

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Date: **26 March 2024**

Time: **4.00pm**

Venue: **Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall**

Members: **Councillors:** Muten (Chair), Nann (Deputy Chair), Davis (Opposition Spokesperson), Asaduzzaman, Bagaeen, Galvin, Guilmant, Miller, Pumm and Robinson

Contact: **John Peel**
Democratic Services Officer
01273 291058
john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through ModernGov: [iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

Date of Publication - Monday, 18 March 2024

AGENDA

Part One

Page

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

73 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

- (a) **Declarations of Substitutes:** Where councillors are unable to attend a meeting, a substitute Member from the same political group may attend, speak and vote in their place for that meeting.
- (b) **Declarations of Interest:**
 - (a) Disclosable pecuniary interests;
 - (b) Any other interests required to be registered under the local code;
 - (c) Any other general interest as a result of which a decision on the matter might reasonably be regarded as affecting you or a partner more than a majority of other people or businesses in the ward/s affected by the decision.

In each case, you need to declare

- (i) the item on the agenda the interest relates to;
- (ii) the nature of the interest; and
- (iii) whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest or some other interest.

If unsure, Members should seek advice from the committee lawyer or administrator preferably before the meeting.

- (c) **Exclusion of Press and Public:** To consider whether, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting when any of the following items are under consideration.

Note: Any item appearing in Part Two of the agenda states in its heading the category under which the information disclosed in the report is exempt from disclosure and therefore not available to the press and public. A list and description of the exempt categories is available for public inspection at Brighton and Hove Town Halls and on-line in the Constitution at part 7.1.

74 MINUTES

To Follow

To consider the minutes of the previous meetings.

Contact Officer: John Peel

Tel: 01273 291058

75 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

76 CALL OVER

- (a) Items 80 – 82 will be read out at the meeting and Members invited to reserve the items for consideration.
- (b) Those items not reserved will be taken as having been received and the reports' recommendations agreed.

77 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

7 - 10

To consider the following matters raised by members of the public:

- (a) **Petitions:** To receive any petitions presented by members of the public;
- (b) **Written Questions:** To receive any questions submitted by the due date of 12 noon on the 20 March 2024;
- (c) **Deputations:** To receive any deputations submitted by the due date of 12 noon on the 20 March 2024.

78 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

To Follow

To consider items referred from the last meeting of Full Council

79 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

11 - 14

To consider the following matters raised by Members:

- (d) **Petitions:** To receive any petitions;
- (e) **Written Questions:** To consider any written questions;
- (f) **Letters:** To consider any letters;
- (g) **Notices of Motion:** to consider any Notices of Motion referred from Full Council or submitted directly to the Committee.

80 PARKING SCHEME UPDATE

15 - 52

Report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture

Contact Officer: Catherine Dignan

Tel: 01273 292235

Ward Affected: Hanover & Elm Grove;
Moulsecoomb & Bevendean;
Queen's Park; Westbourne &
Poets' Corner; Westdene &
Hove Park; Wish

81 CYCLE HANGARS TRO-52-2023

53 - 72

Report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture

Contact Officer: Michelle Jamieson

Ward Affected: All Wards

82 RETENDER OF SUPPORTED BUS SERVICE CONTRACTS

73 - 82

Report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture

Contact Officer: Owen McElroy

Tel: 01273 290368

Ward Affected: All Wards

83 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

To consider items to be submitted to the next Council meeting for information.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 24.3a, the Committee may determine that any item is to be included in its report to Council. In addition, any Group may specify one further item to be included by notifying the Chief Executive no later than 10am on the eighth working day before the Council meeting at which the report is to be made, or if the Committee meeting take place after this deadline, immediately at the conclusion of the Committee meeting

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

The closing date for receipt of public questions and deputations for the next meeting is 12 noon on the fourth working day before the meeting.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

Infra-red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival.

Further information

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact John Peel, (01273 291058, email john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or email democratic.services@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Webcasting notice

This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act 1998. Data collected during this web cast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.

Therefore, by entering the meeting room and using the seats in the chamber you are deemed to be consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for the purpose of web casting and/or Member training. If members of the public do not wish to have their image captured, they should sit in the public gallery area.

Access notice

The Public Gallery is situated on the first floor of the Town Hall and is limited in size but does have 2 spaces designated for wheelchair users. The lift cannot be used in an emergency. Evac Chairs are available for self-transfer and you are requested to inform Reception prior to going up to the Public Gallery. For your own safety please do not go beyond the Ground Floor if you are unable to use the stairs.

Please inform staff on Reception of this affects you so that you can be directed to the Council Chamber where you can watch the meeting or if you need to take part in the proceedings e.g. because you have submitted a public question.

Fire & emergency evacuation procedure

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions:

- You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;
- Do not stop to collect personal belongings;
- Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and
- Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 77(a)

Subject: Petitions

Date of meeting: 26 March 2024

Report of: Executive Director for Governance, People & Resources

Contact Officer: Name: John Peel
Tel: 01273 291058
Email: john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

1.1 To receive any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the committee responds to the petition either by noting it or where it is considered more appropriate, calls for an officer report on the matter.

3. Context and background information

3.1 To receive the following petition signed by 1007 people at the time of publication:

(1) Urge Brighton and Hove Council to Maintain Subsidies for the 79 Bus

The Brighton and Hove Council is considering discontinuing subsidies for the 79 bus route. Cutting this service will significantly reduce access to the Downs for residents who don't own a car as well as tourists and visitors. Additionally, the car park at Ditchling Beacon fills early and gets congested so, using the bus allows car owners and non-car owners alike to enjoy the fresh air and beautiful views outside the town. The bus frequently carries passengers who have travelled from London to Brighton by train and caught the 79 bus in order to access the Downs. According to data from the Department for Transport (2019), public transport usage in our area has been steadily increasing over recent years. The 79 bus route plays a significant role in this trend by enabling us to exercise in the fresh air so benefitting our mental and physical health. The cuts would disproportionately affect low-income households and vulnerable groups such as senior citizens who depend on public transport.

We understand that budgets are tight but we believe that maintaining these subsidies is not just important but necessary for preserving our community's accessibility and inclusivity. We urge the Brighton and Hove Council to continue subsidising the 79 bus route. By doing so, they will be ensuring equitable access to transportation for all residents in our community.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 77(b)

Subject: Written Questions

Date of meeting: 26 March 2024

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:

(1) Zone M – Catherine Lane

In Mayfair and Bournemouth the council charges residents a maximum of £118 for an annual residents permit. The price is £58 in Worthing and Eastbourne. In Brighton zone M it costs £251.85 up to a maximum of £441.65. Why does it cost so much more to administer a resident parking zone permit scheme in Zone M than in these areas?

(2) Elm Grove- Michelle Patel

Would the Chair please confirm the scope and timings for the improvements to crossings, speed regulation and greening on Elm Grove promised and agreed by this committee?

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 79(a)

Subject: Petitions from Members

Date of meeting: 26 March 2024

Report of: Executive Director for Governance, People & Resources

Contact Officer: Name: John Peel
Tel: 01273 291058
Email: john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 To receive any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the committee responds to the petition either by noting it or where it is considered more appropriate, calls for an officer report on the matter.

3. Context and background information

- 3.1 To receive the following petition signed by 1267 people at the time of publication:

(1) Introduce a bus service connecting Woodingdean to Falmer and Lewes

Woodingdean has buses connecting us to Rottingdean to the south and Brighton to the west, but we have no bus services taking us north! This new route would connect Woodingdean to Falmer Village, Falmer train station, the University of Sussex campus and then on to Lewes Town where further connections can be made to locations across East Sussex.

An affordable and reliable public bus network is vital to thousands of people in the City. A public transport system done well gets people out of their cars thus reducing traffic, improving air quality and bringing down congestion. This petition calls on Brighton and Hove City Council to broker a new bus service connecting Woodingdean with Falmer and Lewes.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 79(b)

Subject: Member Questions

Date of meeting: 26 March 2024

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:

(1) Councillor Fishleigh- Park & Ride

What did the Chair think about my suggestion to reach out to Asda to discuss BHCC building a multi-storey car park for Park & Ride above Asda's existing car park at its Hollingbury store?

(2) Councillor Fishleigh- Park & Ride

Please reassure me that plans for a park and ride do not include the 27 bus which is already a troubled route due to congestion on Dyke Road, the city centre and A259 and will be severely affected by Valley Gardens 3 during and post-construction.

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 80

Subject: Parking Scheme Update

Date of meeting: 26th March 2024

Report of: Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture

Contact Officer: Name: Catherine Dignan

Tel: 01273 292235

Email: catherine.dignan@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Name: Charles Field

Tel: 01273 293329

Email: charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: Wish, Westdene & Hove Park, Hanover & Elm Grove, Queens Park, Moulsecoomb & Bevendean, Westbourne & Poets Corner and West Hill & North Laine.

For general release

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline the findings of the recent parking consultation with residents in Zones L (Wish Park area), P (Hove Park area), S (Hanover & Elm Grove area), U (Coombe Road area) and W (West Hove area).
- 1.2 This report also outlines the comments on recent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for a proposal within Kew Street.

2. Recommendations

Parking Scheme Consultation

- 2.1 That Committee agrees that the following parking zones remain light-touch parking schemes: - Zones L (Wish Park area), P (Hove Park area), S (Hanover & Elm Grove area), U (Coombe Road area) and W (West Hove area).
- 2.2 Committee notes that remaining with the light-touch parking schemes creates a £0.3m pressure in the Parking Services budget in 23/24 which rolls over for future years. This is addressed in para 7.3 below.
- 2.3 That Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments agree that the following Traffic Regulation Orders are approved to enable the proposals within Kew Street to proceed to the implementation stage:

Kew Street - Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment Order No.* 202* (TRO-55a-2023).

3. Context and background information

Parking Scheme Consultation

- 3.1 At the Transport and Sustainability Committee on 3 October 2023, it was agreed to consult the residents, services & businesses of five areas on proposals to change five existing Light Touch parking arrangements and introduce all day residents' parking schemes. The Council recognises the need to simplify parking arrangements across the City and at the same time to seek to better manage its resources.
- 3.2 The proposal also considered introducing a two-tier residents' parking scheme. This would be two zones, City Centre, and Outer City which would both operate 8am to 8pm, Monday to Sunday alongside the light touch resident parking schemes. If residents chose to move to the new residents parking scheme, their area would sit in the Outer City Zone and parking restrictions would be in place throughout the day (8am-8pm) instead of the current arrangement of two separate one-hour periods across the day.

