



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT &  
SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE  
ADDENDUM**

**4.00PM, TUESDAY, 14 MARCH 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD,  
HOVE, BN3 3BQ**



# ADDENDUM

**ITEM**

**Page**

**72 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

**1 - 10**



14 March 2017

Brighton & Hove City Council

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

**(i) Brighton & Hove Bike Share- Jonathan Bromberg**

*"1.9.16. I stated "It's clearly much more sensible that the proposed "hub" is sited further north along Whitecross Street so it's away from residents premises, commercial premises / deliveries, and also closer to a large group of potential users of the "hub", being students at City College".*

*2.9.16. ward councillor supported this.*

*Officers never responded about this alternative.*

*10.11.16. FOIA response states "This allocated area needs to be continuous (not interrupted by street furniture) and alternative sites identified unfortunately don't provide such a footprint."*

*Therefore council officers have NOT considered all alternatives identified.*

*Why has this alternative not been considered?"*

**(ii) Brighton & Hove Bike Share- Sandy Crowhurst**

*We would like information as to how the Operator will deal with servicing and maintenance (whether by removal or on the highway) and redistribution of bikes to avoid pile-ups at docking stations.*

**(iii) Electrical Vehicle Charging Points- Paul Norman**

*"Would the council consider placing EV charging points adjacent to all Car Club bays in the proposed Hanover & Elm Grove CPZ area, and include this in the forthcoming Traffic Regulation Order?"*

**(iv) Hanover & Elm Grove controlled parking zone consultation- John Woodington**

*“The street plan was drawn up with no definitive determination of the number of parking spaces required other than a dubious, limited survey by HEGLAT. Could residents be assured that an accurate survey will be made ensuring that the proposed plan will provide residents with sufficient parking spaces for vehicles already DVLA registered (+10% contingency?) and nobody will be required to sell vehicles or face daily fines of £70. This could be achieved by those requiring spaces applying for permits prior to final draft completion. The object of the exercise is to improve lives not cause stress or confrontation.”*

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes.

Deputations received:

**(iii) Deputation: Traffic on Surrey Street**

Since the Station Gateway development our street has become gridlocked. It's become an unofficial taxi rank, with taxis queuing to pick up passengers off the trains. Buses and lorries struggle to get round the corner of Queens Road/Surrey street.

A temporary bus stop outside the Railway Bell, Surrey Street, has become 3 permanent bus stops. These stops block off traffic whenever a bus has pulled in. There is no yellow line on the road opposite, so cars may legitimately park there, and taxis block the other lane by queuing up for the limited spaces in taxi rank in the front of Brighton Station.

Buses regularly mount the pavement to pass stationary taxis, half pulled up on the other pavement, which is dangerous pedestrian traffic. The Emergency Services often cannot get through, which results in the use of sirens at all hours of the night. The last train from London arrive at Brighton Station at 2.32am and then bin lorries and deliveries start up very early, so sleep is very difficult!

The road layout and resulting congestion has added to environmental noise and traffic air pollution in the area, which has a direct impact on everyday lives for residents. There are a number of children living on the street and in the surrounding area. Other residents have been signed off work due to depression and stress due to lack of sleep due to horns beeping at all ours, as the road layout is not working.

We ask that the committee considers and reports on the following actions:

We would like to see a red line throughout the street to stop taxis queuing on the pavements and loading bays.

Can buses and taxis use the top of Queens Road to access the station, or have the taxi rank moved to the back?

Can the council make a Compulsory Road Purchase order for Mangalore Way, and use this area to develop an overflow taxi rank?

We request that the air quality in this area of Brighton is monitored and any reports for the area be made public.

We request that a higher level of policing is established in the area, traffic cameras and installed, and that a CPO be installed to help manage the situation. As we have suffered the impact of this development for the past three years, and in the light of it appearing to continue to deteriorate, we seek your support to find some solutions to all of these continuing problems.

