



# **ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE ADDENDUM**

**4.00PM, TUESDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 2018**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



## **ADDENDUM**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>39      PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>5 - 16</b>



**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.

**(iii) Valley Gardens Phase 3- Angi Mariani**

“One of the key objectives of the plan, even if not stated in the original list of objectives, must be to create ease of access for all people travelling to the city, whether resident or tourist, and by whatever mode of transport. The council planners have indicated that the new scheme will increase journey times for private vehicles. Removing the west side road outside the Royal Pavilion, and diverting buses to the dual carriageway, loses a lot of road space and bus lay-bys and potentially increases the journey times further. Could this west road remain and be used solely by buses, taxis and the cycle lane. It would have the added benefit of moving the cycle lane away from the dual carriageway?”

**(iv) Valley Gardens Scheme- Tam Duy Dao**

“With the funnelling of all traffic to the east side of the Old Steine for Phase 3, which is contradictory to the overall division of public and private transport seen in Phase 1 and 2, why does this scheme differ in its environmental and civic responsibilities by creating pinch points, additional bus stops, bi-directional bus lanes, narrow traffic lanes, congestion and associated emissions by channelling all traffic on the east side for the inclusion of limited public space by the closure of the west side to buses in front of the Pavilion”

**(v) Valley Gardens Scheme- Simon Thetford**

“What consultation and impact studies have been undertaken with businesses in the Old Steine in respect of the proposed loss of car parking and vehicular access?”

**(vi) Valley Gardens Scheme- John Healy**

“At the ETSC October 9th, a report from the office of the Executive Director, EEC presented an appraisal study, recommending a single option for public consultation - the only one of four that did not conform to the core proposal in the Capital 2 Coast commissioned Independent Business case report that *“Buses, taxis and local access will be moved onto a consistent route that will run along the western side of Valley Gardens, and private vehicles will be kept*

*on the eastern side of Valley Gardens".* How was that position arrived at and has that been sanctioned by the LEP?"

**(vii) Valley Gardens Scheme- David Bailey**

"As a business Healy's occupy 2 buildings on the East Side of Old Steine which we have done for 25 years. We employ 35 lawyers and support staff and there are numerous callers to the office each day. Often our clients are elderly or disabled and they require, and have enjoyed, easy access to our buildings by using the open area in front to park, or be dropped off. The scheme proposed eliminates that open space and provides no workable alternatives. Please explain how will our clients and others be able to enjoy equivalent access to our offices if the proposed scheme is adopted?"

**(viii) Valley Gardens Scheme- Nic Roe**

"The area outside 1-15 Old Steine is essential for Brighton Language College's day to day operational needs (tour group arrivals and departures, home stay provider meet and greets, deliveries, maintenance and suppliers). The historical substantial access on which our business and all local businesses rely upon and cannot operate without or the impact of any restrictive loading or parking bays installed leads one to ask how this scheme meets our continuous operational needs and at the same time fulfil our 2014 Section 106 Sustainable Transport Contribution relating to the land at 6-7 Old Steine for a "footway island?"

**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:

**(i) Deputation: Parking Restrictions Hove Park Parking Consultation**

Residents have been asked whether they wish to be included in a new Scheme proposed by the Council. A Scheme already operates satisfactorily in part of the Ward, and it has done so for many years. It is efficient, perfectly understandable, and it provides the maximum number of parking spaces with one hour restrictions morning and afternoon on each side of the roads concerned.

The Council says that it does not wish to continue this current Scheme, but it proposes to introduce a full double yellow line Scheme with parking bays and expensive signage.

If residents do not agree to the Council's proposal then the only alternative the Council offers is uncontrolled parking. Residents do not want to return to such chaos.

We ask that the Council reconsiders its stance. The current single line Scheme should be maintained and, for the sake of uniformity, introduced across the whole of the Ward. Residents are prepared to pay for parking permits if the current Scheme is maintained.

**Signed by:**

Christopher Duncan (Lead Spokesperson)

David Nissan

Liam Murphy

Cherry Irving

David Stevens

Dr Maria Finn

David Diplock

Patricia Stevens

## (ii) Deputation: Hove Park Parking Consultation

I am the Chief Operating Officer for the UK Protection business for Legal & General here in Hove, and the Hove Location Director. This deputation is to register Legal & General's opposition to the proposed parking restrictions in the Hove Park area.