Kew Street

- 3.3 A review was carried out in Zone Y (Central Brighton South area) to identify where potential additional spaces could be introduced to provide parking for residents and visitors due to the high demand for parking in this area. Kew Street was identified as one of the locations where additional parking could be considered to improve capacity.

4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

Kew Street

- 4.1 The main alternative options are doing nothing which would mean that the proposal for Kew Street would not be implemented.
- 4.2 It is recommended by officers to proceed for the reasons that are outlined within the report.

5. Community engagement and consultation

Parking Scheme Consultation

- 5.1 Following Transport & Sustainability Committee approval in October 2023, a letter was sent out to each household in five light-touch residents' parking scheme areas Zones L (Wish Park area), P (Hove Park area), S (Hanover & Elm Grove area), U (Coombe Road area) and W (West Hove area) in December 2023.

- 5.2 The results showed that on average across five zones 82% of respondents were in favour of staying with a light-touch residents' parking scheme. This is based on an overall response rate of 25%.
- 5.3 A Brighton & Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 10,855 property addresses in the above-mentioned areas. A consultation letter and frequently asked question sheet was sent to each address. Respondents were invited to follow the link within the letter to complete the questionnaire. Paper copies were available upon request.
- 5.4 The consultation ran from 13 December 2023 to 14 January 2024 with an extension until 21 January 2024 to allow those who may have received letters late or had not had time to complete the survey over the festive period to submit a response. A summary of the results is shown in Table 1 below.

Table One – Summary of the consultation result across five zones

Overall number of properties mailed	10,855
Overall consultation response rate	2755 (25%)
Stay with your existing scheme	2268(82%)
Convert to an Outer City Zone residents' parking scheme	487 (18%)

- 5.5 Analysis undertaken of all the responses received from respondents and the full results analysis of the consultation including a zone-by-zone report is outlined in Appendix A.
- 5.6 Ward Councillors are satisfied with the consultation process that has taken place.
- 5.7 By not proceeding with the Light Touch to Full Scheme programme this creates a £0.3m pressure within the Parking Services Budget target for paid parking spaces which was an agreed Budget Council proposal in February 2023. The future of Light Touch schemes is being considered as part of the ongoing Parking Review being reported later in the year.

Kew Street

- 5.8 This proposal formed part of TRO-55a-2023 and was advertised in accordance with the TRO consultation process between 15 December 2023 and 11 January 2024.
- 5.9 Plans outlining the proposals were placed on-street for the duration of the required notice period. The TRO was also advertised on the Council website and in the local newspaper.
- 5.10 The Council received 18 objections from residents who live in or live in the vicinity of Kew Street. The reason for going ahead is that Zone Y is currently subject to a waiting list for resident parking permits and Kew Street formed part of an area-based review to identify where additional parking places could be implemented in this high demand area.

- 5.11 A plan of the proposals and comments/objections are listed in Appendix B.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 As set out in the body of the report and as proposed in the recommendations.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 The costs associated with the recommendations of this report will be contained within existing Parking Services budgets and/or funded from additional parking income generated.
- 7.2 Use of surplus income from parking charges and penalty charges is governed by section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Once the direct costs of traffic management have been met, the use of surpluses is legally ringfenced to the provision of public transport services and to road, air quality and environmental improvements. Parking charges are subject to the Council's Corporate Fees and Charges Policy. As a minimum, charges will be reviewed annually as part of the budget and service planning process.
- 7.3 The Light Touch to Full Scheme programme was an agreed Budget Council decision in February 2023 which had a savings target of 0.3m. This target was factored into the budget setting for 23/24 and remains part of the budget for future years. By not proceeding with The Light Touch to Full Scheme programme, there is no mechanism by which to deliver this 0.3m savings target, meaning it is now a £0.3m pressure within the Parking Services Budget for 23/24 and beyond. The future of Light Touch schemes is being considered as part of the ongoing Parking Review being reported later in the year. Those considerations will need to factor in this additional budget pressure as part of the implications and recommendations. The loss of revenue will be reflected in the councils monthly TBM position.

Name of finance officer consulted: David Wilder Date consulted (04/03/24):

8. Legal implications

- 8.1 The Council has given consideration to the representations and comments made in response to the consultation with residents regarding the proposed parking scheme. Such consideration must be given following consultation with the public. The recommendation in this report is based on the responses to the consultation following the required consideration given to them. The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on local traffic authorities to manage the road network with a view to securing, as far as reasonably practicable, the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic.

- 8.2 Under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 a traffic authority may make a traffic regulation order prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road, or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic. A traffic regulation order may provide for the use as parking places of any part of a road and any charges to be made for vehicles left in the parking places.

Name of lawyer consulted: Katie Kam Date consulted (04/03/2024):

9. Equalities implications

- 9.1 Consultation took place and the comments and wishes of the respondents were taken into account when considering what changes would best meet the needs of the local population. Engagement with a wide range of residents has been built into the process from the start including an equality monitoring form. The use and analysis of data and engagement has informed the project to ensure it meets the needs of the local population. The proposed measures will be of benefit to many road users.

10. Sustainability implications

None

Supporting Documentation

1. Appendices

1. Appendix A – Parking Scheme Consultation - Results
2. Appendix B – Kew Street – Plan and Comments

2. Background documents

1. Agenda Item 31 – Report to Transport and Sustainability Committee - 3 October 2023

Zone L West Hove Residents' Parking Consultation

Background

The October 2023 Transport & Sustainability Committee approved consultations for five Light-Touch residents' parking schemes West Hove Area (Zone L), Hove Park Area (Zone P), Hanover & Elm Grove Area (Zone S), Coombe Road Area (Zone U) and Wish Park Area (Zone W). These consultations are to seek residents' views on whether the parking schemes should stay as they are as Light Touch schemes or to change to become Full Residents' Parking schemes in a newly created Outer City Zone.

Headline Findings

- 87.2% of respondents chose to stay with their existing Light Touch residents' scheme.
- 12.8% respondents chose to convert to an Outer City Zone full residents' parking scheme.

Methodology

In December 2023, the council wrote to 2835 property addresses within the boundaries of the West Hove Zone Residents' Parking Scheme. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. The consultation ran from 14 December 2023 to 14 January 2024.

Results

695 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of 24.3%. People were asked whether they wanted to stay with their existing Light Touch Scheme or to convert to an Outer City Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme.

	Number	%
Stay with your existing Light Touch scheme	605	87.2
Convert to an Outer Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme	89	12.8
Total	694²	100

¹ 176 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 27 gave incomplete or no address details, 15 from outside the Zone (mainly neighbouring roads) and 134 duplicate responses (only 1 response is counted per household).

² 1 person did not answer this question.

Respondents could also make comments on proposals. These have been themed and are presented in the table below³:

	Number of times mentioned
No need to change/ works well / no benefit to residents to change	203
Want flexibility for carers/ tradespeople/ visitors / park users / visitors to businesses	89
This is a money-making exercise / be clearer in these intentions / where will this extra money be going?	86
Don't want to pay more for scheme permits or for visitors	50
Don't want full scheme / did not vote for this	45
Consultation letter is unclear / Statements in letter are inaccurate / don't agree with the council argument / not enough information given / difficult to understand the need for change / person has not understood the concept of an outer zone	42
Mixed bays will be used by commuters / rig workers/ users of Portslade Station / will be more difficult for residents to find a space / difficult to find a space as it is	38
Increased price v Discount is a 'threat' / blackmail to get resident buy in / underhand / leaves little choice	36
Remove parking restrictions / Sunday parking restrictions	16
A full scheme will shift costs to visitors	10
I choose full scheme	8
Restrictions are not enforced now how will you enforce full scheme?	4
Current situation means roads are clear, so traffic is faster	3
Letter says 8am-8pm but it's currently 9am-8pm	3

³ Where comments have been mentioned more than once (valid cases only)

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	0	0
18-24	2	0.4
25-34	26	5.3
35-44	65	13.4
45-54	143	29.4
55-64	116	23.9
65-74	89	18.3
75+	45	9.3
Total	486	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	226	40.8
Female	327	59.0
Non-Binary	1	0.2
Other	0	0
Total	554	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	543	99.3
No	4	0.7
Total	547	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	52	9.7
Yes, a lot	41	7.7
No	442	82.6
Total	535	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	57
Sensory impairment	4
Learning disability/ difficulty	2
Long-standing illness	25
Mental health condition	12
Development condition	2
Autistic Spectrum	4
Other	20

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	480	88.1
	Irish	6	1.1
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	1	0.2
	Any other white background	30	5.5
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	5	0.9
	Pakistani	1	0.2
	Chinese	0	0
	Any other Asian background	0	0
Black or Black British	African	2	0.4
	Caribbean	0	0
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	3	0.6
	Black African & White	1	0.2
	Black Caribbean & White	0	0
	Any other mixed background	6	1.1
Any other ethnic group	Arab	2	0.4
	Any other ethnic group	8	1.5
Total		545	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	9	1.8
Gay Man	16	3.3
Heterosexual/ straight	437	89.5
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	8	1.6
Other	18	3.7
Total	488	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	223	44.6
Buddhist	7	1.4
Christian	197	39.4
Hindu	3	0.6
Jain	0	0
Jewish	11	2.2
Muslim	1	0.2
Pagan	0	0
Sikh	1	0.2
Agnostic	13	2.6
Atheist	28	5.6
Other	10	2.0
Other philosophical belief	6	1.2
Total	500	100

Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	72	13.1
No	477	86.9
Total	549	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	42
Partner or Spouse	11
Child with special needs	19
Friend	1
Other family member	4
Other	16

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	0	0	515	100
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	8	1.7	460	98.3
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	13	2.7	463	97.3

Zone P Hove Park Residents' Parking Consultation

Background

The October 2023 Transport & Sustainability Committee approved consultations for five Light-Touch residents' parking schemes West Hove Area (Zone L), Hove Park Area (Zone P), Hanover & Elm Grove Area (Zone S), Coombe Road Area (Zone U) and Wish Park Area (Zone W). These consultations are to seek residents' views on whether the parking schemes should stay as they are as Light Touch schemes or to change to become Full Residents' Parking schemes in a newly created Outer City Zone.

Headline Findings

- 93.2% of respondents chose to stay with their existing Light Touch residents' scheme.
- 6.8% of respondents chose to convert to an Outer City Zone Full residents' parking scheme.

Methodology

In December 2023, the council wrote to 1462 property addresses within the boundaries of the Hove Park Zone Residents' Parking Scheme. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. The consultation ran from 14 December 2023 to 14 January 2024

Results

644 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of 44.0%. People were asked whether they wanted to stay with their existing Light Touch Scheme or to convert to an Outer City Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme.

