

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. 3rd September – Akeman Room, CDC