

Winchester Heritage Centre, 32 Upper Brook Street, Winchester SO23 8DG

Tel: 01962 851664
Email: secretary@cityofwinchestertrust.co.uk



Draft Winchester Town Access Plan

Comments of the CITY OF WINCHESTER TRUST, 12th November 2010

The Trust is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this plan. However, because our comments are extensive we found it difficult to respond on the website form.

All our comments have been entered on the website form but may not be in the correct boxes and format. We have therefore submitted this text version to help you understand our views.

These comments have been prepared by the Trust's Council to broadly reflect the views of our 750 members.

The Trust supports the headline aims of the Plan

We make the following comments on the Priorities:

Priority A Self Sufficient Communities

Agreed. However there needs to be a recognition that for most residents some trips will be by car and access to parking spaces and car clubs is essential.

Priority B Cycling/Walking

Agreed but a balanced approach must be made and pedestrian safety must not be prejudiced by cycle measures

Priority C Parking

Of course Car Parking should be carefully planned but this should not mean that decisions are delayed or constantly reviewed instead of implemented. A key objective should be to reduce traffic generation and demand in the central area. The pledge to close car parks once Park and Ride Car Parks were opened has not been honoured. There is now significant surplus of supply over demand but the vacant spaces will soon be filled, making the decision to close car parks

more difficult. Anecdotal evidence and figures supplied by the City Council indicate a far higher figure than 15% surplus places

This current over supply provides a golden opportunity to change the use of some of the central car park land for high quality housing and commercial uses which will in turn produce capital receipts or rental income for WCC. This will in turn reduce traffic on the one way system and result in better use of the inner ring car park for park-and-walk. The Brooks should ultimately be the only central car park fulfilling what you term "Those who occasionally find it essential to park centrally for a short period".. We are very surprised to learn that money is to be spent on carrying out some repairs to Friarsgate Multi-Storey and see this as a perfect opportunity to close this very shabby facility permanently.

We suggest that any remaining central car parks should be limited to a much shorter stay than at present to encourage people to park and walk from the 'inner ring' car parks where appropriate.

The Trust sees the reduction of street clutter as a high priority and does not want to see traffic management measures which require excessive signing.

Priority D. Impact of Vehicles

This priority should include the centre of the city as well as residential area. Proposals to introduce a 20mph zone have been being studied in Winchester for more than 10 years. Schemes in places such as Portsmouth, Salisbury and Malmesbury have proved successful and the Trust believes that the time to draw up detailed proposals for 20mph limit is long overdue. The Trust is please to see that proposals for reverting parts of the one way system to two-way are still being considered. We believe that this is the only way to provide the opportunity improve and enhance the pedestrian experience and the public realm in Friarsgate St Georges Street and Jewry Street.

Priority E. Public Realm

The recent improvements to the High Street are a great success and show how high quality public realm can be achieved. The Trust is very impressed by this work. Proposals for the Square and the Silverhill area are awaited and the Trust hopes that the same high quality will be maintained. We would like to see a concerted effort made to remove obsolete and unnecessary signs and other street

clutter. Measures should be taken to improve the design and quality of street furniture especially within the conservation area.

Priority F. Low Emission Vehicles

Agreed in principle but we do not think the very specific proposal for providing infrastructure for electric vehicles is high priority.

Priority G. Public Transport.

Agreed, but why is the subsidy for over 60's seen as a problem? This has very significantly increased bus usage and helped to retain services. It must also have significantly reduced car trips previously made by these passengers

Priority H. New development

The Trust would like to see a more proactive approach with more specific proposals arising from development proposal. Developer's financial contributions often disappear into funds with no conspicuous outcome.

We consider the following priorities are not covered:

Little mention is made of the opportunities to reduce traffic in the centre by targeting traffic seeking parking spaces right in the centre.

No mention is made of the opportunities to release the capital value of central car parks that ought to be closed and the development opportunities that these offer. There is no recognition that housing development on these sites would help meet housing targets.