	Number	%
Stay with your existing Light Touch scheme	599	93.2
Convert to an Outer Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme	44	6.8
Total	643²	100

Respondents could also make comments on proposals. These have been themed and are presented in the table below³:

¹ 336 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 54 gave incomplete or no address details, 147 from outside the Zone (mainly neighbouring roads) and 135 duplicate responses. There was also an email received representing all members of Hove Park Rugby Club.

² 1 person did not answer this question.

³ Where comments have been mentioned more than once

	Number of times mentioned
No need to change/ works well / no benefit to residents	247
This is a money-making exercise for the council / be clearer in these intentions / where will this extra money be going	103
Want flexibility for carers/ tradespeople/ visitors / park users / Rugby Club users/ visitors to businesses	81
Don't want full scheme	51
Don't want to pay more for scheme / for visitors	31
Remove all parking restrictions / alongside Hove Park / parking should be free	30
Mixed bays will be dominated by commuters / more difficult for residents to park	30
Consultation letter is unclear / Statements in letter are inaccurate / you are not giving us all the information / difficult to understand the need for change	26
Increased price v Discount is a 'threat' to get resident buy in	21
Will affect parents trying to park near school	17
Parking on Shirley Drive is dangerous	8
A full scheme shifts costs to visitors	5
Discount needs to be longer / discount is not enough	5
Will cause displacement parking further out	4
Current situation means roads are clear, so traffic is faster	4
Implement a full scheme	3
Won't vote for labour next time	3
Not all residents received letters/ heard by word of mouth / not enough publicity	2
Stop overnight parking in Hove Park Road	2

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	0	0
18-24	3	0.7
25-34	11	2.6
35-44	63	14.8
45-54	86	20.2
55-64	110	25.9
65-74	65	15.3
75+	87	20.5
Total	425	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	244	47.7
Female	266	52.1
Non-Binary	0	0
Other	1	0.2
Total	511	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	496	99.4
No	3	0.6
Total	499	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	41	8.5
Yes, a lot	31	6.4
No	412	85.1
Total	484	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	45
Sensory impairment	1
Learning disability/ difficulty	0
Long-standing illness	15
Mental health condition	8
Development condition	1
Autistic Spectrum	1
Other	19

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	414	84.5
	Irish	8	1.6
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0
	Any other white background	34	6.9
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	1	0.2
	Indian	7	1.4
	Pakistani	4	0.8
	Chinese	3	0.6
	Any other Asian background	2	0.4
Black or Black British	African	1	0.2
	Caribbean	0	0
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	5	1.0
	Black African & White	1	0.2
	Black Caribbean & White	0	0
	Any other mixed background	5	1.0
Any other ethnic group	Arab	3	0.6
	Any other ethnic group	2	0.4
Total		490	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	8	1.8
Gay Man	6	1.4
Heterosexual/ straight	401	92.4
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	3	0.7
Other	16	3.7
Total	434	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	160	37.1
Buddhist	3	0.7
Christian	201	46.6
Hindu	1	0.2
Jain	0	0
Jewish	15	3.5
Muslim	10	2.3
Pagan	0	0
Sikh	1	0.2
Agnostic	7	1.6
Atheist	24	5.6
Other	5	1.2
Other philosophical belief	4	0.9
Total	431	100

Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	56	11.0
No	453	89.0
Total	509	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	31
Partner or Spouse	8
Child with special needs	9
Friend	1
Other family member	8
Other	12

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	0	0	482	100
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	11	22.4	451	97.6
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	5	1.1	436	98.9

Zone S Hanover and Elm Grove Residents' Parking Consultation

Background

The October 2023 Transport & Sustainability Committee approved consultations for five Light-Touch residents' parking schemes West Hove Area (Zone L), Hove Park Area (Zone P), Hanover & Elm Grove Area (Zone S), Coombe Road Area (Zone U) and Wish Park Area (Zone W). These consultations are to seek residents' views on whether the parking schemes should stay as they are as Light Touch schemes or to change to become Full Residents' Parking schemes in a newly created Outer City Zone.

Headline Findings

- 72.4% of respondents chose to stay with their existing Light Touch residents' scheme.
- 27.6% respondents chose to convert to an Outer City Zone full residents' parking scheme.

Methodology

In December 2023, the council wrote to 2527 property addresses within the boundaries of the Hanover and Elm Grove Residents' Parking Scheme. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. The consultation ran from 14 December 2023 to 14 January 2024.

Results

555 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of %. People were asked whether they wanted to stay with their existing Light Touch Scheme or to convert to an Outer City Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme.

	Number	%
Stay with your existing Light Touch scheme	397	72.4
Convert to an Outer Zone Residents' Full Residents' Parking Scheme	151	27.6
Total	548²	100

¹ 109 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 23 gave incomplete or no address details, 6 from outside the Zone and 80 duplicate responses.

² 7 people did not answer this question.

Respondents could also make comments on proposals. These have been themed and are presented in the table below³:

	Number of times mentioned
No need to change/ works well / no benefit to residents	120
Don't want to pay more for scheme / for visitors	77
This is a money-making exercise for the council / be clearer in these intentions / where will this extra money be going	69
Want flexibility for carers/ tradespeople/ visitors / visitors to businesses	69
Increased price v Discount is a 'threat' / blackmail / manipulation to get resident buy in / this is underhand	56
Consultation letter is unclear / Statements in letter are inaccurate / don't agree with the council argument / you are not giving us all the information / difficult to understand the need for change / has not understood the concept of an outer zone / want to see maps of inner and outer zones / should not be consulted over holiday period	43
Don't want full scheme / did not vote for this	36
Mixed bays will be dominated by commuters / will be more difficult for residents to find a space	38
Implement a full scheme / at top of the are	17
What are the increased prices if we stay as we are	9
Remove parking restrictions / Sunday parking restrictions / parking restrictions not needed	6
Not all residents received letters/ heard by word of mouth / not enough publicity	5
Disappointed in new administration	4
Discount needs to be longer / discount is not enough	3
Will cause displacement parking further out	3
Why 8am-8pm?	3
A full scheme shifts costs to visitors	2
Want 7-day Light Touch restrictions	2

³ Where comments have been mentioned more than once

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	0	0
18-24	16	3.8
25-34	56	13.3
35-44	86	20.4
45-54	114	27.0
55-64	90	21.3
65-74	41	9.7
75+	19	4.5
Total	422	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	194	42.8
Female	252	55.6
Non-Binary	6	1.3
Other	1	0.2
Total	453	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	440	99.1
No	4	0.9
Total	444	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	41	9.5
Yes, a lot	37	8.6
No	353	81.9
Total	431	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	36
Sensory impairment	1
Learning disability/ difficulty	3
Long-standing illness	29
Mental health condition	20
Development condition	0
Autistic Spectrum	9
Other	10

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	384	87.9
	Irish	12	2.7
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0
	Any other white background	26	5.9
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	2	0.5
	Pakistani	0	0
	Chinese	1	0.2
	Any other Asian background	2	0.5
Black or Black British	African	1	0.2
	Caribbean	0	0
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	5	1.1
	Black African & White	0	0
	Black Caribbean & White	0	0
	Any other mixed background	2	0.5
Any other ethnic group	Arab	0	0
	Any other ethnic group	2	0.5
Total		437	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	24	6.2
Gay Man	13	3.4
Heterosexual/ straight	320	82.9
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	12	3.1
Other	17	4.4
Total	386	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	242	60.0
Buddhist	7	1.7
Christian	67	16.6
Hindu	1	0.2
Jain	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Muslim	0	0
Pagan	4	1.0
Sikh	1	0.2
Agnostic	13	3.2
Atheist	44	10.9
Other	14	3.5
Other philosophical belief	10	2.5
Total	402	100

Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	50	15.3
No	277	84.7
Total	327	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	27
Partner or Spouse	8
Child with special needs	9
Friend	0
Other family member	5
Other	0

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	1	0.3	316	99.7
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	5	1.7	284	98.3
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	7	2.3	293	99.7

Zone U Coombe Road Residents' Parking Consultation

Background

The October 2023 Transport & Sustainability Committee approved consultations for five Light-Touch residents' parking schemes West Hove Area (Zone L), Hove Park Area (Zone P), Hanover & Elm Grove Area (Zone S), Coombe Road Area (Zone U) and Wish Park Area (Zone W). These consultations are to seek residents' views on whether the parking schemes should stay as they are as Light Touch schemes or to change to become Full Residents' Parking schemes in a newly created Outer City Zone.

Headline Findings

- 79.6% of respondents chose to stay with their existing Light Touch residents' scheme.
- 20.4% respondents chose to convert to an Outer City Zone full residents' parking scheme.

Methodology

In December 2023, the council wrote to 2493 property addresses within the boundaries of the Coombe Road Zone Residents' Parking Scheme. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. The consultation ran from 14 December 2023 to 14 January 2024.

Results

406 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of 16.3%. People were asked whether they wanted to stay with their existing Light Touch Scheme or to convert to an Outer City Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme.

	Number	%
Stay with your existing Light Touch scheme	320	79.6
Convert to an Outer Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme	82	20.4
Total	402²	100

Respondents could also make comments on proposals. These have been themed and are presented in the table below³:

¹ 89 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 30 gave incomplete or no address details, 1 from outside the Zone and 58 duplicate responses.

² 4 people did not reply to this question.

