

PSG Meeting 3 Minutes

1. Welcome/introduction/membership

- i. Introductions
 - a. Chair: Prof. Roger Brown.
 - b. Members: Adam Tewkesbury, Adam Truscott, Andrea Sutcliffe, Angela Cotton, Charlie Nicholson, Chris Zardis, Johnnie Dellow, Lawrence Coomber, Liz Murray, Lyn Brayshaw, Paul Beard, Pete Thomas, Peter Hull, Vijay Chopra.
 - c. Observers: Cllr Katherine Barbour.
 - d. SCC Officers: Alex Thurley-Ratcliffe, Carolyn Ireland, Martina Olley.
 - e. Consultant: Philip Moss.
- ii. Apologies: Ali Haydor, Barbara Claridge, Clare Diaper, Graham Johnson, Jeanette Maidment, Karen Edwards, Spencer Bowman, Sue Swallow.
- iii. Resident of Uplands Estate contacted the Council interested in joining Steering Group but heard no further. SCC did respond to the email with details of the next meeting but there was no response to this. SCC to attempt contact again.
- iv. Welcome from Chair:
 - a. Meeting 2 report is now on the project website.
 - b. Good public information is important. An update letter will be sent from Council to residents and other stakeholders, including TRO information.
 - c. Mentioned Portswood Shopping Centre redevelopment and planning application; Highfield Residents Association have asked the Council to defer consideration of this until there is a strategy for Portswood Broadway.

2. Minutes of last meeting

- i. [4.iv.b] Why are names not in the minutes?

Attendees/apologies are noted (since meeting 2) but comments are not attributed to specific individuals. This is as agreed at meeting 1 following a lengthy discussion; some members felt they could not be free and frank with their views if their comments were attributed to them in writing, as there could be repercussions for their business/organisation.
- ii. [4.iv.e] Don't recognise the statement that there was low representation of people with children at co-design workshops. Others do remember this.

- iii. [4.iv.e] How do you know there were not many cyclists or people with children at co-design?

This demographic information was not collected however many attendees discussed this with their group – particularly how people travel round the area, as this was a prompt question from facilitators.

The minutes are not a statement of fact, but a record of discussions at the meeting.

- iv. [4.v.6.c] “Research backs this up” – which research?

Council can point members to relevant research by follow-up email. But given the original point was raised by members, those members should highlight any other research to which they were referring.

3. Matters arising

- i. None

4. ATZ detailed design (for information)

- i. Detailed design has been sent to members. Cycle bypasses and marked priority added, following comments received on sketches presented at meeting 2.
- ii. The design feels safer with the cycle bypasses, especially inset A, B and C.
- iii. How do cyclists use Brookvale Road with the new design? Cyclists may be tempted to overtake on the pavement (on the left).

In the non-bypass direction traffic has priority, so cyclists (and drivers) can continue with general traffic unimpeded as opposing vehicles should give way.

Where there are bypasses, cyclists do not need to give way to oncoming vehicles, though if there is slow/stationary traffic they may need to overtake to reach the bypass. The Highway Code states cyclists may pass slower moving or stationary traffic on their right or left and should proceed with caution.

There is not sufficient road space to include cycle lanes (at least not without significant loss of on-street parking).

- iv. Concern around materials used for cycle lane defenders. Those in St Mary’s are vulnerable to cars.
- v. The traffic filter gaps are not wide enough to accommodate cargo bikes- should be minimum 1.5m.
- vi. Highfield Lane gateway is missing from the plan. This is on a separate drawing and will be available with the TRO documents.
- vii. Any further comments will be recorded but cannot be incorporated into the detailed design of the trial.

5. TRO consultation (for information)

- i. Annexes C & D detailing legal methods of introduction of each measure sent out with PSG2 report on 8 October.

Now available publicly on Council website. Can be shared by members.

- ii. Clarification requested on when to comment on different elements.

This is explained in Annex D (p2). Any elements can be commented on 25 October – 15 November.

Comments made on the ETROs before they come into force (27 January 2025) will be recorded but will only be considered along with all other responses to the ETROs following the end of the six-month consultation period.

Comments on the permanent TRO, and any other mechanisms, will be reviewed at the end of the TRO consultation period.

- iii. Why does the 20mph on Highfield Lane now start west of Shaftesbury Avenue?

Starting it at the Portswood Road junction is likely to be costly and require significant traffic management (road closure) to install new posts. Extension could be considered at a later date, as part of a wider 20mph roll-out; this area is intrinsically linked to the Portswood Project.

- iv. Can the TRO report / comments be copied to the Steering Group?

An update can be given to the Group. Individual comments are not usually published by SCC; TRO is a standard process that should be respected.

Discussion around whether members should be able to review all public comments received:

- a. Some feeling that this should be part of the Steering Group's role, and indeed that it might be difficult for the Group to fulfil this without seeing the detailed comments. One member felt that it would be impossible for the Group to fulfil its requirements without seeing the comments.
- b. Others felt the Group is intended to sit at a more strategic level and so doesn't need to see specific comments.
- c. The Chair could work with officers to ensure any summary is representative, so the Group does not get bogged down in too much detail (losing its ability to steer) but ensuring Officers are trusted.