As you may be aware, our site is based at Hove City Park, at the Droveway, and borders Hove Park and Nevill Road. As we have no access to any public car parks in the vicinity, restricting parking will make the daily commute very difficult for our employees, and as a major employer in the city, we have no doubt that this will have an impact on our ability to attract and retain employees.

We currently employ more than 1800 people who are based in City Park. Our on-site car park has 400 spaces, and as you may be aware, many of our employees also use the surrounding area to park. In an effort to minimise potential parking congestion and to reduce overall car use, we invest £250,000 a year in implementing a number of measures to encourage our employees to opt for alternative and more sustainable methods of transport. These measures include a car share scheme (where car sharers are given priority access to our car park), shuttle bus to and from Hove railway station, park and ride operating from Withdean, coach service to and from Kingswood in Surrey for our Surrey-based employees and a cycle to work scheme. We are also investing in technology to enable more of our employees to work from home which will further reduce the traffic to the office on a daily basis, at a cost in excess of £1million.

Legal & General has chosen Hove as one of its key locations from which it supports more than 7 million customers. As a result, we provide high quality jobs in multiple disciplines, including Finance, HR, Actuarial, Sales, IT, Operations and we are in the process of adding another 100 Digital Development roles. However, despite our best efforts and investment, parking does remain one of our main challenges when it comes to attracting and retaining employees. It is also a major concern for our current employees who are worried about what parking restrictions will mean for them and their ability to continue to work in Hove going forward. This would not be so much of a concern if there were alternative parking provisions in the area, such as an NCP, but there is no alternative parking for our employees. However, residents living in the areas where parking restrictions are proposed, do have an alternative, as most homes in the area have driveways and off-road parking. While we have introduced many options to support alternative travel, some people are not in a position to use public transport due to where they live, or are put off by the cost, or have caring responsibilities at either side of the day, which means they require the most efficient means of getting to work.

The light touch proposal, while it may seem more flexible than some schemes, would simply not be practical for our needs. Restrictions at any time during the day rules out whole day parking in one place. Even if it were possible to move your car to somewhere else at these times, I am not sure there will be anywhere to move your car to, and it would not be practical to have potentially a couple of hundred cars being moved in the course of the day, creating business disruption and congestion on the streets. This isn't what we would want for the area, and I am sure the residents would not welcome this either.

While the area to the east of us will remain unrestricted for the time being, there will be additional pressure on this area following any changes around the Hove Park area, potentially creating a challenging situation and making it more likely that further restrictions will follow in the future.

Respecting our neighbours, including residents is extremely important to us. This is why we have invested so much in alternative transport methods to help minimise the inconvenience to residents caused by our employees using local streets for parking. As a large city employer we bring economic benefits to the local economy in addition to the benefits we bring to the community through our charity and community work.

We are committed to continue to do this, however the parking restrictions proposed in the absence of any viable alternative parking in the vicinity would present an increasingly challenging situation for us. We are extremely concerned that any parking restrictions in the Hove Park area would make attracting new employees difficult for us, and we could lose existing valuable employees, putting us in a hugely challenging situation as an employer. I urge the council to take account of our needs in their deliberations.

**Signed by:**

Karan Martin (Lead Spokesperson)

Phil Anderson

Lucy Pearce

Pam Edwards

Paul Lewis

Tanya Rousseau

- (iii) **Deputation:** Seeking a solution to the dangerous and disruptive traffic flows between The Old Shoreham Road and Highdown and Lyndhurst Roads in the Goldsmid ward of Hove.

I am speaking on behalf of the residents of Wolstonbury Road and Silverdale Road in the Goldsmid ward of Hove. Wolstonbury and Silverdale Roads should be quiet residential streets, they lay between the busy A270 Old Shoreham Road to the North and Highdown and Lyndhurst Roads to the south, and at present they bear the brunt of traffic looking for a short cut between the two. The residents of Wolstonbury Road have been seeking a solution to the use of their residential street as a “rat run” for 15 years.

A petition was presented in 2004 and again in 2017 by householders, asking councillors to implement measures that could transform the street, but during that time the traffic has become worse. Two factors have contributed to the worsening of the situation:-

1. The scheme to improvement Seven Dials junction in 2013.
- 2.The expansion of BHASVIC college.

We have spoken to dozens of residents and found overwhelming support for action to tackle the problem. The petition presented by the residents of Wolstonbury Road in January this year was signed by 184 residents.

