

## **Cirencester Parking Demand Project**

### **Meeting Notes**

**13th July 2015**

#### **1. Welcome , Introductions and Apologies**

Attendees: Councillor Sue Jepson, Councillor Mark Harris, Councillor Chris Hancock, Christine Gore, Christine Cushway, Philippa Lowe, Claire Locke

Apologies: Councillor Nick Parsons

#### **2. Nomination and election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Councillor Hancock was elected as Chair and the Board agreed that no vice chair would be elected but should Councillor Hancock be absent another Member would substitute for him.

#### **3. Terms of Reference (TOR)**

Draft TORs were discussed and it was agreed that:

- The inability to resurrect the Cirencester Parking Partnership and undertake a holistic review including on and off street parking in partnership with GCC, should be highlighted in the "Background" section.
- Adopting a Collaborative approach to tackling parking demand should be added to the project "Desired Outcomes".
- Understanding the options for acquisition and disposal of car parks as Council assets should be included under "Desired Outcomes".
- Meeting notes highlighting issues and actions would be produced and published.

**ACTION – CL to amend TORs and circulate to Board**

#### **4. Project Initiation Document (PID)**

Whilst this project would focus on Cirencester, it was agreed that where solutions are identified which can be transferred to other settlements this would take place.

As in the Terms of Reference, outcomes will be amended to include collaborative working and asset management of car parks. Key stakeholders should include Community groups and local pressure groups and communications should go out to stakeholders before they are issued to the press. Cllr Harris offered to provide CL with list of relevant community groups.

**ACTIONS – Cllr Harris to send list of groups to CL**

**- CL to amend PID and circulate to Board**

#### **5. Risk and Issues Log**

Initial risk log produced by Officer Group was noted and will be updated and presented at each Board meeting.

The following Issues were raised at the Board meeting and will be documented in an Issues log:

- Without direct involvement from GCC it is essential that links are maintained as off street and on street parking can't be considered in isolation.
- Parking issues in other settlements such as Tetbury and Moreton in Marsh need to be addressed but this should be picked up as operational issues.
- Need to get a legal opinion from Bhavna Patel – if the Board support a planning application to provide additional parking, how does this affect Board Members who sit on the Planning Committee – would they have to declare an interest?
- Currently developers can use capacity within the Council's car parks to meet the needs of their development which means they do not have to meet parking needs on their development site – an example of this is the Brewery Development. If this continues an additional provision CDC puts in could be 'used up' by developers. The Board were keen that there should be requirements in the local plan that developers have to meet their own parking needs on-site or ask that they make a contribution to off-site provision. It was noted that a maximum of 5 developments can be grouped together to pool S.106 funding. Board felt that development that is not anticipated in the Local Plan should have to provide its own car parking. This should apply to development both on Council land and private land.  
**ACTION - PL to consider how this can be built into Local Plan.**

## 6. Project Plan

The Government has announced changes to the Local Plan process and it is anticipated information including a timetable will be published in the next 2 weeks. Once this is received a detailed project plan for the parking demand project will be drawn up to compliment the Local Plan timetable.

**ACTION – CL to produce project plan.**

## 7. Funding for feasibility studies

A high level review of all sites is required to assess potential suitability. Much of this can be done quickly, using CDC knowledge and information but will document why certain sites are excluded from further consideration i.e. poor access. Some sites have been considered historically but this will need updating i.e. Waterloo, as flood risk has now changed. A more detailed feasibility study will then be required of sites that may be viable. It will be of benefit to use external consultants to get an independent view of issues and sites. A Report will be submitted to Cabinet in September for initial funding.

## 8. Communications

A draft communication to all key stakeholders was discussed which will be issued within the next few days.

Stakeholder meetings will be held and it was highlighted that a process for receiving comments is needed. It was suggested that FAQs could be used to provide information on key issues relating to the project i.e. Does the council have to provide parking?

**ACTION – CL to work with Bob McNally to redraft and issue communication on project**

## 9. Date of next meeting

**9.30 a.m. 3<sup>rd</sup> September – Akeman Room, CDC**

# Cirencester Parking Demand Project

## Meeting notes 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2015

***Please note these notes are available to the public except any sections shown in yellow which must remain confidential.***

1. **Apologies:** Councillor Sue Jepson  
**Attendees:** Councillors Nick Parsons, Chris Hancock and Mark Harris  
Christine Gore, Claire Locke, Christine Cushway, Philippa Lowe

### 2. Actions from last meeting

Need evidence to show impact on parking before can negotiate with developers over provision – currently analysing survey data and looking at what additional information may be required.  
Need to establish what the developments impact is and what the options are for dealing with it.

Survey data obtained shows that there is capacity in car parks at various times of the day. We have told permit holders that they can park in alternative car parks i.e. Waterloo. The data can be used to better manage the capacity by trying to encourage people to park in alternative car parks. Will feed into stakeholder meetings where the capacity is – they could trial this.

**ACTION CARRIED FORWARD – Requirement for developers to meet their own parking needs on-site, needs to be covered in Local Plan (PL)**

### 3. Terms of reference

Some minor amendments – otherwise TORs agreed.

### 4. Project Initiation Document

Current version agreed.

