

## **HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Operations and Place Shaping Board held on 10 March 2020

Present

Councillor Lloyd (Chairman)

Councillors Carpenter, Jenner, Milne, Raines, Rennie and Robinson

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s): Bains, Keast, Robinson, Satchwell, Scott and Thomas

### **50 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Francis and Councillor Guest.

### **51 Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meetings of the Operations and Place Shaping Board held on the 16 December 2019, 17 December 2019 and 28 January 2020 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

### **52 Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

### **53 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest relating to items on the agenda.

### **54 Decision Call-In: Hayling Island Transport Assessment**

The Chairman invited Councillor Keast to sit as a guest of the Board. His knowledge and experience of planning matters could help inform the Board and encourage discussion. She explained to Members that whilst he could speak and inform the debate he could not vote.

Following an outline of the process for the call-in meeting, and the possible outcomes, the Board received deputations from Mr Dave Parham and Professor Nick Hounsell. Mr Parham objected to the Hayling Island Transport Assessment Addendum on the grounds that:

- a) Hayling Island was a unique and vulnerable island and therefore should be treated as such;

- b) there was no way to determine the flow capacity of the single access road and therefore the resultant impact on the island of allowing more traffic to run through it;
- c) the proposed mitigation did not satisfy the requirements of the flood risk strategy and therefore did not allow for sustainable infrastructure.

Professor Nick Hounsell objected to the Hayling Island Transport Assessment Addendum on the grounds that:

- i) there were no alternative routes to and from the mainland on the island besides the single access bridge;
- ii) whilst the government guidelines for the traffic simulation model were for it to fall on the average normal term time day, Hayling Island's situation was unique in that the Summer and weekend traffic was more significant to record;
- iii) a range of scenarios should be forecasted in order to get the most accurate data result, such as the effects of windfall, summer traffic and the best and worst outcomes measured up in order to justify the decision either way.

The Chairman invited Councillors Satchwell, Robinson, Scott and Thomas to present their reasons for the call in and the alternative action requested.

Councillors Satchwell and Thomas set out their reasons for the call-in. The main points raised in the call-in were:

- the capacity of the single access road on and off Hayling Island was unknown and therefore the full impact of mitigation could not be known;
- lack of clarity as to where funding for the mitigation packages would be found and how it would be achieved in time for implementation of each stage;
- the yet to be determined viability of the Hayling Billy Line whilst being included as an area for potential mitigation could lend to further issues;
- the data used for the mitigation packages coming from the 2011 Census which is close to becoming out-dated;
- the microsimulation model did not include data from the Summer months at peak times when anecdotally traffic was at its worst, or projected data considering windfall developments;
- areas concerned with flood management were included in the mitigation package when in reality they were areas at risk;
- the decision had not yet been through a Scrutiny process beyond its formulation.

They requested that the Board refer the decision back to Cabinet. In response to a question by the Board concerning their preferred amendments to the addendum, Councillor Satchwell explained that they had a belief in community involvement and transparency as a Councillor, and they felt that residents' concerns and comments about the Transport Assessment Addendum had been overlooked in previous meetings of the Hayling Island Infrastructure Advisory Group. They also felt that the Addendum was a difficult document to fully understand due to its technical nature, but their main points for concern were the population increase the Transport Assessment Addendum may facilitate, flood risks across the island and the wider borough, and unsustainable development.

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Lead for Planning, Regeneration and Communities, Councillor Pike, responded to the call-in. He thanked the officers for their work and explained that he was confident he had received the best advice in order to make such an important decision. He reminded the Board that Planning Policy was not an independent area of the council and must reflect national protocols and methodology. If they did not conform to these protocols, then any decision could be overturned by the Inspectorate. He explained that Cabinet had used public scrutiny multiple times by allowing residents' groups to join the debate and deliver their thoughts. He explained that it was a once in a lifetime decision for the council to make and whilst they could not correct the mistakes of the past, they were able to help the future. As the council was the master planning authority for Hayling Island, they needed to ensure all aspects and resultant effects of the Addendum were considered, such as environmental benefits, safety, community severance and more consistent journey times. He reiterated that improvements were expected to be funded through development and that he was confident the funding could match the work in the order in which it was needed.

