.
	48	No base data or planned dates for data collection during the trial	This document does not list data sources or M&E timeline. Baseline traffic surveys have been completed and baseline community surveys are currently being undertaken. Data sources and data

			collection dates can be discussed further at the next Steering Group meeting and/or monitoring sub-group meeting.
--	--	--	---