

Overview & Scrutiny Task Group Meeting Notes



| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Review topic | Date of Meeting |
| Lichfield City Centre Masterplan – Car Parking | 27 July 2021 |

| Attendance | Venue |
|---|--------------|
| Members: Ball (Chair) Baker (Vice Chair) Checkland Cross Warburton Apologies: E. Little (Cabinet Member) Officers: Helen Bielby Simon Humble Dash Dhadwar Christine Lewis Witnesses: None | Virtual |

| Areas Discussed |
|--|
| <p>Election of Chair and Vice Chair It was noted that due to the new rules of procedure following the O&S Committee restructure, it was for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the overarching O&S Committee to appoint Chairs of Task Groups based on experience and training. It was reported that for this Task Group, Cllr Ball had been appointed as Chair. It was recognised that Cllr Baker was also considered however was currently Chairing another Task group and so agreed to assist Cllr Ball in a Vice-Chair role. Introductions were then given for all in attendance.</p> <p>Governance The Governance arrangements for the Task Group were noted and it was reported that they would be in line with the Council’s Constitution.</p> <p>Introduction to the Lichfield City Centre Masterplan</p> |

The Task Group received background to the overall project including the Plan itself, update of the project and timescales. It was requested that Members receive a hard copy of the Masterplan for ease of reading. It was agreed that as the Masterplan was an approved project, focus for the meeting would be on the Car parking Strategy.

Car Parking Strategy

It was noted that there was a scoping document identifying the required outcomes from the Task Group and the draft strategy. It was reported that the group needed to give their opinion as to whether the strategy was robust enough to go to the project board and then Cabinet for approval.

There were concerns that the document, as produced by consultants, did not have the level of detail expected with no options included. It was reported that it was a high level document which would then bring forward the action plan of works/projects/ business cases to be undertaken. Members felt that it was more a broadbrush evaluation and review document and suggested that it be referred to as such to prevent any potential disappointed expectations.

It was discussed that there was little data shown on where, what and why people came and parked in the City and therefore difficult to know if the strategy was a correct one. It was felt that there should be more information on behaviour data of parkers. It was felt that some people feel more confident to park at certain sites due to layout or space size and other reasons and that this should be investigated further to gather more understanding. It was felt that Multi Storey Car parks were considered unsafe to many users. It was reported that much of this information had been received via the consultation questionnaire but it was noted that it may not be obvious in the strategy however could be referred to greater in the action plan/business plans. The task group was reassured that the public's views on the car parks would be equally taken into account as well as the consultants professional scoring of sites.

It was felt that provision of parking spaces to match the overall housing numbers agreed in the Local Plan should not be forgotten. It was reported that the consultants had used a recognised formula to come to their conclusions on recommended spaces however the strategy would be continuously monitored including parking demand.

Toilet provision was discussed and the need for them including accessible facilities including changing places and it was noted that it would be covered more in the Public Realm Strategy.

Disabled parking was discussed and it was felt that the Friary Inner site would be a good location for many blue badge spaces.

It was discussed how the introduction of café pavement licensing had impacted these users and would continue to in the future. It was noted and agreed that outdoor dining had enhanced the city centre but it was felt that the bigger picture on parking needed to be balanced against this.

Park and Ride was considered and it was felt that Lichfield City was a more compact area with the out of centre areas being much closer than other places that run these schemes eg York or Worcester and so it was questioned if this would actually be of benefit. It was suggested that it could be useful during peak times of the events calendar including festivals. Similar, cycle routes were discussed and it was noted that there was a balance between the need for green transport vs the potential impact on an already compact centre.

It was asked if the consultants could give advice regarding the targets on the Council's own delivery plan on matters such as number of EV charging points and cycle parking provision and it was reported that they would be asked for their views. Members also felt that the additional

interventions of Variable Messaging Systems (VMS) and Flexible Charging Systems should be considered/included on the emerging action plan.

Transfer of some car parks to a private operator was discussed and there was concern on how they were being run as well as the fines charged to residents especially blue badge holders. It was noted that Officers were in discussions with the operator to resolve these issues as much as possible.

Outcomes

That the Strategy be referred to the project board however be considered as more a review and evaluation document.

Further Work Required/Next Steps:

To consider the priority of action plan/projects formed from this overarching document.