

Portswood Steering Group meeting 5 minutes

1. Welcome/introduction/membership

- i. Introductions
 - a. Chair: Prof. Roger Brown.
 - b. Members: Andrea Sutcliffe, Angela Cotton, Barbara Claridge, Charlie Nicholson, Katherine Holmes, Johnnie Dellow, Karen Edwards, Sonia Cottrell, Lyn Brayshaw, Paul Beard, Pete Thomas, Peter Hull, Roger Munford, Chris Zardis.
 - c. Observers: Katherine Barbour.
 - d. SCC Officers: Wade Holmes, Greg Churcher.
- ii. Apologies
 - a. Members: Adam Tewksbury, Adam Truscott, Alex Iles, Clare Diaper, Elaine Cook, Jeanette Maidment, Kayleigh Hiscocks, Liz Murray, Spencer Bowman, Sue Swallow, Vijay Chopra.
 - b. Observers: Cllr Anne Marie Finn, Cllr John Savage.

2. Minutes of last meeting

- i. Peter Thomas was awaiting amendments to the minutes regarding comments on Dwell Time. He had emailed the amendment to Officers. Officers agreed and the update will be made.
- ii. 20mph signage – issue raised again that 20mph signage was too high. The information was noted by officers.
- iii. The flashing 20mph SLOW sign was not working and we should have these signs installed permanently. The information was noted by officers.
- iv. It was agreed in the meeting that the steering group would be notified but not necessarily consulted however we were being notified too late. The information was noted by officers.

3. Matters arising

- i. Principles to adopt
 - a. The Chair outlined four principles to adopt, intended to protect the integrity of the trial and the Steering Group. These principles are 1 There should be no changes to the trial other than on clear and urgent grounds of safety; 2 Any changes should be the minimum necessary; 3

Any changes should only be made after careful consideration of the wider consequences; 4 Any changes should only be made with consultation of the proposal by the Group (which could be by Chair's action if urgent).

- b. A member agreed that if changes were to be made to the current trial, then it needs clear rationale as it changed the nature of the trial. It was also noted that if you make changes then you create other issues.
- c. Other members were not in agreement as they felt there were dangerous issues on Brookvale Road that require intervention now and not at the end of the trial e.g. open Russell Place to allow traffic to use that road as well and not just Brookvale.
- d. SCC agreed that there was a clear steer that the trial was seen through.

II. Role of the Steering Group

- a. Clarification was sought on the ATZ Options paper and the role of the Steering Group, with reference made to statements made in the Council meeting held earlier that day. Members of the Group raised concerns that the Steering Group could be blamed for decisions made and outcomes of the trial and any potential changes to the ATZ.
- b. SCC Officers outlined that the Group was not asked to sign off or recommend the proposals but it was there as part of their Terms of Reference to give oversight and input into documents. The ATZ options paper to be discussed later on in the agenda did not need to be signed off in this meeting and would be a live document that members will be able to provide feedback on at any stage.
- c. It was agreed that the Chair would meet with Councillor Keogh to discuss the Group's concerns in relation to timely manner of information being given, the impact that the trial is having and clarification of the role of the Steering Group.

Action – SCC to set up a meeting with Steering Group Chair / Cllr Keogh

4. Council Update

- i. Clarification of Council Position
 - a. SCC reconfirmed that the Council was committed to seeing through the trial as per the existing layout.

- ii. 20mph on Church Lane
 - a. The 20mph speed limit zone had been extended along Church Lane. This followed requests by the school for their access to be included with-in the 20mph speed limit.
- iii. Brookvale changes
 - a. SCC updated that the interim Road Safety Audit had recommended changes to the trial layout on Brookvale Road. These were for the removal of one of the build-outs and a section of on-street parking. On this basis those changes had now been made.
- iv. Signage review
 - a. A member requested that one of the signs be reviewed again. This was on Brookvale Road with Waitrose on right, the arrow pointing drivers towards the bus gate.
Action - SCC agreed to review this sign and feed back to the Steering Group.
 - b. Members suggested the signs were not clear enough. There were too many words on some signs. There had been feedback to a group member that people do not know what a bus gate is. Not everyone knows the highway code terminology. The information was noted by officers.
 - c. The report didn't cover if there are better ways to direct people onto the correct routes or if new signs are needed. SCC confirmed that the report outlines that all entry points are covered by prescribed signage.
- v. Response to trial
 - a. As of 18th of March there had been 956 responses to the ETRO consultations. This was based on individual responses, not respondents. Any person is able to submit multiple comments.
 - b. There were two petitions. Scrap the Portswood Bus Gate which had received 1,004 signatures and Stop Portswood Bus Gate Trial which had received 1,405 signatures.
- vi. Road Safety Audit
 - a. An independent Road Safety audit had been carried out on the Bus Gate and ATZ measures installed for the trial. One change had been made based on this report as per the removal of build-out on Brookvale Road.
 - b. A member said they had come out to Brookvale Road at 4pm and not during the problem times when traffic is higher. The information was noted by Officers.

vii. February Monitoring Report

- a. Issue raised that dashboard was received same day as published in Daily Echo.
- b. It was asked why a third colour 'amber' was added to the dashbaord. SCC explained that the third colour was added to differentiate between modest changes and larger changes in the data.
- c. A clarification was asked about bus punctuality data and what it refers to. Information was asked on what punctuality information is available for other areas in the city for comparison.
Action – SCC to provide other punctuality data to allow for comparison
- d. It was noted by a member that the results look better than last months results for the trail.