The supporting officers then gave a presentation providing clarity to the decision.

In response to questions by Members, the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Lead for Planning, Regeneration and Communities explained that:

- 1) the Hayling Billy Trail needed feasibility studies to determine what purpose it could hold, the funding of which was secured at the February Council meeting when the Community Infrastructure Levy was agreed;
- 2) some improvements to the A3023 would take place before any new dwellings were built and some would take place whilst dwellings were built, but it was better to get much of the funding prior to mitigation implementation;
- 3) the Hayling Island Transport Assessment Addendum had gone above and beyond the normal requirements to allow development to take place, and whilst improvements to the road network were not necessary to allow development to take place, it was deemed desirable for residents and visitors to make such improvements;

and

- 4) development on Hayling Island was determined by the Local Plan, not by the Transport Assessment.

In response to questions by Members, the officers responded that:

- a. the simulation model was commissioned for the 2036 Local Plan and as such it was designed to only mitigate development within that plan;
- b. the Transport Assessment Addendum had shown that developing all mitigation packages could only take place with the funding provided by developers, and therefore development was crucial;
- c. there were two separate assessments - one for the mainland and one for the island – because they were intended to perform two different functions;
- d. the areas allocated for friction reduction measures were all within public control;
- e. the purpose of the Hayling Island Transport Assessment Addendum was to provide a possible solution to the transport issues the island faced and would face, not the complete and full guaranteed solution;
- f. the transport model was run according to guidance that it should be modelled on regular days considering normal conditions, not on abnormal events such as Summer peak times;
- g. the severe impact is measured by impact on more than car drivers; the mitigation proposed is to improve connectivity, safety, road-user observation, and more. There is no quantifiable measure of “severe”, but all mitigation measures should have a positive impact on all aspects of travel;
- h. all models are for an imagined future, and as it is not impacted by development which could take place after 2036 they cannot alter the present without the decision coming to appeal;
- i. the model was taken via Bluetooth and collected data between 7am-10am, 11am-2pm, 4pm-7pm. Video cameras on the dashboard were used to help measure this and the data was collected in the Summer months.
- j. the Sinah Lane development would provide approx. £700,000 worth of funding for mitigation, which was proportionate given the size and scale of the development;
- k. windfall sites on Hayling Island were difficult to predict but if the council were to try to do this then it would threaten deliverability;

- l. there is no finite capacity of a road as it is a dynamic stretch;  
and
- m. whilst the planning policy team did not compare Hayling Island to other areas in looking at the Hayling Island Transport Assessment mitigation, they did follow national policy guidelines, and areas such as flood risk mitigation would be looked at later, on a case by case basis.

Councillor Satchwell as the primary Call-In Councillor gave a final statement.  
Councillor Pike as the decision maker gave a final statement.

The Board then debated whether the call-in of the decision was necessary. The Board were unanimous in their response that the decision call-in was necessary at this time.

Board Members then debated their actions in response to the call-in. Concerns by Members included the feasibility of the Hayling Billy Trail for mitigation measures; the reliability of phased funding; issues around flooding on the island and how that would interrupt mitigation; and the desire to use updated data which took into consideration windfall development and more current population statistics.

A vote was taken and it was AGREED THAT the decision be referred back to the Decision Maker for reconsideration on that grounds that they should consider:

1. including a document to include a phased funding timeline with trigger points;
2. further research in respect of flooding and how this might affect the mitigation measures proposed;
3. waiting until the feasibility of the Hayling Billy mitigation measure was determined; and
4. altering the addendum and mitigation measures to include data that the Council holds since the 2011 census, including windfall development.

***The meeting was adjourned at 19:50***

## **55 Winter Parking Charges on Hayling Island**

***The meeting reconvened at 20:00***

The Chairman opened the item by explaining the background behind the petition.

The Board discussed the nature of the petition, highlighting that it was not a conventional petition for the Council to accept as it had been submitted electronically and had not been supplied with a full list of signatories and their addresses for the Board to examine. It was noted however that the issue had

garnered significant public interest therefore the Board unanimously agreed to accept the petition.

The Chairman invited Mr Mark Coates to speak with the Board and make representations on behalf of the Lead Petitioner.