Following the presentation of the petition to this committee in January, residents were promised that officers would look into possible solutions and provide answers through their local councillors. The residents have heard nothing and no solutions have been provided.

Will you give the residents of Wolstonbury and Silverdale Roads a commitment to look again at providing a real and lasting solution to this worsening problem by permanently closing access to these streets from the Old Shoreham Road? A solution inline with the councils own policies to create safer less polluted streets. To prioritise active clean transport solutions, and to give residents a say in the way their city is governed?

**Signed by:**

Steve Moses (Lead Spokesperson)

Cllr Amanda Knight

Tobias Glass

Theo Goodyer

Kristina Astrom

Bakhtiar Saeedvafa

Jodie Botterill

Chris Berry

Simon Bellringer

Susan Thorpe

Richard Silver

Matt Thornton

#### **(iv) Deputation: Valley Gardens Phase 3 Option 1**

In conjunction with the 'The Brighton & Hove Taxi Trade Submission Document' we respectfully request the council to fully re-examine Option 1 of the Phase 3 with regards to the economic impact not only directly to the taxi trade but also the higher taxi fares that will be imposed on the general public with specific reference to:

##### **1: Grand Junction Road / Old Steine / Marine Parade / Media Drive Intersection**

The replacement of the current and established roundabout system with a T-Junction with phased traffic lights that trade predicts will cause a knock-on effect to traffic both East and West of the junction adding to higher taxi fares at weekend that has not been taken into consideration with the councils method of Modelling

##### **2: Madeira Drive - One Way Entry**

The new one-way only entry to Madeira Drive creating a huge one mile long 'Cul de Sac' with the enforcement for the only exit for all traffic.... which includes taxis.. buses...coaches delivery vans and cars at the far East of Madeira Drive at the junction of Dukes Mound and Marine Parade.

The trade predicts this will cause major issues of tailbacks and severe congestion at that junction in addition to higher costs of taxi fares for all intended West and Northbound journeys having to travel the unnecessary distance of up to two miles to loop back West along Marine Parade after getting through the junction at Dukes Mound

##### **3: No left turn for busses and taxis North Street /Old Steine**

The removal of the current road layout system that allows taxis and busses to turn left at the bottom of North Street which will enforce these public transportation vehicles to queue up at new traffic lights at the newly formed junction on the East side of Grand Parade to join the new two-way traffic system to head Northbound.

In addition

##### **4: Hackney Carriage Ranks**

To allow full consultation between the trade and other businesses in the areas the replacement one specific established rank. The retention of one specific night time taxi ranks and the addition of a much needed taxi rank in an area which is currently used as an unofficial taxi rank by 'out-of- town' taxis and private hire vehicles which are not licensed by the council that work under the direction of Uber.

##### **Signed by:**

Andy Peters (Lead Spokesperson)

Andrew Cheesman

Andy Beal

Tony Breslin

George Ayad

Mohammed Shahjahan Ahmed

Mark Durell  
Sean Ridley  
George Beresford

#### **(v) Deputation: Valley Gardens Scheme- Option 1**

We wish to express the deep concern of Old Steine based organisations, businesses and residents identified below concerning the loss of the open area currently used as an essential facility for us all.

Option 1 as currently proposed removes access / loading / setting down on the East side of the Old Steine with no alternative site. This simple change would effectively force relocation for some of the smaller businesses and render it almost impossible for the surgeries, college, offices, pubs and restaurants in the area to function in the medium to longer term. It's important to restate here that none of us are against overdue improvement to the area, but the way we live and work in the city centre has not been fully considered - or on the face of it, considered at all up till now. It is staggering that nobody thought of consulting the Pavilion & Regency Surgeries 2,3 & 4 Old Steine until we raised the issue with the Senior Planner. These are vital city surgeries with 15,000 registered patients requiring disabled parking, GP parking bays and space for loading and unloading, couriers collecting blood samples, medical supplies and ambulances 8am-8pm seven days a week. When asked about this, we were assured that of course they had been consulted throughout. After a very strong complaint and repudiation, the Senior Planner had a first meeting with them last week.