³ Where comments have been mentioned more than once

	Number of times mentioned
No need to change/ works well / no benefit to residents	130
This is a money-making exercise for the council / be clearer in these intentions / where will this extra money be going	74
Increased price v Discount is a 'threat' / blackmail / manipulation to get resident buy in / this is underhand	41
Consultation letter is unclear / Statements in letter are inaccurate / don't agree with the council argument / you are not giving us all the information / difficult to understand the need for change / has not understood the concept of an outer zone / want to see maps of inner and outer zones	34
Don't want to pay more for scheme / for visitors	29
Want flexibility for carers/ tradespeople/ visitors / visitors to businesses	29
Mixed bays will be dominated by commuters / will be more difficult for residents to find a space / don't want non-residents parking here/ difficult enough to park as it is	23
Don't want full scheme / did not vote for this	19
irrelevant	17
Remove parking restrictions / Sunday parking restrictions	14
Disappointed in new administration	8
Restrictions are enforced how will you enforce full scheme?	6
Implement a full scheme	4
Discount needs to be longer / discount is not enough	3
A full scheme shifts costs to visitors	2
Not all residents received letters/ heard by word of mouth / not enough publicity	2
What are the increased prices if we stay as we are	2
want parking restrictions at weekends	2

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	1	0.3
18-24	33	8.7
25-34	56	14.8
35-44	86	22.8
45-54	76	20.1
55-64	70	18.5
65-74	29	7.7
75+	27	7.1
Total	378	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	172	42.4
Female	230	56.7
Non-Binary	4	1.0
Other	0	0
Total	406	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	383	98.7
No	5	1.3
Total	388	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	57	15.0
Yes, a lot	30	7.9
No	292	77.0
Total	379	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	30
Sensory impairment	1
Learning disability/ difficulty	2
Long-standing illness	32
Mental health condition	18
Development condition	0
Autistic Spectrum	3
Other	17

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	338	84.1
	Irish	4	1.0
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	1	0.2
	Any other white background	34	8.5
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	4	1.0
	Pakistani	0	0
	Chinese	1	0.2
	Any other Asian background	1	0.2
Black or Black British	African	3	0.7
	Caribbean	1	0.2
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	5	1.2
	Black African & White	1	0.2
	Black Caribbean & White	3	0.7
	Any other mixed background	2	0.5
Any other ethnic group	Arab	2	0.5
	Any other ethnic group	2	0.5
Total		402	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	31	9.0
Gay Man	13	3.8
Heterosexual/ straight	278	80.6
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	13	3.8
Other	10	2.9
Total	345	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	208	59.3
Buddhist	1	0.3
Christian	78	22.2
Hindu	1	0.3
Jain	1	0.3
Jewish	2	0.6
Muslim	5	1.4
Pagan	1	0.3
Sikh	1	0.3
Agnostic	9	2.6
Atheist	31	8.8
Other	6	1.7
Other philosophical belief	7	2.0
Total	351	100

Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	49	12.3
No	351	87.8
Total	400	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	27
Partner or Spouse	6
Child with special needs	18
Friend	1
Other family member	10
Other	13

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	0	0	386	100
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	8	2.2	354	97.8
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	6	1.6	361	98.4

Zone W Wish Park Area Residents' Parking Consultation

Background

The October 2023 Transport & Sustainability Committee approved consultations for five Light-Touch residents' parking schemes West Hove Area (Zone L), Hove Park Area (Zone P), Hanover & Elm Grove Area (Zone S), Coombe Road Area (Zone U) and Wish Park Area (Zone W). These consultations are to seek residents' views on whether the parking schemes should stay as they are as Light Touch schemes or to change to become Full Residents' Parking schemes in a newly created Outer City Zone.

Headline Findings

- 74.1% of respondents chose to stay with their existing Light Touch residents' scheme.
- 25.9% respondents chose to convert to an Outer City zone Full residents' parking scheme.

Methodology

In December 2023, the council wrote to 1538 property addresses within the boundaries of the Wish Park Zone Residents' Parking Scheme. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. The consultation ran from 14 December 2023 to 14 January 2024.

Results

471 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of 30.6%. People were asked whether they wanted to stay with their existing Light Touch Scheme or to convert to an Outer City Zone Full Residents' Parking Scheme.

	Number	%
Stay with your existing Light Touch scheme	347	74.1
Convert to an Outer Zone Residents' Full Residents' Parking Scheme	121	25.9
Total	468²	100

¹ 119 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 7 gave incomplete or no address details, 20 from outside the Zone and 92 duplicate responses.

² 3 people did not answer this question.

Respondents could also make comments on proposals. These have been themed and are presented in the table below³:

	Number of times mentioned
No need to change/ works well / no benefit to residents	144
This is a money- making exercise for the council / be clearer in these intentions / where will this extra money be going	56
Want flexibility for carers/ tradespeople/ visitors / park users / Rugby Club users / visitors to businesses	39
Consultation letter is unclear / Statements in letter are inaccurate / don't agree with the council argument / you are not giving us all the information / difficult to understand the need for change / has not understood the concept of an outer zone / want to see maps of inner and outer zones	37
Increased price v Discount is a 'threat' / blackmail / manipulation to get resident buy in / this is underhand	27
Don't want full scheme / did not vote for this	26
Don't want to pay more for scheme / for visitors	24
Implement a full scheme	23
Mixed bays will be dominated by commuters /will be more difficult for residents to find a space/ difficult enough to find a space as it is	8
A full scheme shifts costs to visitors	7
Remove parking restrictions / Sunday parking restrictions	6
Not all residents received letters/ heard by word of mouth / not enough publicity	4
Will cause displacement parking further out	3
Will affects parents trying to park near school	2
Disappointed in new administration	2

³ Where comments have been mentioned more than once.

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	0	0
18-24	5	1.6
25-34	10	3.2
35-44	36	11.4
45-54	95	30.2
55-64	84	26.7
65-74	43	13.7
75+	42	13.3
Total	315	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	176	46.1
Female	205	53.7
Non-Binary	1	0.3
Other	0	0
Total	382	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	368	78.1
No	0	0
Total	368	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	44	12.1
Yes, a lot	18	5.0
No	301	82.9
Total	363	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	36
Sensory impairment	6
Learning disability/ difficulty	0
Long-standing illness	25
Mental health condition	4
Development condition	0
Autistic Spectrum	0
Other	13

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	304	84.4
	Irish	10	2.8
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0
	Any other white background	27	7.5
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	2	0.6
	Indian	3	0.8
	Pakistani	0	0
	Chinese	1	0.3
	Any other Asian background	1	0.3
Black or Black British	African	1	0.3
	Caribbean	2	0.6
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	3	0.8
	Black African & White	0	0
	Black Caribbean & White	2	0.6
	Any other mixed background	0	0
Any other ethnic group	Arab	2	0.6
	Any other ethnic group	2	0.6
Total		360	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	4	1.3
Gay Man	2	0.6
Heterosexual/ straight	285	89.1
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	9	2.8
Other	20	6.3
Total	320	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	160	49.8
Buddhist	2	0.6
Christian	113	35.2
Hindu	2	0.6
Jain	0	0
Jewish	14	4.4
Muslim	1	0.3
Pagan	2	0.6
Sikh	3	0.9
Agnostic	4	1.2
Atheist	10	3.1
Other	6	1.9
Other philosophical belief	4	1.2
Total	321	100





Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	49	12.7
No	338	87.3
Total	387	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	25
Partner or Spouse	8
Child with special needs	14
Friend	0
Other family member	4
Other	7

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	1	2.4	320	97.6
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	8	2.4	320	97.6
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	5	1.5	330	98.5

Appendix B

KEY

-  Proposed Shared parking bay of 20m
-  Removal of DYL by 20m
-  Existing DYL
-  Existing Refuse Area



APPENDIX B

Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Multiple trader vehicles (with trader permits) often park along Kew street, including BAHC contractors working on the land between Kew Street and Crown Gardens. •Drivers with disability badges park all along Kew street, for long periods of time, often overnight. •Emergency services, waste collection trucks, removal vans and delivery vehicles already have difficulty passing through the street when there are numerous cars and vans parked all along it. •Vehicles that park or hover along the stretch marked with double yellow lines from houses 1-5 already make it difficult and sometimes impossible for residents to pull out from their drives. This congestion will only increase if cars were permanently parked in parking spaces opposite the green. •The resident's parking space next to the green and house number 5 would be made difficult to exit. •Delivery motorbikes, cyclists and scooters regularly go the wrong way down Kew Street, which already has a "blind" corner going down into North Gardens. 	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is at least one (and often 3 or 4) commercial vehicles with trader permits parking and/or utility contractors on Kew Street for work in the immediate vicinity. - drivers with Disability Badges park on Kew Street. Oftimes there are up to 3 vehicles at the same time, parked from early to late in the day; - emergency vehicles, household waste trucks, utility contractors etc require clear access along the length of Kew Street. - any vehicle parked in the residents' car parking space adjacent house no. 5 would likely be unable to exit the space given the proposal to put additional parking up to the south boundary of the residents' communal garden which abuts Kew Street. - there are many instances of vehicles (usually cars and cyclists) going the wrong way along Kew Street (from the Church Road end). <p>With the proposed additional parking permit spaces, all such vehicles cited above will continue to park or hover on Kew Street but will instead only be able to use the reduced length of double-yellow-lined space on the east side of the road, thereby increasing congestion, reducing road access and safety, and blocking the vehicle exit from driveways of houses nos. 1-5 making it impossible for residents to leave in their vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kew Street, being close to St Paul's C of E Primary School, is a walk-to-school route for small children. The proposal potentially puts at increased risk these often high-spirited and fast-moving small people; - the rise in the road from North Gardens and Queen's Road has a tight bend at a point where road users have restricted (verging on blind) view of the road ahead; this would include restricted view of the proposed parking spaces as vehicles climb the rise. The trajectory of vehicles rising the hill is off-time steering left as they rise the hill and this would put them on a collision course with permit-parked vehicles. <p>Given the foregoing points, the proposal to add (paid) parking permit spaces on the east side of Kew Street appears unwise, ill-considered and potentially dangerous both to the residents of Kew Street and to the pedestrians (including small children), able and disabled drivers, cyclists, municipal traffic and trade/commercial vehicles using Kew Street. Furthermore, it would appear at variance with BAHC's stated desire to minimise/reduce the amount of traffic within the urban area wherever possible.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>I most certainly object, as a long-term resident, to this imposition of unwanted extra traffic upon our little street and consider this overall large expansion will cause further environmental damage to our city centre and to be a kick in the teeth to supporting sustainability in public transport.</p> <p>The city centre is very adequately serviced by both train and bus, and we should be positively promoting and expanding park and ride options and not encouraging more motorists in what is already a crowded street and road layout in central Brighton.</p> <p>My other concern is that whilst the proposed bay is in front of the lawned area, it will inevitably attract other indiscriminate parking, such as Blue Badge and rogue parkers who fill in the space in the rest of the street, making it impossible for the owners of houses 1-5 to be able to park off-road in their own driveways. Cars here must have a 90-degree turning angle to access our bays and therefore need the full width of the street to manoeuvre. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 states in Section 34(5) that a parking place also includes the means of entrance and egress from the parking space. This would not be possible if the street is filled with parked cars, and this is a major concern to us all.</p> <p>Finally, the notice issued also states that there will be shared permit & paid parking bays but fails to indicate or identify where the payment machine will be situated, or how this will fit in with what are very narrow pavements, which is another grave concern as this could prove to be an obstacle to prams and wheelchairs.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. There are no plans for the introduction of a pay and display machine as part of the proposals therefore any reduction in footway width will not be an issue. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>I concur with my neighbours previous lodged comments.</p> <p>However I spent many months looking for a property with private accessible parking at considerable cost, and this new proposal would make it almost impossible for me to use my space, whilst a luxury it is very tight and requires a full swing in and a full reverse to the curb at an angle from 5 Kew and if the adjacent space is occupied I have to manoeuvre my car at least 3-4 times to get an angle in to park. Impossible if your proposal is progressed.</p> <p>We have people who come the wrong way down this one way street and park inconveniently blocking out accessibility. Usually disabled badge holders, which has often caused problems. Delivery vans are not excluded from this fact and not least to say there is no accessibility if a lorry or fire truck were to try and get down this road. And that's without permitted street parking.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that parking is at a premium in Brighton this proposal does not solve traffic congestion and Would indeed exacerbate and cause problems for not just myself but my neighbours.</p> <p>Please lodge my views for your consideration of the final outcome of your proposal.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. There are no plans for the introduction of a pay and display machine as part of the proposals - any payment for parking can be made via the paybyphone application or at a PayPoint location. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown.</p>

