

## **PSG Meeting 2 Minutes**

### **1. Welcome**

- i. Introductions
  - a. Chair: Prof. Roger Brown
  - b. Members: Adam Tewkesbury, Andrea Sutcliffe, Angela Cotton, Charlie Nicholson, Chris Zardis, Johnnie Dellow, Lawrence Coomber, Liz Murray, Lyn Brayshaw, Paul Beard, Pete Thomas, Sue Swallow
  - c. SCC Officers: Carolyn Ireland, Martina Olley
  - d. Observers: Cllr John Savage
- ii. Update on representation/new members
  - a. Invited and accepted: GMB, Hampshire Constabulary, University of Southampton, University of Southampton Students' Union, Waitrose
  - b. Invited, no response: Hants & IOW Fire & Rescue Service, Southampton Council of Faiths, South Central Ambulance Service, Unite
  - c. Suggestion of inviting Highfield School/after school club/Family & Friends (HSFF)
- iii. Apologies: Ali Haydor, Barbara Claridge, Clare Diaper, Graham Johnson, Jeanette Maidment, Karen Edwards, Peter Hull, Vijay Chopra, Cllr Anne Marie Finn, Cllr Katherine Barbour

### **2. Minutes of last meeting**

- i. No comments

### **3. Matters arising**

- i. None

### **4. ATZ co-design workshop summary of feedback and proposed measures**

- i. Papers circulated very recently, therefore high-level discussion now. Members to review proposals outside of meeting and provide any further comment by email
- ii. Doc 2.1: 149 people came to the workshops, nobody turned away. More people from/with an interest in Highfield attended.
- iii. Doc 2.2: In general the feedback wasn't a surprise. No total consensus. Very varied feedback.
- iv. Comments on the first two papers:
  - a. Very good papers. Would be good to see the summary of the existing situation. SCC focused on the outcome of what people wanted to see, not existing issues. It was a shame that the workshop information couldn't be sent out electronically to a wider group of people.

- b. Member doesn't recognise a lot of the summary feedback in the document. Residents Association committee asked to see the full results of the workshop. Feedback is summarised as the large maps/facilitator notes don't make sense out of context.
  - c. Steering Group needs to have full access to the plans for monitoring before the trial starts.
  - d. At PSG1 requested there would be a way for people to submit comments if they can't attend. It wasn't 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.
  - e. Low representation of cyclists at the workshop. Also of people with children. Safety around build outs might not have been fully considered.
  - f. Elderly population may not have been able to attend the workshops.
  - g. The summary loses the rich text of discussion at the workshops.
- v. Comments on proposals (doc 2.2.3 / 2.2.4):
- 1. 20mph limit for the area, with VAS
    - a. Why not up to the Common? Lots of people still will have to walk through 30mph. What is the rationale of the extent of the area?
    - b. There is a 20mph within the university area. Widen it to combine the two?
  - 2. Gateway on Highfield Lane
    - a. Not suitable for bikes. It's an uphill. Needs a bike lane
    - b. Significant discussion about width and whether to have marked priority.
  - 3. Buildouts with wooden planters on Belmont Road and Brookvale Road
    - a. What is the anticipated traffic change with the proposed measures?
  - 4. Traffic calming on Brookvale Road
    - a. Alternating give-way was popular at co-design. SCC are looking at what is feasible within the available road width
    - b. Consider cycle safety for children particularly. Cycle bypasses are welcome.
    - c. Demarcation of priorities is preferred
    - d. If no raised tables, then speeds won't reduce. Build outs are a waste of money.
    - e. "amend existing islands". Confusion- buildouts not islands
  - 5. Trial traffic filter somewhere on Russell/Abbotts

- a. One filter will not be enough.
- b. This filter won't stop Abbotts/Russell being used as a rat run
- c. Proposals 4 and 5 will work against each other.

6. Other/general comments

- a. Quite a few of the suggestions don't take into account that people need access the area (in and out).
- b. Opposition to Westridge Road not having any measures even though more traffic will be diverted through this road This is unfair, there need to be measures. Proposal 1 & 3 are intended to calm and discourage through traffic on Westridge (alongside the wider signage plan).
- c. Modal filters do work even though people don't like the idea of them! People come to like them e.g. St Denys. Research backs this up.
- d. Why is there is nothing about a one-way system in the proposals?
- e. Gap on islands for cycles and scooters like on Church Lane
- f. Filters are the only thing that stop traffic. Fines are the biggest push factor.
- g. Make sure the trial is safe. An independent Road Safety Audit will be undertaken on any designs.
- h. Boy racers might treat narrowing as a race course.
- i. Waste of money as these roads are already blocked by cars.

**5. Broadway detailed design**

- i. Some found the drawings difficult to understand, particularly acronyms which needed clarifying. These are technical drawings which have not been simplified for the group
- ii. Comments on signage plan (doc 2.4):
  - i. TS14 and TS8 - why "alternative route". Too much information. Arrow needs to point in the direction we want people to drive. Nobody knows where the A335 is.
  - ii. TS12: meaningless as miles away from A335.
  - iii. TS14: can we say "local traffic only" - similar on most other signs.
  - iv. TS6 appears to be sending northbound traffic up Portswood Road left into Brookvale Road.
  - v. Why change the sign on the Avenue. Existing one is clearer than this.
- iii. Comments on General Arrangement (doc 2.3):

- i. Concerns re. change of restrictions on St Denys Rd spur. Delivery bay on there will not be used. They will continue to deliver on Portswood Rd. Right turn into the spur is a problem and will slow buses. Conflict with cycle lane. Don't use the spur! Create a pocket park.
- ii. Advisory lane adjacent to spur road should go as far as the zig zags. Can the cycle lane continue along the zig zags

#### **6. Outcome of monitoring sub-group meeting 1: proposed KPIs**

- i. A few comments from the sub-group received by email were summarised
  - a. Disagreement with the priority ranking
    - Agreed not to use the priorities in future. They were never intended to give different weightings to the objectives. All will be measured.
  - b. Objectives unlikely to be met by a trial/part-time scheme
  - c. Economic Assessment should benchmark business performance in Portswood against other similar district centres
- ii. Clarification on acronyms in the document (2.5)
- iii. No monitoring sub-group meeting prior to next Steering Group; more time needed for consultants to prepare baseline report

#### **7. AOB**

- i. Members to send in comments on items of today ASAP by email by Friday 6<sup>th</sup> September (13<sup>th</sup> if absolutely not feasible). RB and SCC will review comments and produce a Steering Group response; this will be reported to the group at meeting 3.
- ii. People need to be listed in the minutes. Anyone who doesn't want to be listed must let SCC know (if preferred by email- by the end of this week)
- iii. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Steering Group meeting will take place Monday 21 October 5.30-7pm in Portswood (location TBC)