Brighton Language College is the largest independent English school in the city with 3,000 students a year operating 4 buildings (5, 6, 7 and 12 Old Steine), with additional classrooms in the high season acquired from the University of Brighton close by. We employ 80 staff. The open area outside our premises is essential for our survival, enabling them to operate on a number of levels, from tour group arrivals and departure, home stay meet and greets, blue light services in the case of emergencies, deliveries and waste management.

The open space has been accessible for over 200 years and residents and businesses have developed using access to this area fundamental to their operational requirements. We urge the committee to provide a firm assurance that an amendment to the plan allowing continued access to our premises for the purposes of access / loading / setting down as well as guaranteed parking provision for doctors and elderly or disabled patients will be included as part of the 'irreducible core' of the proposed development. Pavements could still be widened or reshaped and this amendment to the scheme would have minimal impact in terms of a loss of new public space.

Until a few days ago, we were under the impression that the core rationale for funding the Valley Gardens was to make public transport a more efficient, attractive solution to getting around the city, easing congestion and improving air quality as a consequence. Option 1 which funnels traffic into a narrow corridor will achieve precisely the opposite. Option 3 takes into account dedicated crossing points for cyclists, improved access for pedestrians and offers a ready-made solution to all of the above. Buses and taxis retain a dedicated lane to the West of the Old Steine, allowing them easy access to a dedicated, contiguous bus lane in the adjacent area. We urge Councilors to pause, think again about Option 3 and the near universal support which that slightly amended version would achieve.

#### **Signed by:**

Gary Farmer (Lead Spokesperson)

Michelle Spicer  
Jeff Wood  
Anna Moulson  
Simon Botting  
Emma Clarke  
Diana Palmer

**(vi) Deputation:** Valley Gardens preferred Option 1

We are addressing you today because of our fundamental objection to the adoption of 'favoured' Option 1 on account of the effect it will have on our businesses. Brighton Palace Pier is the biggest single visitor attraction in Brighton. We rely upon day-trippers, stay-trippers and Brighton families being able to easily gain access to the iconic attraction. The ability for vehicles, whether private or public, to reach us is of significant concern to us, as it is the life blood of our businesses, bringing more than 4,500,000 visitors each year to us and for all seafront businesses. Tourism is essential for a vibrant and strong city and the ability of tourists to easily arrive at their destination is a key ingredient when they are making travel decisions. It is expected that this scheme would increase travel times in to the city which make the destination less attractive, if this happens then the tourists will seek alternative destinations.

The proposal to run all traffic along the east side of Old Steine will adversely affect traffic access to the seafront. Merging private vehicles with buses and taxis in the way proposed will exacerbate congestion, creating unprecedented tailbacks from the seafront and well into the northern approaches to the centre. The scheme designers' ambition to create a public space to the east of the Royal Pavilion is admirable but simply ignores the complex way the city has evolved as a successful resort destination.

Traffic delays will also increase if you proceed with the proposed T junction between the Old Steine and the seafront. We understand that road safety has been put forward as a reason to re-configure the area. Whilst the current roundabout may be unattractive, there is little doubt that traffic moves more freely and is demonstrably safer (in terms of serious injury or measured fatalities over the last 5 years) than at other nearby junctions. The seafront already becomes congested peak times, adding traffic lights into the mix would just create further delays.

The total absence of consultation with the key organisations in the area, the lack of a considered tourism focused Economic Impact Assessment, or indeed time appropriate modeling of this current iteration of the scheme are symptoms of an ill-considered rush to push this through. The Old Steine is at the very heart of the city and any changes to this artery require a far better study and consultation than has so far been afforded it. The full Independent Valley Gardens study commissioned by the LEP in 2015 identified a core proposal that: *"Buses, taxis and local access will be moved onto a consistent route that will run along the western side of Valley Gardens, and private vehicles will be kept on the eastern side of Valley Gardens."* Options 3 which has not been considered for public consultation would have stayed true to this firm guidance.

If it is a purpose of Valley Gardens Phase 3 to encourage the use of more efficient and attractive public transport as a solution to getting around the city, easing congestion and improving air quality as a consequence, then Option 3 with the roundabout retained ticks all boxes.

**Signed by:**

Dave Rochford (Lead Spokesperson)  
James Hawker  
Nick Wright  
Daniel Nathan

Dino Skinner  
Nats Spada