Resident	Object	<p>1. Emergency and other access to Crown Gardens. Crown Gardens (parallel to Kew Street to the East) has no vehicle access to the front of the houses. Therefore, emergency services, tradespeople and couriers have to stop in Kew Street to service the entire street of Crown Gardens. The proposal will reduce access for these vehicles to the detriment of all properties in Crown Gardens.</p> <p>2. Use by Council Workers. The green land between Crown Gardens and Kew Street is owned and maintained by the Council and regular visits by Council workers require them to stop their vehicles in Kew Street. They move a flat-bed trailer pulled by a van to a variety of locations along Kew Street, as they work their way along the strip of land. The proposal will obstruct access for Council Workers and their vehicles.</p> <p>3. Use by other neighbouring roads / properties. The other roads very near to the proposed parking bay are: The top of North Road (West of Queens Road), a very narrow hill where stopping or parking are almost impossible; the Southern end of North Gardens, where the motorcycle parking bays extend close to the junction making other parking or stopping almost impossible; and the hill and very narrow sharp bend in Kew Street (at the entrance / Northern end) with bollards on the edge of the pavement making stopping or parking totally impossible without blocking the road entirely. Valid stopping or parking is needed by vehicles attending properties in all of these adjacent areas / roads and that will no longer be possible with the proposed parking bay.</p> <p>4. Disabled Parking. Disabled parking is needed for visitors to shops and other premises in Queens Road, and it is important that the whole of Kew Street can be used for this.</p> <p>5. Safety in One Way Street. Currently it is very common for vehicles to travel the wrong way along Kew Street despite both signage and wording painted on the road at the exit from Kew Street onto Church Street. Rarely a day goes by without my seeing at least one such vehicle, so the actual number must be considerably greater than that. This is a safety risk, made worse when Queens Road is congested and Kew Street is used as a rat-run. At times of increased traffic the risk of a collision on the narrow, sharp bend is much increased and when people know of parking bays there will inevitably be a significant increase in traffic going both in the correct direction (South) and in the wrong direction. The proposed parking bay will make the street less safe.</p> <p>6. Other Parking. There are already two major car parks nearby – North Road Car Park is about 100 – 125 metres away, and Theatre Car Park in Church Street is 200 – 250 metres away. The need for parking is already well catered for just here. Visitors to my house in Kew Street always know to use these if no other spaces are available, although in practice there are almost always spaces in the area very close to here. The proposed parking bay is not needed at this location.</p> <p>7. Emergency access and refuse lorries. The addition of these proposed spaces will, inevitably, create more congestion for emergency vehicles, refuse collections, etc. Frequently at present there are vans or cars parked on both sides of Kew Street at the proposed location, and the addition of this bay will make that problem far worse as every delivery, tradesperson etc will be forced to park opposite the parking bay. I have been unable to attach a photo of three vans and a car at exactly the proposed location on Kew Street taken as I prepared this submission on 18 December. I will try to send it separately. Such a problem is very common. The proposed parking bay will make this congestion worse and hinder access by Emergency Services and Council Refuse Lorries.</p> <p>8. Children's Safety. Kew Street is used by many parents and children to walk to and from St Paul's Primary School twice each day because it is a safe and quiet route to the school. The parking bay will result in the road becoming busier and so less safe for these children.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>My reasons for writing to oppose the proposal to have a 20m parking bay in Kew Street are that it will make a quiet and safe street into a busier, chaotic and dangerous street. Local residents in Crown Gardens (with no road access) as well as Kew Street and neighbouring roads rely on this space for ambulance and fire service access. School children use it as a safe way to our local primary school. Kew Street and Crown Gardens need it for deliveries, tradespeople, builders etc. Disabled people using the local shops use it for disabled parking. All of this would be made far worse if the proposal went ahead. I therefore oppose it.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kew street is already squeezed for space when there are bin lorries, trade vehicles, cars parked with disability parking cards and often illegally parked vehicles. • Houses numbers 1-5 access their private parking directly off Kew Street. Cars parked on the street could create challenges in accessing their private parking in front of their properties. • Currently it is not fully clear to many drivers that Kew Street is a one-way street. Cars often go the wrong way and then meet cars coming up the hill from North Gardens or Queens Road and there is insufficient room to turn around. Now that many of us work from home or are retired we see this often. • The land immediately across the road from the Kew Street group of houses is owned by the Council. This land backs onto the small gardens of the houses in the Crown Gardens witten. Council staff come on a regular basis to mow that grass, remove bamboo and to keep this strip of land clean and tidy. When this regular activity is taking place, Council staff park a large flat-bed truck with gardening equipment along that side of Kew Street. • In an emergency, for example a fire in Crown Garden, which is a Twitten without access, emergency service vehicles park in Kew Street on the yellow line. • Kew Street residents themselves also require access for ambulance and emergency services in times of emergency. These vehicles park on the one-way street Parking along Kew Street would impede access for all the above activities. So it is evident that parking of cars in this narrow one-way street would be a retrograde move and would harm the amenity of the neighbourhood. 	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>Firstly, on the grounds that whilst cars are parked in the parking spaces, large trucks, in particular the bin lorries which serve the bins at the end of Kew Street would not be able to drive around the parked cars without driving onto the pavement on the opposite side and possibly the lawn which is fenced with a spiked chain. Secondly, in the event of a fire in Crown Gardens where there is no vehicle access, any emergency vehicles would need to park in Kew Street to gain access, having parked cars in the way could seriously hamper the time and efficiency in dealing with that emergency. Thirdly, delivery vans, tradesmen vehicles and blue-badge car holders continually use this section of Kew Street as temporary parking whilst accessing the community in Kew Street or Crown Gardens, if there were parking spaces this convenience of sorts would not be possible.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>I wish to complain bitterly about the proposals for public parking spaces in Kew St. The very reason why the occupiers of our small street's 17 homes live where they do is because of the peace it offers in a very central location. To try to ruin this for ever, simply to raise money is monstrous. I don't know who has devised this scheme, but I can guarantee that none of the home-owners of Kew St has been consulted, and/or agreed.</p>	<p>The proposal was advertised both on the council website and within the Evening Argus which is the legal process required when advertising Traffic Regulation Orders. In addition, public notices and plans of the proposals were placed within Kew Street inviting comments.</p>

Resident	Object	<p>I would like to express my objection to the proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Kew street is already restricted for space when there are bin lorries, trade vehicles, cars parked with disability parking cards and often illegally parked vehicles. •Crown Gardens down the slope from Kew St has no road access. Therefore, for emergencies accessing the houses is dependent via Kew street for emergency vehicles is the only option. This creates a risk if cars can park and block access to the back of all th houses which are accessible. •Kew Street is one way. However current signage and marking both in and before entering the street is not sufficient to stop vehicles attempting to exit one way. The removal of double yellow lines increases the risk of accidents. •The land between Kew St and Crown Garden sis owned by the council and needs to be accessed for maintenance which would not be readily accessible if cars are parked. •A risk is created for emergency access vehicle sot Kew Street houses <p>Happy to discuss this further or clarify if needed.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance and unobstructed. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians.</p>
Resident	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conflict with City Centre Transport Plan The proposed order contradicts the "Proposed Interventions" outlined in the "Developing a new transport plan for Brighton & Hove" released in September 2021. 2. Environmental Pollution In light of Brighton City Centre's documented pollution concerns, as evidenced by assessments and the "Air Quality Action Plan 2022 to 2027," the proposed order conflicts with the city's commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Encouraging active travel is a priority, and an increase in parking spaces would contribute to air pollution, negating the efforts to safeguard public health and mitigate environmental concerns, including noise pollution. 3. Traffic Congestion Kew Street being a no-through road with only one entrance and exit, additional parking spaces would likely lead to traffic congestion. This congestion could extend to major roads such as Queens Road, adversely affecting the living environment of street residents and impeding the overall flow of traffic. 4. Safety of Pedestrians The proposed order poses a significant risk to pedestrian safety along Queens Road, Kew Street, and the routes to St Paul's CE Primary School and Wagtails Nursery. The increased traffic resulting from additional parking spaces heightens the risk of accidents, especially during peak travel times. This poses a particular threat to schoolchildren who frequently traverse Kew Street. 5. Fire Hazard Given Kew Street's one-way configuration and narrow entrance and exit points, the proposed order could impede firefighting efforts in the event of an emergency. Cars parked along the roadside may obstruct fire engine access, posing a serious threat to the safety of street residents. 6. Contradiction to "Supplementary Planning Document (SPD14) – Parking Standards – Brighton & Hove City Council Local Development Framework October 2016": The SPD14, Zonal Approach - 2 Guiding Principles of the Standards, explicitly states, "The overarching principle being that developments located within central areas, close to good public transport services and local facilities and with operational Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) will require less parking than equivalent developments in areas with lower levels of public transport accessibility, especially in outer areas of the city." The proposed amendment, by increasing parking spaces in the city centre, runs counter to this principle, which is fundamental to the local development framework. 7. Contradiction to Local Planning Policy CP9 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One: In accordance with local planning policy, policy CP9 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One stated that "The council will work with partners, stakeholders and communities to provide an integrated, safe and sustainable transport system that will accommodate new development; support the city's role as a sub-regional service and employment hub, and improve accessibility. It will promote and provide measures that will help to manage and improve mobility and lead to a transfer of people and freight onto sustainable forms of transport to reduce the impact of traffic and congestion, increase physical activity and therefore improve people's health, safety and quality of life." It explicitly outlines the council's commitment to providing an integrated, safe, and sustainable transport system that accommodates new development, supports the city's role as a sub-regional service and employment hub, and improves accessibility. The policy emphasizes promoting measures to manage and enhance mobility, leading to a shift towards sustainable forms of transport to mitigate the impact of traffic and congestion while enhancing public health, safety, and overall quality of life. The proposed order clearly contravenes these stated policies. 	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>
Resident	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contradiction to City Centre Transport Plan The suggested amendment directly clashes with the goals outlined in the "Developing a new transport plan for Brighton & Hove" released in September 2021. The introduction of more parking spaces on Kew Street, a central location, is poised to attract increased private car traffic, inevitably leading to congestion. This directly undermines the city's objective of cultivating a more appealing and lively city center and establishing low-traffic neighborhoods, especially with the proximity of St Paul's CE Primary School and Wagtails Nursery. 2. Environmental Implications Brighton City Centre's acknowledged pollution issues, as highlighted by assessments and the "Air Quality Action Plan 2022 to 2027," make the proposed order incompatible with the city's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The emphasis on encouraging active travel stands at odds with the potential rise in air pollution due to additional parking spaces, thereby compromising public health and exacerbating environmental concerns, including noise pollution. 3. Traffic Congestion As Kew Street is a one-way road with a solitary entrance and exit, the creation of extra parking spaces is likely to result in traffic congestion. This congestion could extend to major thoroughfares such as Queens Road, adversely affecting the residential environment and disrupting overall traffic flow. 4. Pedestrian Safety Concerns The proposed order poses a considerable risk to pedestrian safety along Queens Road, Kew Street, and the routes to St Paul's CE Primary School and Wagtails Nursery. The heightened traffic resulting from additional parking spaces increases the likelihood of accidents, particularly during peak travel times, posing a significant threat to schoolchildren who frequently navigate Kew Street. 5. Fire Safety Implications Given Kew Street's configuration as a one-way road with narrow entrance and exit points, the proposed order could impede firefighting efforts during an emergency. Cars parked along the roadside may obstruct fire engine access, posing a severe threat to the safety of street residents. 	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>