Charlotte Glasson (Lead Spokesperson)

Jan Kordek

Wendy Hall

Phillipa McEvoy

Brian Roe

Ilham Trari  
J Thornton  
Emma Melson  
Brian Pace  
Alice Woods  
Hilary Standing  
Russell Glasson



#### **(iv) Deputation: Parking on Pankhurst Estate**

The Queens Park Community Association represents residents living on the Pankhurst estate. We have organised meetings to enable residents to become informed about the Controlled Parking Zone proposals for our area. We did not take a view on the best option believing that it was up to residents to consider carefully the paperwork and decide themselves- we are now adding our support to the views of our residents gave in the consultation.

When Residents on the Pankhurst estate were asked if they would like to be considered for a controlled parking zone, they said NO. When residents living in the area proposed for a light touch parking zone were asked the same question in the consultation they also said NO. Imagine our dismay on seeing the committee is being asked to ignore the votes of the residents and impose a light touch controlled parking on us and others that voted against. We urge councillors instead to listen to and support residents

In the consultation, residents were asked at public meetings to consider the impact of displacement and whether the parking situation would get worse and whether it would be better to opt for controlled parking now. However despite uncertainty concerns over displacement, residents of Pankhurst have voted NO to controlled parking. Given the uncertainty, we ask that the situation is reviewed in a year's time in case residents no longer oppose controlled parking. We understand that zone U is to be reviewed in the future and would like our estate to be part of this review.

During the consultation we were discovered that on the Firle, Glynde and Clayton roads would have double yellow line on both sides and no parking at all. Yet there were no yellow lines on the consultation maps and this confused many people. The council did correct this with postcards sent to some addresses. But many people in these roads had already voted, many voted under the impression that they would still be able to park on one side as now. Thus the consultation on Pankhurst Estate was (albeit unintentionally) misleading and flawed. When they did find out about yellow lines in Clayton Rd, 83% of residents voted against having a scheme! There are around 170 households in these streets that will lose all of their current parking, displacing large numbers of cars into the rest of the estate. There is also concern that these roads will used as a race track for motorbikes and become more dangerous.

We will be speaking to residents in these roads and bring their views to committee.

We remind you that we are voters who will take note of which of our elected councillors support us.

To conclude, the consultation was flawed and misleading. Many did not realise they would lose all parking on their streets. Despite some not realising the full loss of parking, residents still rejected on controlled parking. On behalf of the Pankhurst estate residents we urge that you take notice of our views and:

- 1) Exclude the Pankhurst Estate from the light touch controlled parking and reject the zone as a whole
- 2) After a year the Pankhurst estate are given the opportunity to reconsider their choice in the light of the impact and opt to join a neighbouring zone

Supported by:

Tony Price (Lead Spokesperson)

Jane Brown

Amanda Orchard

Tracy Weller

Anita Anderson

Lisa McSorley  
John Beresford

**(v) Deputation: Parking in Hanover & Elm Grove**

We run a range of businesses within the Hanover & Elm Grove area included within the proposed parking scheme. Having considered the proposal and discussed the possible impact with other business owners and Council officers, we have grave concerns for the future of our businesses if the proposed parking scheme were to be introduced in its current format.

We strongly feel that the needs of businesses in the affected area have not been fully considered by the Council when drafting the parking proposals.

Our businesses within just 100 yards on just these few streets of Whippingham Road, Bernard Place and Brading Road (as an example of the types to be found in the area) vary from a children's nursery, dance studio, garage, pub and electrical contractors. Between us we employ over 120 people (including over 20 apprentices). We strongly believe that unless the proposed scheme or Council policies are amended, our businesses are at significant risk of closure or downscaling. Businesses in the Fiveways area of Brighton in which a CPZ was recently introduced have reported a reduction in turnover of up to 25% hence our extreme concern. From the published consultation results, it is of note that our businesses are sited within the proposed Light Touch scheme which is being proposed as operating seven days a week. Our scrutiny of the results shows that 58% of the Light Touch streets voted for the scheme to be five days a week not seven.