Mr Coates gave a representation as Petitioner Representative. They felt the car parking charges were an additional tax on local people as it was primarily Borough residents who used these car parks in the Winter months. He felt there was a lack of infrastructure at the seafront car parks which was not representative of the cost of using the car parks. Local businesses had been negatively impacted by the increased cost of using the car parks and trade was significantly lowered. Many of the car parks suffered from issues with erosion and being consistently weather-beaten given their location, which was not reflective of the cost visitors had to pay. He also explained that not everyone on Hayling Island was mobile enough to get to the sea by other means, and that the council's desire to maximise income was deterring visitors away from the beaches and from the borough altogether.

The Cabinet Lead for Neighbourhoods, Safety and Enforcement gave a response to the petition. She explained that the comments surrounding visitors not wanting to come back to the area due to the cost of the car parks was not backed up by the figures they held and that parking charges were implemented throughout the borough. She encouraged residents to visit the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership webpages which contained information about the work taking place on Hayling Island and surrounding areas. The nature of the car parks meant the council did not have the luxury of laying down tarmac as an easy response to the infrastructure issues some held, but the Cabinet Lead wanted the Board to know the council was doing the best it could to respond to the issues.

In response to questions by the Board and Petitioner Representative, the Parking Team Leader explained that some of the car parks on Hayling Island cost more to maintain than others due to the dynamic surface they had. Natural England determined what materials could be used to repair the car parks as they are located on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The West Beach Car Park, Central Car Park and Royal Car Park were SSSI car parks and therefore required more maintenance.

In response to a question by the Board about parking for disabled residents and tourists, the Traffic and Parking Manager explained that with a registered Blue Badge in their vehicle an individual could park wherever they needed, free of charge.

In response to questions by the Board and Petitioner Representative, the Head of Neighbourhood Support explained that:

- a) safety was the number one concern for any car park, hence the decision to close 50% of the West Beach Car Park to the public in November;

- b) whilst the West Beach Car Park had been damaged by the strong weather and tide conditions of the 2019/20 Winter Season, it was not beneficial to immediately repair this car park until the weather improved;
- c) with the new electronic payment system, the parking team were able to profile the users of the car parks and collate statistics to better improve the car parks;
- d) as car parking charges had not been imposed before 2018 and had remained the same price since, there was no way of accurately determining whether the charges had disincentivised visitors from using the car parks and the seafront businesses;
- e) West Beach Car Park still had a level of enforcement operating within it and the Council would be monitoring the levels of maintenance required in better weather to be implemented in the Summer;
- f) electronic payments through the app 'RingGo' meant that no visible tickets were needed in order to park in the seafront car parks.

The Cabinet Lead for Neighbourhoods, Safety and Enforcement gave a final statement. If any business believed that they had suffered a decreased footfall due to parking charges she encouraged them to approach the council with business plans in order to ascertain whether the council could offer any assistance. The Parking team would look into reviewing charging policies and how permits can benefit both the council and residents alike.

The Petitioner Representative gave a final statement. They felt there was a lack of infrastructure, pliability and dynamism to the car parks at present and did not feel the current charge was proportionate to the current quality or functionality of the car parks. He felt the surfaces of some of the car parks were difficult to negotiate and residents wanted there to be a sense of fairness and encouraging the local strip to thrive.

The Board then debated the matter. While Members empathised with the anecdotal evidence of businesses suffering or residents unable to find adequate parking, they felt the charges currently imposed were appropriate given charges found in other areas of the Borough, and that the quantity of free parking found on Hayling Island in the Winter months was more than sufficient in order to allow visitors to park without needing to pay. They felt that parking permits were a worthwhile investment and were wide-ranging and flexible enough to allow anyone to park where they desired on Hayling at the price they were willing to pay.

The Board therefore unanimously AGREED that no further action be taken in response to the petition.

The Chairman thanked the Officers, Members and Petitioner Representative for their time and chose to defer the final item of the meeting to the new municipal year.

**56 Enforcement - Relaunch/Rebrand of the Parking Service**

This item has been deferred for consideration in the new municipal year.

**The meeting commenced at 5.40 pm and concluded at 8.45 pm**

.....

**Chairman**