Resident	Object	<p>1. Contravention of City Centre Transport Plan The proposed amendment starkly contradicts the objectives outlined in the "Developing a new transport plan for Brighton & Hove" released in September 2021. The introduction of additional parking spaces on Kew Street, a central locale, is poised to attract an influx of private car traffic, inevitably leading to congestion. This directly undermines the city's pursuit of creating a more appealing and vibrant city centre and establishing low-traffic neighbourhoods, particularly with the proximity of St Paul's CE Primary School and Wagtails Nursery.</p> <p>2. Environmental Ramifications Brighton City Centre's acknowledged pollution concerns, as underscored by assessments and the "Air Quality Action Plan 2022 to 2027," render the proposed order incongruent with the city's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The emphasis on encouraging active travel is at odds with the potential escalation in air pollution resulting from additional parking spaces, thereby compromising public health and exacerbating environmental concerns, including noise pollution.</p> <p>3. Traffic Congestion Given that Kew Street is a one-way road with a solitary entrance and exit, the creation of supplementary parking spaces is likely to precipitate traffic congestion. This congestion could extend to major thoroughfares such as Queens Road, adversely impacting the residential environment and disrupting overall traffic flow.</p> <p>4. Pedestrian Safety Apprehensions The proposed order poses a substantial risk to pedestrian safety along Queens Road, Kew Street, and the routes to St Paul's CE Primary School and Wagtails Nursery. The heightened traffic resulting from additional parking spaces increases the likelihood of accidents, particularly during peak travel times, thereby posing a significant threat to schoolchildren who frequently traverse Kew Street.</p> <p>5. Fire Safety Implications Given Kew Street's configuration as a one-way road with narrow entrance and exit points, the proposed order could impede firefighting efforts during an emergency. Cars parked along the roadside may obstruct fire engine access, posing a severe threat to the safety of street residents.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>I would just like to record my objection to the proposed changes. I am a resident of Kew Street and agree with all the objections previously raised by my neighbours.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>Firstly, by NOT having on street parking in Kew Street you have created a surprisingly well used amenity. Every single day the street is used by carers in the local community as they visit clients or do laundry drops with heavy bags of clean/dirty laundry. Barely a day goes by when there are fewer than three vans parked on the street by local tradespeople working on homes in the vicinity. By putting parking spaces on the street, this local amenity will be lost as there will be no room for these activities. The risk is of course that this parking activity is displaced potentially to less convenient places for local residents and for traffic flow. Secondly, you might consider if you should put five vehicle spaces. there is a steep ramp up to Kew Street at my end of the street. In icy weather I've spent many an hour watching cars, bin lorries, vans etc accelerate in the attempt to get up the ramp which is rarely salted and if they make it to the top there is a distinct lack of control and some skidding. The last car to park in a bay would be vulnerable to being clipped. This is also a danger while drivers get used to the parking bays because cars tend to come quickly up the ramp on the left hand side of the road and because it's a blind bend they are also likely to hit the last car in the row. I hope that these two points are food for thought and wait with interest for the results of your consultation.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>
Resident	Object	<p>Kew Street Brighton — location of proposed shared permit/paid bays is on a blind corner after a steep slope/hill, and is part of a known cut-through used by many driver, therefore constituting a potential hazard.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>

Resident	Object	<p>1. The "consultation" took place during the holiday period when many residents were away. I feel that this was very unfair and almost calculated to keep any protests by local residents to a minimum. Everyone affected on Crown Gardens which backs on to Kew Street should have had a written consultation letter delivered to their properties. I am afraid expecting us to regularly check your website or inspect lampposts for notices on a street which we rarely walk down is not good enough.</p> <p>2 Our property is directly opposite the proposed parking bays. One of the reasons we bought it two years ago was because the view from the back was unrestricted and car free. Can't spaces be made where the rubbish bins are (they could be moved across the road to Church Street) where some properties have shrubbery against the railing to hide the view?</p> <p>3. According to Brighton and Hove's Full Carbon Neutral 2030 Programme "They made 10 recommendations, which will be considered by the Council in developing its fifth Local Transport Plan and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan:</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>
Resident	object	<p>As the resident of Crown Gardens, which Kew Street backs onto, I strongly object to this proposal of creating parking bays on this street. this would be to the detriment of local residents, who already have to put up with too large a number of vehicles entering city centre, where the trend should be to reduce the number of vehicles in central Brighton, in line with what other cities are now promoting. Having visited Cambridge in the summer, where the park and ride scheme is well established, we had first-hand experience of how immensely reducing number of vehicles in the city centre benefits both tourist and local residents, with the reduction of traffic, pollution, and providing more space for accessing pavements p, etc. thus promoting people walking rather than clogging the town which is already too small for the number of vehicles entering. Furthermore, I am sure I can speak for all residents of Crown Gardens, whose back patios back onto Kew Street. Having parking bays in this area will significantly reduce quality of life for these residents, who would have to put up with noise, pollution and lack of privacy (my daughters' bedroom window is at the street level with Kew Street, and people would be looking directly into their bedroom). As the patios are in a dip, any fumes and pollution will linger and further spoil the already polluted air. As we have seen in the case of London, air pollution poses a significant health risk, especially to children. The families in city centre already have to put up with a lot of inconvenience related to the high amount of traffic, and this would further degrade the already tough living conditions. Another point is, Kew Street is used by a lot of parents and children as a thoroughfare to school, with St Paul's at the top of the hill. Increasing traffic in this area will endanger their safety, and can potentially lead to dangerous situations. I would also like to mention that west hill is a conservation area, and it is in the interest of the council to preserve the beauty of this part of town, not further clog it with vans, 4x4's, etc. parking and deteriorating this part of town. I trust that, in light of the above, the council will take local residents' views into account, and not impose this hideous and dangerous thing on us.</p>	<p>The proposal for a formalised parking arrangement with Kew Street meets the necessary highway standards which ensures access for service and emergency service vehicles will not be compromised. Officers discussed on site any potential issues with the distance from the bend to where the proposed parking places are to begin and concluded the sight lines are sufficient in terms of distance. Vehicles belonging to traders permit holders and Blue Badge holders will also have the opportunity to park within the marked bays. The proposed parking places are clear of the frontage to residents properties that have access to off street parking and will not compromise access. Officers will review the existing traffic sign and road marking arrangements associated with the existing 'one way' arrangement to ensure they are sufficient in terms of coverage and condition. Vehicles contravening the current no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) can be reported to the councils parking enforcement contractor whilst vehicles contravening the 'one way' arrangement can be reported to Sussex Police via Operation Crackdown. Officers can find no real clear evidence to suggest the introduction of the proposed formalised parking arrangement in Kew Street constitutes a danger to residents or pedestrians. In terms of the concerns relating to increased pollution, comments indicate there to be a number of vehicular movements by various types of vehicle within Kew Street presently, however transport officers acknowledge it is not clear whether the proposals would result in poorer air quality or not without having access to data showing current levels or the means to monitor levels post implementation.</p>

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 81

Subject: Cycle Hangars Installation Update following TRO-52-2023

Date of meeting: 26th March 2024

Report of: Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture

Contact Officer: Name: Matthew Reid
Tel: 07878683795
Email: Matthew.E.Reid@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

For general release

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 The aim of the cycle hangars project is to provide access to safe and affordable cycle storage and encourage modal shift in line with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) 5 and the Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
- 1.2 On the 6th July 2023 the Transport & Sustainability Committee authorised officers to progress the roll out of Cycle Hangars across the city with the target of installing 150 hangars in total and that further reports detailing progress are submitted to the committee. This report provides an update on the installation of cycle hangars within Brighton and Hove, following the TRO consultation TRO-52-2023.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Committee notes that 39 cycle hangars have been installed following the locations advertised under the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) TRO-52-2023.
- 2.2 That Committee agrees, that having taken account of comments and representations received through the TRO consultation, 20 cycle hangars, out of 51 advertised, will not be installed. Please refer to paragraphs 3.5 to 3.7 and the table in point 3.7.

3. Context and background information

- 3.1 At Budget Council on 25th February 2021, the Council committed funding towards the implementation of cycle hangars. This funding was subsequently included in the LTP Programme at Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in March 2021 and again at the February 2022 Budget Council.

