

Notes taken by KEPC Representative at Meeting between KEPC Representatives & GCC on 11/11/2020 3pm

Meeting Friday 11th November 2020

Present Alexis Newport, Hannah Basset Lowe, Roger Pettit and George Collins. Councillor Shaun Parsons has intended to be present but had issues with connection

Q - Reference recent request from Kemble Parish Council for Experimental Traffic Order on Pheasants Hill section of Windmill Road;

ETRO cannot be used in these circumstances, specifically excluded in legislation where the outcome is known, guide price not less than £20K

Q - Asked about the 70% support figure mentioned in some Glos CC documents

70% support level figure – no depends on nature of scheme and who specifically respond and where they live exactly, and nature of comments received. Case by case Need Parish council agreement

Q – Can changes still be made after the consultation period

Where appropriate some changes can be made depending on the response and where they are as a result of consultation

Parish council will be involved in response to comments – shared response, use local knowledge but has to comply with Legislation and Glos CC policy, PC has no veto.

Q - PPA Details

Permit to park at any time in the operating times, can park anywhere that is not a yellow line

In bay park for 4 hours without permit or all day with permit

50 visitor vouchers @£1.25 whole day parking (book 10) any reg, any visitor

Trade waiver £20 per day

FAQ sheet available from Glos CC as part of presentation to Village

Visiting Blue badge not in residents only, but 3 hours in bays

Carer free permits for domiciliary care, park anywhere, just not on yellow line

Chase up on original offer of support from GWR for residents

Email received by KEPC Representatives following Meeting between KEPC Representatives & GCC on 11/11/2020 3pm

From: BASSETT-LOUIS, Hannah <Hannah.BASSETT-LOUIS@gloucestershire.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 November 2020 16:56

To: 'Roger Pettit' <Rogerpettit@hotmail.co.uk>

Cc: NEWPORT, Alexis <Alexis.Newport@gloucestershire.gov.uk>

Subject: Kemble Schemes

Hi All (sorry Roger please could you pass onto George as I don't seem to have his details and I will pass onto Cllr Parsons)

Thank you for attending the meeting this afternoon. It sounds as though we can finally move forward with this scheme. Just a recap of what we discussed and our plan of action:

Discussion

- Experimental TRO (ETRO) – AN explained that an ETRO is not appropriate for DYLS along Pheasant Hill. The legislation is very strict that an ETRO can only be used to carry out a genuine trial and cannot be used to get a scheme in quickly. There is no trial here as we already know the outcome – DYLS will mean that vehicles cannot park there. RP asked

about displacement parking. This is not classed as a trial because displacement parking is to be expected and there is plenty of car park space and residential roads to accommodate this displacement. An ETRO is built and brought into effect before public consultation, however, the public consultation is a lot longer than with a permanent TRO (21 days v 6 months). An ETRO also has to be closely monitored which uses a lot of officer time and makes an ETRO quite a costly exercise. An estimate is that an ETRO would cost not less than £20k but could be a lot higher if many representations are received.

- RP asked whether GCC had a policy where there needed to be at least 70% support before a TRO can be progressed. HBL and AN explained that as far as they were aware there was no such policy and that each scheme is dealt with on a case by case basis.
- RP asked if the PC would be included in any discussions about representations and ways to resolve any issues. AN confirmed that the PC would be included at each step of the process and work together as appropriate. The PC has valuable local knowledge that will assist GCC in their decision making.
- HBL and AN explained how the PPA worked including the purchasing of visitor vouchers, tradesmen waivers and free carers permits.
- AN confirmed that more (or less) marked parking bays could be considered but a site visit would be required to see the width and visibility issues. HBL explained that the proposal had been drawn up by an expert traffic project manager and that we relied on that expertise as to where he has marked the bays.
- Pheasant Hill – DYLS are required here whatever the decision is on permit parking. HBL explained that highway works were taking place to put a new footway in so the Council does not want these works ruined by cars parking on the footway. RP understood this.

Plan of Action

- RP to discuss the TRO options with George and then relay to the PC meeting on Friday 13th November
- PC to set up a further meeting to discuss just the TRO scheme and come to an agreement on which proposal will be taken forward and feedback to HBL/AN
- Deadline for a decision is 4 weeks from today
- Aiming to go out to public consultation in January 2021
- HBL to set up a final meeting on 8th December to agree the proposal plan. HBL will then allocate to a TRO Engineer to package the proposal together in readiness for advertising in the New Year
- HBL to chase regarding whether GWR are funding the permits

TRO Options

- To advertise DYLS along Pheasant Hill as a standalone TRO; or
- To advertise the PPA (with or without any slight amendments) to include the DYLS along Pheasant Hill – plan attached for ease
- To advertise the RPZ (with or without any slight amendments) to include the DYLS along Pheasant Hill – plan attached for ease

I hope this covers everything.

Kind regards,

Hannah Bassett-Louis
Traffic Regulation Order Manager

Network and Traffic Management
Gloucestershire County Council
Shire Hall, Westgate Street, Gloucester, GL1 2TG

✉ hannah.bassett-louis@gloucestershire.gov.uk

☎ 01452 583688/07900055380