5. Feedback from Monitoring sub-group

i. Minutes

- a. Amendments were suggested for the minutes of the sub group as follows:
- b. Request to make clearer that longer dwell time is not always a positive thing. What was shown in the baseline report was not heat maps.
- c. The minutes did not confirm that steering group will feed into survey questions. Please make clearer.
- d. Please make correction. Member did not tell people not to respond to the resident survey, only that they thought it looked like a scam.
- e. Request that it be confirmed where the Healthy Streets Assessment had been carried.
- f. Section 4.4 was last action was added after and not said by SCC in the meeting.

Action – minutes to be amended by SCC

6. Options for ATZ amendments

i. Discussion of the Document in general.

- a. SCC explained that the ATZ options outlined in this document were what could be done after the trial had completed and had been based on comments received so far from the trial. These had not come from SCC officers or Councillors. The SCC team had reviewed all the options for their

strengths and weaknesses and scored them based on the areas Strategic, Economic (not cost but benefit to society), Finance, and Management. The document aimed to capture all the options and all their positive and negative impacts.

- b. SCC now asked that the Steering group to add missing options as well as comment on the negatives and positives of each. SCC agreed it was not intended that the Steering Group decide which options should be implemented. The document once agreed with PSG would go to Cabinet to inform decision.
- c. The Chair commented that we could only discuss the options in general terms as until the trial ends, we did not know what the issues were to resolve. If you make a change in one respect it makes changes to others.
- d. Members noted that not everyone had yet provided feedback on the ETRO process or the Portswood inbox so some feedback would be missing at this point in time. The information was noted by officers, but it was pointed out that the document was considered a live document and could be added to as the trial continues.
- d. Further to this point, the Title only says community feedback not ETRO so needs amending. SCC should also clarify on the website that there was ongoing analysis of responses and individuals can respond twice.
- e. It was confirmed that the options should be considered for the whole ATZ area. This document is not just about Brookvale Road. Westridge Road and Belmont Road was raised as another area experiencing displaced traffic and near misses between pedestrians and cars.
- f. The group agreed that the summary table scoring each of the options needed revising. There was no clear science as to how each score had been determined, yet this table could have a lot of sway on decision making. It needed revising or even removing from document. SCC agreed if Steering Group want the scoring table removed then it can be.
- g. Member said it is not clear what the difference is between Economic and Finance. SCC will therefore consider an alternative title.
- h. It was questioned if the scoring sufficiently reflects the impact on buses. This should be considered.
Action – Steering Group members to provide feedback on the ATZ options
- i. Feedback on each of the ATZ options

Notes were taken on feedback provided by each ATZ option as discussed in the meeting.

Notes include issues relating to finance sections, scoring of each option, knock-on impacts of an option, examples of the treatment being used elsewhere.

Action – SCC to update options paper based on feedback raised in the meeting

7. Future Decisions

- i. Portswood Broadway Decisions
 - a. The Chair felt we were getting ahead of ourselves in the last meeting discussing outcomes of the trial, nevertheless it is worth reminding ourselves of what we may be being asked at end of trial. Any comments from the group on the options presented were welcome, otherwise it is to be reserved for reference.
 - b. A submission was read out from a member who was an apology, noting that members of the Group should read other SCC documents such as the Bus Service Improvement Plan.

8. Future meetings

- i. No date has been agreed for the next Steering group meeting. A date will be circulated by SCC in the coming weeks.

9. AOB

- i. A member spoke on behalf of local businesses asking SCC to consider what they can do to help promote businesses during the trial. Businesses have fed back that business is down since the trial started including the Post Office which of course people did not want to lose from the area.

Action - SCC will consider what options there are to help promote local businesses.

- ii. Further to this, the ATZ Options paper should consider amendments that would be beneficial for local business.

Action List

Item Number	Item	Action
3	Role of the Steering Group	SCC to set up a meeting with Steering Group Chair / Clr Keogh
4	Signage review	SCC agreed to review this sign and feed back to the Steering Group.
4	February monitoring report	SCC to provide other punctuality data to allow for comparison
5	Feedback from Monitoring sub-group	minutes to be amended by SCC

6	Option for ATZ amendments	Steering Group members to provide feedback on the ATZ options
6	Options for ATZ amendments	SCC to update options paper based on feedback raised in the meeting
AOB		SCC will consider what options there are to help promote local businesses.