- 3.2 At the Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting on 6th July 2023 it was agreed that the roll out of cycle hangars should continue with the objective of installing a total of 150 hangars in the city before the end of March 2024.
- 3.3 At the Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting on the 5th December 2023 Members noted that 40 cycle hangars had been installed following the positive consultation results of TRO-38-2023. This meant that a total of 111 cycle hangars had been installed throughout Brighton.
- 3.4 Between the 1st December 2023 and 12th January 2024 a further 51 new cycle hangars were advertised through TRO-52-2023. Please refer to Appendix A for a summary of the comments and objections received.
- 3.5 Following TRO-52-2023, 39 hangars were installed between February and March 2024, these are listed in appendix B and were the sites that registered the least objections. Eight of these locations were agreed from the previously advertised TRO-38-2023 due to minimal objections. These 39 hangars combined with the 111 already installed within the city brings the total of installed cycle hangars to 150 and concludes the installation program.
- 3.5 Of the 51 cycle hangars advertised in TRO-52-2023 (including 3 on the footway not requiring a TRO), 34 received less than 6 objections and 23 received messages of support for individual locations. There were also 27 messages of support for the cycle hangars scheme generally and all the locations within the TRO advertised.
- 3.6 17 cycle hangars received over 6 objections. Most objections were related to concerns around the loss of parking. Other concerns were the visual impact, graffiti, installation in a conservation areas, proximity to listed buildings and safety. There were however a number of supporting statements, common themes of which were, meeting a need for secure cycle parking, looking forward to utilizing the proposed hangar, a positive idea which encourages cycling, and appreciation of the fact that many residents do not have space to store bicycles within their homes.
- 3.7 As the target of 150 installed hangars has been achieved, officers recommend that the locations from TRO-52-2023 which received six or more objections, or an objection from a Councilor are not installed. It is also proposed that 4 cycle hangars that received less than 6 objections are also not installed, following a further review of the proposed locations. Therefore 20 hangars from TRO-52-2023 will not be installed. These are listed in Appendix D
- 3.8 There is evidence of demand for cycle hangars since the first ones were installed in the summer of 2022. Most of the 150 hangars installed are fully booked with waiting lists. The overall number of people waiting for a space across all 150 hangars (900 Spaces) currently stands at 2,120.

4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

- 4.1 In November 2021 a survey was carried out to determine residents' suggestions for cycle hangar locations. There were over 2,000 responses from residents, resulting in 525 roads being requested across the city.
- 4.2 A scoring matrix was developed, which considered the number of requests from the survey, the type of property (flat or house), cycle storage at the property, propensity to cycle and levels of cycle theft in the area. All 525 roads have been scored on the matrix.
- 4.3 Various factors were considered when choosing locations, including demand from the survey, drainage, sightlines/clearance, street furniture, conservation areas and access to properties.
- 4.4 The higher scoring roads were prioritised for assessment and advertisement first, and 150 out of the 525 roads requested in the survey now have cycle hangars installed. If funding is secured in future for more cycle hangars, a new process for requests will be developed.

5. Community engagement and consultation

- 5.1 As referred to in section 4.1 above an initial residents' survey was advertised asking for residents to identify locations for cycle hangars. Over 2,000 residents responded to this survey. These locations were considered as part of the initial assessment process. The survey was widely published in the press, on social media and on the council website.
- 5.2 All proposed locations for a cycle hangar are discussed with internal officers and then Ward Councilors before TRO's are advertised.
- 5.3 TROs associated with the hangars were advertised on the council website and in the local press and distributed to our Statutory Consultation list. This provided people with the opportunity to comment on the proposed cycle hangar locations. Residents that lived within view of the advertised locations were sent letters with the details of the TROs. The letter also included a picture of a cycle hangar and plan of the proposed location.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 Following TRO-52-2023, 39 hangars were installed between February and March 2024, these are listed in appendix B and were the sites that registered the least objections. Eight of these locations were agreed from the previously advertised TRO-38-2023 due to minimal objections. These 39 hangars combined with the 111 already installed within the city brings the total of installed cycle hangars to 150 and concludes the installation program.
- 6.2 Falco UK Ltd will continue the management and maintenance of the 150 hangars. From April 2024 this will be implemented in a cost neutral contract.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 At Budget Council on 25th February 2021, the Council committed £0.500m Capital budget towards the implementation of cycle hangars across the city on a self-funding business case. A further £0.500m was also committed at the February 2022 Budget Council. The Capital project is funded through unsupported borrowings with both loan and interest charged to the City Transport divisions revenue budgets over the life of the asset, which is assumed to be 10 years, based on other equipment acquisitions. This works out at approximately £0.120m per year. £0.125m recurring budget has been allocated as part of the 24/25 to support the unsupported borrowing of the capital investment. Any significant variation to budget will be reported as part of the council's monthly budget monitoring process.
- 7.2 The approximate loss of income to the parking revenue is approximately £0.046m per annum for 150 cycle hangar installations. This figure is based on a review by the councils' parking team. This latest review carried out in 2023 accounted for potential income loss based on the income received from paid for parking and resident permits. It considered the fact that some areas are under utilised, and loss of parking will not have an effect. The figure includes a 5% contingency to allow for parking price increases. All figures are estimated and based on the most expensive permits and vehicle categories.
- 7.3 The cycle spaces are currently charged at £60 per annum, per space and each cycle hangar has 6 spaces. The revenue is received by Falco UK under their current contract. Officers have negotiated a new two-year contract with Falco UK Ltd, to commence on the 1st April 2024. At this point the rental fee will likely increase to £66 per annum. This new contract will maintain the current arrangement, whereby all rental income from the hangars is received by Falco UK Ltd which will enable Falco to provide all management and maintenance for 150 hangars until at least March 2026, resulting in no or low management and maintenance costs to the council.

Name of finance officer consulted: John Lack Date consulted (13/02/24):

8. Legal implications

- 8.1 The Highways Act 1980 permits local authorities to place objects or structures on a highway for the purposes of providing a service for the benefit of the public, or a section of the public.
- 8.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on local traffic authorities to manage the road network with a view to securing, as far as reasonably practicable, the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of all types of traffic. The Council regulates traffic by means of traffic regulation orders (TROs) made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which can prohibit, restrict, or regulate the use of a road, or any part of the width of a road, by vehicular traffic. After the public notice of proposals for a TRO has been advertised, any person can object to the making of the TRO. Where there are 6 or more unresolved objections to a TRO, then the matter must be returned

to the Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision. The Committee can decide to make the TRO unchanged, to make it with modifications that reduce the restrictions or not to proceed with it.

Name of lawyer consulted: Katie Kam Date consulted (20/01/24):

9. Equalities implications

- 9.1 The Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) for the cycle hangars project has been carried out and is attached in appendix C.
- 9.2 Some of the cycle hangars have been provided with spaces for non-Standard cycles (including those used by families, disabled users, and Others who need adapted cycles) to enable all users to access this provision.
- 9.3 As part of the identification of potential locations for cycle hangars an evidence-based prioritisation process was undertaken to assess where there is the greatest need and the greatest benefit to residents. The process used datasets such as Indices of Multiple Deprivation Health and Disability.

10. Sustainability implications

- 10.1 The scheme aligns to the city's development plan policy SA6 Sustainable Neighborhoods.
- 10.2 The Falco cycle hangar units are powder coated using sustainable powder coatings.
- 10.3 Falco products are manufactured Falco products are manufactured in their own 35,000m² production facility which meets International Standards for Organisation (ISO) - ISO 9000 (Quality), ISO14001 (Environmental) and National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE) CO₂ Level 3 standards.

11. Other Implications

Social Value and procurement implications

- 11.1 A procurement process was undertaken to find a suitable supplier for the cycle hangars and approved by the Procurement Advisory Board on 26th July 2021.
- 11.2 The contract with Falco includes a social value offering of one Falco Quarter Cycle Shelter (galvanised) incorporating a 5 space Sheffield stand parking rack for a school in the city.

Crime & disorder implications:

- 11.3 There's potential for criminal damage and graffiti to the cycle hangars. This has so far been minimal and not reported to police. Officers will continue to monitor this.

Public health implications:

- 11.4 Supporting and encouraging people to own and use a bicycle could help the city to be a healthy and caring place; one where healthy life expectancy is increasing through the promotion of physical activity and health inequalities are reducing.

Supporting Documentation

1. Appendices

1. Appendix A – summary of support & objections
2. Appendix B – List of installed hangars following TRO-52-2023
3. Appendix C – Equalities Impact Assessment
4. Appendix D – List of locations advertised hangars will not be installed.

Appendix A - Summary of Support & Objections

Location	Councillor Objections	Resident Objections	Specific location support
Bates Road		8	2
Inwood Crescent - hangar 1		1	
Inwood Crescent - hangar 2		2	
Ditchling Road (on 100 Rugby Rd)			2
Beaconsfield Villas			
Clermont Terrace (hangar 2)		1	
Ardingly St for St James Street			
St Aubyns 2 hangars together on footway (no TRO)			
Brunswick Place - hangar 1 on Lansdowne Rd		11	
Brunswick Place - hangar2	2	12	
Brunswick Place - H3&4 o/s #30	2	37	
Adelaide Crescent	2	10	3
Brunswick Terrace - hangar 1	2	36	5
Brunswick Terrace - hangar 2	2	36	4
Brunswick Terrace - hangar 3	2	36	4
Brunswick Square - H1&2 o/s#29 Brunswick place	2	41	2
First Avenue - hangar 1		3	1
First Avenue - hangar 2			1
Grand Avenue			
Second Avenue		1	1
Goldstone Road			1
Cowper Street - hangar 1		2	1
Cowper Street - hangar 2			1
Shirley Street - hangar 1			

Shirley Street - hangar 2			
Davigdor Road		1	
Wilbury Road			2
Albany Villas		3	
Eaton Gardens - hangar 1		2	2
Eaton Gardens - hangar 2		3	1
Langdale Road		1	
York Villas/Grove - 2 hangars together		1	
Vernon Terrace			1
Montpelier Crescent - hangar 1		3	
Montpelier Crescent - hangar 2		6	
Poynter Road - hangar 1		19	1
Poynter Road - hangar 2		23	1
Buller Rd - hangar 1			
Hanover Street		9	4
Finsbury Road			1
Melbourne Street - 2 hangars together		7	1
Arnold Street			
Southampton Street		2	
Cavendish Place		1	
Norfolk Terrace			1
Sillwood Street		1	

General Support	Context of objections
29	Loss of parking, already adequate cycle parking in properties.
27	Too close to the 2 on Compton Rd which is not full. <i>Hangar not installed for this reason. Hangar 2 installed only</i>
27	Reduces parking
29	
27	
27	Ugly, not needed, graffiti
27	
27	
27	Parking loss, conservation, tourism, protected vista, not needed.
27	Not needed, loss of parking, waste of money, not essential, listed building.
27	Conservation/protected vista. Not needed, loss of parking. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses. Encourages break ins. Safety, high winds could affect the hangar doors.
30	Conservation, taking away parking/wrong solution to problem. Protected Vista. Hangars are ugly.
32	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses.
31	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Safety concerns. Negative effect on local businesses.
31	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses.
29	Conservation/protected vista. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses.
28	Street clutter/parking/6 bikes not enough. Conservation area/look ugly/bad design.
28	
27	
28	Removes parking, some people need to drive.
28	
28	Eyesore, loss of parking, street clutter. Not needed, attract crime, investment should be in EV charging.
28	
27	