Rather than just saying 'no' to the parking proposals, as a group of businesses, we have been proactively looking to come up with amendments that would reduce the impact of the parking restrictions. Our businesses do have varying parking requirements for staff, visitors and customers and therefore believe a range of amendments are required and should be at least piloted in our area. These include:

- Business Permit Allocation - we feel that the blanket policy of issuing businesses with only two business permits does not reflect the varying needs nor size of business. AJ Taylors as an example of the businesses, employs up to 70 people and has a fleet of 40 vehicles; two business permits is simply not reflective of the needs of the business. We believe the allocation of number of business permit needs to be more flexible.
- Visitor & Customer Permits - we have been told by Council officers that businesses are currently not allowed to purchase the Visitors Permits that residential properties have access to. As businesses we feel this should be reviewed prior to any parking scheme being introduced. By having the ability to issue (give or sell) staff, visitors or customers parking permits it would greatly reduce the harmful impact that the parking scheme could have on our trade & turnover. Having access to such vouchers would encourage customers in to local businesses, prevent dead spots in the trading day and allow staff to park close to their place of work. For offices such as AJ Taylors, having vouchers would still allow visitors and meetings to be held during parking restriction hours. For businesses such as the pub and dance studio, vouchers would still allow customers to park and have a meal, or attend a half day dance activity. For the garage, it would allow mechanics to park the ten or so cars they work on each day. For the nursery it would allow the dozen staff who commute by car to retain their jobs. Expanding the residential Visitor Permits to include businesses would create additional income for the Council and mirrors the existing Hotel Permits scheme that is available to hotel businesses in zones C & N.

Whilst these solutions and modifications have already been suggested by us to Council officers, we are concerned that they will not be considered for implementation ahead of any parking scheme being introduced. The response of the 'scheme will be reviewed after implementation' is simply not good enough; we fear that by the time of any review our businesses will have been forced to move, fold or downscale.

As a collective of businesses, we would urge the Committee members to consider the impact on businesses and our suggested amendments. We strongly believe that the draft proposals and policies must be revised to minimise harm to businesses, prevent job losses and to avoid changing the character of the communities.

Supported by:

Simon Colquhoun (Lead Spokesperson)

Andy Taylor

Mark Bryant

Ceyda Tanc

Liza Amos

Angela Page

Lee Godden

Peter Shooter

Alex Wingham

Damien Jordan

Malcolm Searle

**(vi) Deputation:** Statement from Hanover & Elm Grove Local Action Team Parking Sub-Group

We are broadly supportive of the Council's attempts to provide parking solutions for the whole area. However, we recognise that the findings of the consultation and the proposals do not address problems in Elm Grove (the road), the streets known as the Top Triangle\* and on the Pankhurst Estate where residents will lose large amounts of parking. The current proposals appear to do little to improve the arrangements for residents in those areas.

We request that the Council commit to working with local residents and HEGLAT to explore more viable solutions. We therefore support the petition and deputations brought by residents and businesses at this stage of the process, to this Committee.

In order to increase parking capacity and improve traffic calming, we request that the Council consider the provision of a short length of cars parked on BOTH sides in some of the medium-width streets where car spaces are currently proposed for ONE side only.

We understand that the fire service will accept streets of less than 3.1m consistent with those seen in Zone J at Brewer Street, St. Paul's Street and Mary Magdalene Street, and on this basis, we request that the Council revisit the designs in some of the medium sized streets in Hanover.

We support the residents of the Top Triangle area to be re-consulted in the light of the proposed scheme and we support the residents of the Pankhurst Estate in their desire to be excluded from the current scheme, and for this to be revisited again in 12 months.

\*Carlyle Street, Arnold Street, Lynton Street, Baxter Street and Cromwell Street

Supported by:

David Hearne (Lead Spokesperson)

Chris Roberts

Wilf Nichols

Andy Hampson

Peter Fitzgerald

Emma Barr

Peter Greenwood

Clare Halsted

Linda Morrice

Paul Norman

Chris Margerison

**(vii) Deputation: Hanover & Elm Grove Controlled Parking Proposals**

I wish to ask the Committee to consider adding some short lengths of parking on both sides in some medium width Hanover streets that are currently proposed to be altered to parking on one side only.

The purpose being to address concerns of insufficient parking capacity in the proposal, and to provide traffic calming to help prevent these streets becoming blighted by faster traffic.

I will present evidence of similar layouts in other schemes and responses from the Fire Service.

Nick Adams (Lead Spokesperson)

Chris Taylor

Steve Gladwin

Phil Newmarch

David Hunt

Dominic Marley

Ben Grover