- v. Will Public Notices be posted on lampposts in the area?

Yes, also copies available in Portswood Library, October Books, Gateway (in the Civic Centre), on the website and can be shared by residents' associations etc.

- vi. Is the TRO consultation different to the recent resident and community survey?

Yes, the TRO consultation is part of a formal legal process required to introduce the scheme. Residents can comment on, support or object to the proposals, and comments will be reviewed at the end of the consultation period. The decision on whether to implement the measures as advertised is delegated to

the Head of Transport & Planning in consultation with the Executive Director Growth & Prosperity and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

The resident and community survey is a voluntary survey conducted by WSP on behalf of SCC. It is a questionnaire about people's experience as a resident or visitor to Portswood high street and the surrounding area. Results will feed into the baseline monitoring report, and surveys repeated near the end of the 6-month trial.

6. Preparatory works

- i. Works to be completed between now and bus gate go-live (provisional 27 January 2025):

- a. November / December 24

1. Highfield Gateway installation
2. Portswood Road left hand filter to St Denys Road
3. Re-phasing of St Denys Road / Thomas Lewis Way lights
4. Installing signage poles for the 20mph and Bus Gate

- b. January 25

1. ATZ buildouts/cycle bypasses and traffic filter
2. Bus Gate (cameras, layby resurfacing, high-friction surfacing, lining, lighting, illuminated signs, Meristem parklets, St Denys Road spur works)
3. Signage for the Bus Gate and 20mph
4. Bus shelters

- ii. Will the Council consider lifting the right turn ban from Portswood Road to Highfield Lane?

This will not be changed under the trial as it would impact the ability to accurately monitor outcomes of the bus gate trial. There were also concerns raised at previous consultation and co-design workshops around removal of the restriction.

- iii. Re. the Portswood Road left filter light: won't allowing/encouraging more left turns affect safety of the pedestrian crossing?

St Denys Road has a controlled signalised crossing which will remain; pedestrians will have their own green time.

- iv. Thought high-friction surfacing was not being used?

HFS is not being pursued in the ATZ due to cost, and difficulty to remove should the trial not be made permanent.

HFS is being used on the Broadway, as it can remain in place regardless of the trial outcome as a safety feature to help to slow traffic in front of shops. There will be no “bus gate” lining on the road during the trial, so no changes to the HFS regardless of trial outcome.

- v. Information should be added to the update letter about preparatory works.
- vi. Actual planned works dates will be confirmed in due course and communicated to directly affected residents.

7. Monitoring and evaluation

i. M&E timeline presented

- a. Future Steering Group dates to be added.
- b. What will the review period be at the end of the 6-month trial, before any decision is made?

Per the M&E timeline, the evaluation report is due approximately 2 months after the conclusion of the 6-month trial. Time will then be required to formulate recommendations and present to Cabinet (and/or other Committees/Boards TBC) for a formal decision. This is not yet a fixed date but could take until around December 2025. The ETRO legally allows for a trial length up to 18 months, but we would not expect to use the full 18 months for an unchanged trial.

ii. Resident & community engagement survey

- a. What was the coverage? Many people didn't hear about it. Some people on Abbots Way and Russell Place say they didn't receive the leaflet.

Surveyors were out over 6 days in various locations across the ATZ area. They delivered leaflets and door knocked residents.
- b. SCC need to make sure the consultant upholds good standards; there is a level of quality control needed when work is commissioned. There is a cost associated with the M&E which is taxpayer money.
- c. The leaflet didn't contain enough information. A lot of people binned the leaflet thinking it was a scam. Some people thought it was to do with the Portswood Centre redevelopment.
- d. Survey questions can be shared with members to make sure they are in line with the KPIs.
- e. Survey could be publicised with lamppost flyers, like with TRO Notices.
- f. QR codes need to be supplemented with a URL (and not a bit.ly link).
- g. For any Council consultations, consider more use of emails instead of paper. Better for cost saving and the environment.

- d. Meeting towards end of 6-month trial and any further meetings to be scheduled in due course.
- ii. These would replace existing future meeting dates:
 - a. Weds 5 Feb 25: PSG meeting 4.
 - b. Thurs 8 May 25: PSG meeting 5.
- iii. The new meeting dates were agreed and will be circulated by follow-up email.

9. AOB

- i. Summary by Chair:
 - a. Meeting 2 Report and Annexes are now published on the Council website.
 - b. The Council will be sending a letter to properties in the area on 25 October with an update on the project and information about the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation and how to comment. A copy will be shared with members.
 - c. The consultant's monitoring report containing baseline data will be shared with the Council in November, and following this discussed with the Steering Group – either by email or via an additional monitoring sub-group meeting.
 - d. A written progress report including outcome of the TRO consultation and next steps for the scheme installation will be shared with the group in early December.
 - e. The next meeting of the group will be on 15 January 2025.