Little mention is made of the need to better regulate servicing and deliveries in the city centre

This Plan is being prepared in parallel with the new "Blueprint" proposals and it is important that the two plans are inclusive and that neither is delayed by the other.

It is disappointing to see so many Long Term projects. This is understandable in the current financial situation but emphasises the need to get priorities right

We have the following comments on the Action Plan

We found the Action Plan difficult to follow and difficult to relate to specific aims and priorities in the text.

- APPA.02,03** *Travel plans have been a requirement for some time. The emphasis should now be on ensuring they are implemented.*
- APPB 03** *If we are to encourage walking then paving on footways must be of high standard but in replacing paving damaged by lorries etc using narrow streets, it is essential to ensure replacements are able to withstand the weight of lorries and not break again. We do not want to see more bollards or guardrails*
- APPB.05** *Better performance by Utility Companies is always talked about but remains poor. The recent very conspicuous tarmac reinstatements in the paving in The Square and outside QE II Court are prime examples. Paving should always be replaced immediately.*
- APPB.07** *Is the opportunity to provide a footway on the east side over the railway in Andover Rd now lost? This was a real failure in grasping an opportunity.*
- APPC.01/02.** *The time is right to reduce central parking space. Several very central car parks should be closed now to offset the 800 spaces opened at Winchester South P&R. We do not see where there were recent reductions in parking in Middle Brook Street.*
- APPC.04** *The relocation of coach parking to Bar End is favoured but should be offset by landscaping and enhancing the frontage of the Winchester Hotel (existing Coach Park)*
- APPD.04** *We are pleased to see 20mph scheme is at approval stage and is high priority. This has been wanted by many members for a long time.*
- APPD.05** *We are pleased to see Traffic Management Study is high priority and look forward to seeing the report before the end of 2010. Implementation of new measures should be high priority, and where appropriate, on experimental or trial basis*
- APPE.01** *Whilst these measures in the Square are needed there is an urgent need to review all delivery arrangements in the city. The priority should be to ensure deliveries are timely for businesses and have minimal interference to residents, pedestrians and shoppers.*
- APPF.02** *The price differential for very central parking spaces should be further increased but with reasonably cheap rate for very short stays*

- APPH.01** We agree that *Manual for Streets* principles should be applied but that developers be allowed to innovate and not have to apply the standards too rigidly.
- PBLT** We agree with the proposals to improve pedestrian and cycle facilities but care must always be taken to avoid conflict/sharing between pedestrians and cycles Repairing pavements should be high priority
- PELT** We support all proposals to reduce the dominance of traffic in the central area and ask to be involved in consultations at the conceptual stages in the same way we were for the High Street. This should follow on quickly from the traffic management studies
- PFLT 01** A car club should reach a wider market than the Silverhill development and its timing should not be held back by the timing of that development

Map of Key Services. This map, which is an insert to the plan contains a number of errors/omissions. The map doesn't seem to be referred to in the text and we question its relevance.

For example:

Neither Sainsburys nor Waitrose supermarkets are shown.

Tesco at Harestock is shown as a supermarket rather than convenience store whilst the Tesco at Andover Rd is not shown.

A supermarket is wrongly shown in Church Lane Kings Worthy

A police station is wrongly shown at Winnall

St Swithun's, Lanterns and Osbourne schools are not shown

Winchester College/Pilgrims school are not shown

River Park Leisure Centre is not shown

The doctor surgery at Weeke is not shown

The Area of Potential Growth at Bushfield misleadingly includes the downland to the north which has not been identified in this way before and must never be developed.

I Patton

Chairman

City of Winchester Trust.

14th November 2010

cc

John Sorrell HCC

Keith Wilcox HCC

Cllr Brian Collin HCC/WCC

Cllr Phren Dickens HCC

Steve Tilbury WCC

Andy Hickman WCC

Cllr Barry LipscombeWCC