

Co-operative Scrutiny Board

Wednesday 23 December 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor James, in the Chair.

Councillor Mrs Aspinall, Vice Chair.

Councillors Mrs Beer, Mrs Bowyer, Sam Davey, Deacon (substitute for Councillor Ricketts), Councillor Hendy (substitute for Councillor Murphy), Jordan, Sparling (substitute for Councillor Bowie), Storer and Kate Taylor.

Apologies for absence: Councillors Bowie, Murphy and Ricketts.

Also in attendance: Councillor Ball, Philippa Davey (Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities), Councillor Evans (Leader of the Council), Phil Heseltine (Head of Transport, Infrastructure and Investment), Robin Pearce (Smarter Choices Manager), Councillor Ricketts, Jim Woffenden (Transport Planning Officer) and Helen Wright (Democratic Support Officer).

The meeting started at 4pm and finished at 5.20pm.

Note: At a future meeting, the committee will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.

77. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the code of conduct Councillor Ricketts declared a private interest, as he was a resident in the area and rented out a property.

78. **CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Chair's urgent business.

79. **CALL-IN: THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT No. 2014.1636344 - CENTRAL PARK AVENUE) ORDER 2014 & THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH (MOVING TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) (AMENDMENT No. 2014.1636344 - SUTHERLAND ROAD, RESTORMEL ROAD) ORDER 2014**

The Co-operative Scrutiny Board considered the call-in of the Cabinet Member's decision relating to the City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment No. 2014.1636344 – Central Park Avenue) Order 2015 and the City of Plymouth (Moving Traffic Regulation Orders) (Amendment No. 2014.1636344 – Sutherland Road, Restormel Road) Order 2014.

The Co-operative Scrutiny Board hear that –

(a) Councillors Ricketts, Mrs Pengelly and Ball had called the decision in for the following reasons -

- the decision maker failed to consider alternative course of action; the action should be no action;
- the decision taker failed to take into account relevant factors;
- the call-in was in relation to the no-turn sign into Restormel Road on Sutherland Road; the cost estimates for the works on Restormel Road and Maple Grove for the cost of footway widening, dropped kerbs, related resurfacing and tactiles and so on was approximately £73,000; the cost of the necessary resurfacing works in this area was expected to be approximately £23,000;

this no-turn would cause gridlock on the Houndiscombe Road/North Road East traffic lights; the junction was already gridlocked at the various points in the day and this would only make it worse. The extra university outlets on the campus had caused extra pressure on the road junction; people could also use the back road of Sutherland Road and Restormel Road and this would create many traffic/safety issues;

this proposal needed to be removed from the decision.

(b) Councillors Ricketts and Ball considered that –

- the cost of the scheme on the council tax payers of Plymouth (approximately £100,000);
- the proposed no left turn into Restormel Road would cause gridlock in the area;
- the additional outlets on the university campus had created further pressure on the highway network in this vicinity;
- the scheme had been approved based on the results of the survey (1500 leaflets had been distributed with only 110 responses being received);
- the creation of a one-way system for Restormel Road would not make it safer for pedestrians or cyclists to use;
- a similar scheme had been sought on a narrow/restricted road in the Compton Ward but this had been refused by the highways authority which was considered to be a contradiction in policy;

- members of the public were not comfortable with the removal of parking spaces (six in total) and instead considered that the money could be spent on resurfacing roads and clearing drains.
- (c) the Leader of the Council (Tudor Evans), the Cabinet Member for Safer and Stronger Communities (Philippa Davey) Phil Heseltine (Head of Transport, Infrastructure and Investment), Robin Pearce (Smarter Choices Manager) and Jim Woffenden (Transport Planning Officer) responded with the following main points -
- the proposed scheme to improve walking and cycling in this area had been funded through two successful bids to the Department of Transport which had secured £885,000 from central government; the Council provided match funding in the sum of £559,000;
 - the proposed scheme included improvements for the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists being put at risk (there had been a recent incident whereby a vehicle had mounted the kerb which was putting the safety of pedestrians at risk);
 - a robust consultation process had been undertaken (statutory and extensive additional non-statutory consultation had taken place which had included the delivery of 1500 leaflets to households in the area);
 - if the scheme was not implemented the monies would have to be paid back to central government;
 - the increase in outlets on the university campus had reduced the number of car parking spaces on the site; it was not anticipated that there would be an increase in traffic in this area;
 - the decision related to the implementation of the scheme and not why the scheme was needed.

The main points arising from the Board debating the call-in included –

- (d) Councillor Ricketts confirmed that he had received the consultation information and had responded accordingly; he also confirmed that residents had also received the information but was not in a position to say whether they had read it;
- (e) Councillor Ricketts had circulated a leaflet (that he had drafted) and from his recollection had fed any responses he had received into the formal consultation process;

- (f) if the scheme was not implemented the funding would need to be paid back to central government; the monies could not be used for other highways works;
- (g) the scheme had been approved by design specialists and was considered to be safe for both pedestrians and cyclists;
- (h) officers were confident that the consultation process had captured the views of residents;
- (i) the majority of objections had been received from residents who did not live in the immediate vicinity.

The Board agreed to confirm that the decision should be implemented.

80. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

There were no items of exempt business.