## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE - (4th July 2023)

## PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No	Question / Comment sfrom:	Item	Question
1.	Mark Rison	LHI Improvem ent Programm e	Coldham's Lane in Romsey is a residential road that has long been neglected or even harmed in favour of both neighbouring residential roads and neighbouring ring roads. It suffers from a toxic combination of congestion and speeding, and the consequent chemical and noise pollution. It was due to receive a modal filter as part of the active travel funding in the Covid era, but this funding was squandered, so active travel remains heavily discouraged.
			I understand that four proposals were put forward under the LHI scheme to provide partial relief: two Zebras, a weight limit and a 20 mph limit. And yet, again it seems Coldham's Lane will get nothing.
			What has happened to these applications? It seems the weight limit application was "withdrawn", but it is not clear by whom was it withdrawn, or on what basis. Gilbert Rd and Victoria Rd, for example, have one, so Coldham's Lane in Romsey should also have one. And the 20 mph limit application has just vanished. Mill Rd and Cherry Hinton Rd both have 20 mph limits. Even Coldham's Lane in Cherry Hinton has one! So Coldham's Lane in Romsey should also have one. We don't want to be promised some vague city-wide scheme at an undefined point in the future, and that will be abandoned in the face of opposition from the motoring lobby (see: congestion charge), we need action for Coldham's Lane in Romsey now!
			Response:
			<ul> <li>The 20mph application has been moved to the 20mph process as bids for 20mph limits aren't accepted through the LHI programme. Applicants will be updated on the prioritisation outcome later in the year, and a report with the prioritised list for delivery will go to the October H&amp;T.</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>The costs for the zebra crossing applications exceed the programme limit for the LHI fund by a considerable margin. Officers are currently working on alternative funding options which have been discussed with the local member, and other members in the LHI member working group.</li> </ul>

No	Question /	Item	The weight limit application doesn't meet the current HGV policy due to existing site-specific issues. These will be discussed with the applicants in more detail via a constructive feedback session with officers in due course. An email has been sent to the applicants explaining this.  Question / Statement
•	Comment s from:		
2.	Councillor Alex Bulat	LHI Improvem ent Programm e	I would like to make two comments for the committee to consider in how to best improve the scheme for our residents in the next round:  First, we need better communications with residents on those schemes. For example, in my division in Abbey, while one of the previous year's schemes has been completed, I heard nothing about another scheme funded at the same time for the last months. Regular communications with local members and residents are essential to maintain trust in our services.  Second, I would like to ask the committee members to consider how the LHIs we fund as a county can be better integrated with wider schemes. For example, one of the schemes proposed to be funded in my division is for parking restrictions in Riverside. This is an area of high public interest, with several applications made in the past and failed parking schemes. Residents have been asking for a continuous footpath for over a decade part of the Riverside Vision approved by the City Council. At the same time, we have the GCP's Bottisham Greenway proposed to cross Riverside as
			well as a possible GCP East Riverside residents parking consultation soon. This is a good example of how we must coordinate all local projects better with the GCP developments which have been progressing since the LHI application was submitted.  However, I was pleased to see the changes in the LHI process this year, separating schemes into complex and non-complex and streamlining decision making. I think we are moving in the right direction, offering local residents more say over local improvements and I thank officers and the committee for all their work on this.

	Response:
	Statement- No response required.