### 5. Site specific discussion

#### Old Memorial Hospital site (Sheep street car park)

There has already been Council approval to dispose of this site and start marketing it but with caveats regarding no loss of parking. Need to understand demand and also assess how much developers are likely to do to provide parking. Maintaining disused building is expensive but the site provides 76 parking spaces. Total demolition did not initially appear to be an option as English Heritage objected to its removal for provision of additional parking. Demolishing the back whilst retaining the front of the building, would provide about 20 additional spaces but cost £600K approx. to demolish rear section and refurbish retained building. Building is not listed and provision of additional parking would contribute to the vitality of the town – so this may provide greatest public interest. There will be local sensitivities.

**ACTIONS – Check when receipt from sale of OMH site is in financial plan (CL).**

- **Discuss site with stakeholder groups to get their views (CL)**

**DECISION - Boards advice to Cabinet – not to actively pursue marketing at this time.**

Will need to do some protective work – need to consider whether to do short term repairs or just put hoarding around to prevent entry or injury.

#### Brewery car park

Decision taken to dispose of the Council land to facilitate the development, now discussing access arrangements, position of hoardings etc. Likely to be on-site Nov/Dec. 2015. The survey data can be used to tell motorists where there is alternative capacity. There will be a permanent loss of 25 spaces, and an additional 25 -30 spaces will be temporarily lost during construction.

Market place work will start in Nov – phased but will result in some loss of spaces.

Text has been deleted to protect confidential information relating to specific negotiations with site owners, site purchase and lease negotiations and financial data which cannot yet be made public.

If a car park is developed as a Strategic site we could seek CIL or S.106 funding for implementation.

The planned Improvement programme for CDC car parks will result in a loss of car park spaces.

**ACTION - need to calculate the impact of this loss of spaces (CL).**

#### **6. Stakeholder consultation**

Three stakeholder consultation meetings planned in for September – feedback to Board at next meeting. Board expressed concern whether we are reaching retailers as they aren't widely represented within the Chamber of Commerce.

#### **7. Cabinet Report**

Board agreed that as we are unsure exactly what feasibility works will be required the amount requested should be increased from £50,000 to “up to £75,000”.

**ACTIONS - Circulate survey results to Board Members (CL)**

- **Calculate how many unused business spaces there are– how many additional permits for Waterloo could we provide? (CL)**

Date of next meeting: 23 November 2015

# Cirencester Parking Demand Project

## Meeting notes 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015

**Please note - these notes are available to the public except any sections shown in yellow which must remain confidential.**

1. **Apologies:** Christine Gore  
**Attendees:** Councillors Nick Parsons, Chris Hancock, Sue Jepson and Mark Harris  
Claire Locke, Christine Cushway, Philippa Lowe, Chris Vickery

### 2. Minutes of last meeting

(2) *ACTION – Chris Vickery to prioritise calculating impact of development on parking demand.*

*ACTION – Report to Board in January on calculated future parking capacity required.*

CL informed the Board that Fiona Woodhouse is managing this work; looking at the calculation of parking impact as a result of the local plan, assessing the potential loss of spaces from the car park improvement programme, impact from existing approved planning developments (increased demand or loss of spaces) and any other parking demand issue we have become aware of.

Text has been deleted to protect confidential information relating to specific negotiations with site owners, site purchase and lease negotiations and financial data which cannot yet be made public.

(4) *ACTION – PL/CG to have discussion with SJP about how receptive they would be to green travel plan/ parking on outskirts and SJP provide shuttle service. ACTION - Carried Forward.*

(5) Text has been deleted to protect confidential information relating to specific negotiations with site owners, site purchase and lease negotiations and financial data which cannot yet be made public.

Text has been deleted to protect confidential information relating to specific negotiations with site owners, site purchase and lease negotiations and financial data which cannot yet be made public.

### 3. Overview from CV on Local Plan

Out to consultation on Reg 18 – planning policies and some strategies including Cirencester Town Centre. Have tried to take account of all relevant evidence. Cirencester Strategy is quite flexible but clear in its intent so provides the necessary context for future planning decisions.

Policies should cover all the bases i.e. a decked car park – policies should inform that decision.

One of the key things in the SPOD was the need for traffic management, need to resolve the parking issues so we know what we are dealing with in terms of traffic management. Also frees up other parking sites for development. Cirencester has a lot of potential but its development is locked up in the parking and significant investment and a holistic approach.

Next stage – whole plan consultation (Reg 19) in Spring 2016, this is the examination stage. Asking Amended to take account of new evidence. Won't invite general comments, it will be asking what within the plan is unsound.

At the moment we don't have sufficient evidence to put weight against planning decisions – need interim position. ACTION – need to identify interim position , Parking team to summarise evidence (complaints, parking data) and CL will then discuss with Planning team. Committee should take the work of this group into account – well known there is an issue we are trying to address; planning by negotiation can then see if we can get something out of developer.

Back up with Evidence, David Halkyard pages 85/86 – run past a planner (would it work)

Pages 102 – 104 – CV all key sites should have prepared a master plan based on parking impact in advance of any submission.

AOB

Civic society keen to take steps to ensure Old Station is preserved. If museum in cottages could be moved to Old Station. Significant costs to repair.

Date of next meeting – 8 Jan 2016