27	
27	Safety, congestion issues. More suitable locations nearby, close to property windows.
29	
27	Parking issues. Hangar is an eyesore. Not needed, properties have cycle storage.
29	Cost, not needed. Noise, disruption for residents.
28	Not needed, loss of parking. Unsightly, waste of money, dangerous.
27	Loss of parking, elderly residents, already cycle parking in block, security issues.
27	
28	
27	Loss of parking. Lots of street furniture already, encourages anti social behaviour
27	Ugly/parking issues/listed building. Encourages graffiti. Concerns around access and value of properties. Conservation issues, not needed.
28	Parking pressure. Not needed. People have gardens for their bikes. Congestion could worsen at j/w Sackville. Close to property window.
28	Parking pressure. Not needed. Ugly, graffiti. Other areas more suitable. Safety Concerns.
27	
31	Other hangars nearby/conservation area. Parking issues/narrow St/Delivery drivers. Not needed as most have front gardens. Close to properties that don't want it. Access issues.
28	
28	No need/reduces parking. Looks unsightly. Waste of money.
27	
27	Very close to property window, would obstruct as pavement is very narrow. Concerns around space on pavement. <i>Hangar not installed (due to some of these issues)</i>
27	Loss of parking
28	
27	Loss of parking

Appendix B- List of installed hangars following TRO-52-2023

Location	Amount of Hangars
Queens Park Terrace & Freshfield St	2
Queens Park Road (hangars 3&4)	2
Bonchurch Road	1
Lincoln Street	1
Southover St	2
Finsbury Road	1
Arnold Street	1
Cowper Street - hangar 1	1
Cowper Street - hangar 2	1
Shirley Street - hangar 1	1
Shirley Street - hangar 2	1
St Aubyns 2 hangars together on footway (no TRO)	2
First Avenue - hangar 1	1
First Avenue - hangar 2	1
Grand Avenue	1
Second Avenue	1
Wilbury Road	1
TOTAL	21

Location	Amount of Hangars
Ditchling Road (on 100 Rugby Rd)	1
Clermont Terrace (hangar 2)	1
Beaconsfield Villas	1
Inwood Crescent - hangar 2	1
Montpelier Crescent - hangar 1	1
Vernon Terrace	1
York Villas/Grove	1
Cavendish Place	1
Norfolk Terrace	1
Sillwood Street	1
Albany Villas	1
Langdale Rd	1
Eaton Gardens - hangar 1	1
Eaton Gardens - hangar 2	1
Davigdor Road	1
Goldstone Road	1
Ardingly St for St James Street	1
Buller Rd - hangar 1	1
TOTAL	18

Short Equality Impact and Outcome Assessment (EIA)

Title of EIA ¹	Cycle Hangars	ID No. ²	EEC32
Team/Department ³	City Transport		
Focus of EIA ⁴	<p><u>Background/Reason for the project</u></p> <p>It is only recently that council and national policy has required developers to provide cycle parking as a standard for all new residential housing. This means that storage of bicycles in older properties, existing flats or houses of multiple occupancies are a significant challenge to residents in the city who wish to own or store a bicycle. The city also suffers from a high level of bike theft and vandalism due to lack of safe, secured and covered facilities for residents. Local Transport Note 01/20 Cycling Infrastructure Design, released in July 2020, states that “Cycle parking is integral to any cycle network, and to wider transport systems incorporating public transport. The availability of secure cycle parking at home, the end of a trip or at an interchange point has a significant influence on cycle use”. Therefore, the provision of high-quality secure cycle parking is a key determinant of whether people will choose to cycle or not.</p> <p>Funding has been secured for an initial rollout of 100 cycle hangars to be installed across the city. This was subsequently extended to 150 cycle hangars.</p> <p><u>Who is affected by the service, or how it is delivered?</u></p> <p>The cycle hangars project will provide residents across the city with the opportunity to park their bikes in locked units. Each unit can hold up to six bikes. Residents, and businesses will be affected by the project. Some residents parking bays may be removed to accommodate the hangars. Disabled parking bays will not be removed unless there is evidence that they are underutilised by disabled users. In the unlikely event that disabled parking bays are proposed to be repurposed for the installation of cycle hangars, their usage will be thoroughly researched by the parking infrastructure team prior to this.</p> <p>Initially the hangars will mainly be used by residents. We may work with businesses in future after the initial rollout of 100 to potentially provide them with cycle hangars to assist their business models if relevant.</p> <p>Providing secure cycle parking potentially encourages cycle use, which delivers health and wellbeing benefits and reduces demands on the health service. Encouraging cycle use could reduce the number of motorised vehicles travelling in the city, making roads safer for pedestrians and other cyclists. People who may not be able to afford bicycles and therefore may not benefit directly from this scheme are likely to walk and use public</p>		

transport more than an average person and tend to live in more congested areas. As a result, they would benefit positively from safer streets, improved air quality and reduced congestion due to lower levels of motor traffic, which better provision for cyclists might bring.

Equality will be considered throughout the process of identifying and implementing the cycle hangars through the following aspects:

- As part of the identification of potential locations for cycle hangars an evidence-based prioritisation process was undertaken to assess where there is the greatest need and the greatest benefit to residents. The process used datasets such as Indices of Multiple Deprivation Health and Disability. The subsequent top 20 location recommendations will be referred to when prioritising the bike hangar locations.
- An online survey was carried out in October/November 2021 for residents to suggest locations for the cycle hangars. Following this a prioritisation matrix system will be used to identify the initial 150 locations. The matrix will incorporate findings from the survey and the above data sets along with other set criteria such as type of property. Equalities questions were not asked as part of the survey.
- It is likely that some of the cycle hangers will be provided with spaces for non-standard cycles (including those used by families, disabled users and others who need adapted cycles) to enable all users to access this provision – the requirement for this was stipulated in the tender documents for procuring a supplier of the cycle hangars.

Due to vehicle parking spaces potentially being repurposed for the cycle hangars to be installed, most cycle hangar locations are likely to be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) before the cycle hangar is installed. This will give residents on the roads where we are intending to install the hangars the opportunity to look at the planned locations and comment. If a TRO is not needed, residents on the affected roads will still be consulted on the plans before the cycle hangars are installed.

How does it fit with other services?

The project fits with other transport policies and services such as:

- Active travel fund
- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)
- Capability fund
- Access to education/employment
- Cycle lanes & Cycle Training
- Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs)
- General cycle parking
- School Travel Plans & School Streets
- Cargo bike accelerator project
- Local Transport Plan 5

Other teams from BHCC that will be involved in the project are the Parking Team, Housing Team, Highways, Transport Policy & Strategy Team, Transport Administration & Research Team, Business Development &

Compliance Team, Traffic Team, Procurement Team, Community Engagement Team, and the Legal Services Team.

External Stakeholders include: NSL parking enforcement, Project Centre, Hanover Community Centre, Falco, Cyclepods, and Ditchling Rise And Residents Association (DRARA).

Who implements the project?

The Transport Projects & Engineering Team will be project managing the cycle hangars project. Initially approximately 100 cycle hangars are being planned, more may be installed in future depending on future funding being secured. A procurement process has been carried out to find an external contractor to supply, install and manage the spaces in the cycle hangars, as well as maintaining them. The project may be brought in-house in future once the project is well established, following an initial contract of 2 years with the external contractor.

Who are the external and internal service-users, groups, or communities?

All residents, of Brighton and Hove will be able to apply for a space in a cycle hangar once they are installed and a system is set up for allocating spaces within the hangars. Employees of BHCC that are also residents in the city will be able to apply for a space if they choose to.

Outcomes

One of the outcomes in the Council's Plan is to deliver a 'sustainable city', and as part of this, a transport network that ensures Brighton & Hove becomes carbon neutral by 2030 and keeps the city moving. With a focus on providing cycle parking infrastructure the project will help meet the corporate priority of developing a sustainable and active travel network as follows:

- encouraging mixed mode travel with good transport interchanges and better integration of travel information.
- delivering a transport system that provides sustainable travel with investment in walking, cycling and smart traffic signalling.

Supporting and encouraging people to own and use a bicycle will also help the city to be a 'healthy and caring' place; one where healthy life expectancy is increasing through the promotion of physical activity and health inequalities are reducing.

Cycle storage will be easier for residents where the cycle hangars are located. Having secure cycle parking near residents' homes therefore encourages cycle usage.

Objectives

The aim of the project is to encourage modal shift in line with the LTP 5, LCWIP and to help towards BHCC becoming a carbon neutral council by 2030, to reduce issues for residents such as cycle theft, cycle storage space, and to support the use of cycling as a mode of transport.

	<p>Replacement of car parking with cycle parking would be a benefit of the project in terms of encouraging cycling and helping modal shift away from the car. The scheme has the potential to benefit residents of housing estates, shared flats and those without outdoor space, and for disabled cyclists who may want easy access for their bicycle.</p> <p>A further benefit may be the improvements to the overall street scene, with the reduction of bike storage in front gardens, lamp posts and near-by railings.</p>
--	---

Assessment of overall impacts and any further recommendations⁵

As the cycle hangar project is a new scheme for BHCC, we do not have any local, specific research or data to show the positive or negative impacts that the cycle hangars could have on specific groups. Therefore, the overall impacts are as follows:

Disability: Cycle parking provision has the potential to have a positive impact on the community. Increasing cycling has both direct and indirect health benefits which impact not only an individual that cycles (through better fitness and improved mental health) but also the wider community, (through better air quality, less noise pollution, reduced road danger, etc.). The cycle hangar spaces will be available for all residents to apply for. The units can be adapted to accommodate large, adapted bikes, such as those used by disabled cyclists, as well as for bikes with child seats on them and cargo bikes which parents may use for carrying children. These may therefore benefit disabled people.

Gender: Carefully selected locations that are well lit and overlooked and centrally located, will ensure that the environment is well considered to ensure all users of the hangars feel safe when getting their bicycles in and out.

Age: The scheme is intending to broaden the demographic of cyclists, in particular where users may need to repeatedly carry cycles up or down stairs the scheme should have a positive impact. The elderly tend to be less physically active – cycling provides a cheap form of transport and a simple form of physical exercise. The hangars are designed to accommodate most types of bicycle, inclusive of all the age groups.

Economic: In the Department for Transport's report, "The value of cycling" (Raje F. and Saffrey A. 2016. University of Birmingham and Phil Jones Associates) typical benefits of providing a secure cycle storage or bike hanger scheme were identified:

- Strategic economic benefits: High-density, cycle-friendly improvements to urban streetscape is conducive to achieve agglomeration benefits, although evidence in relation to regeneration and residential property effects is mixed
- Individual benefits: Evidence for individual benefits accruing from a specific investment is mixed, acknowledging the link between hard and soft measures to deliver individualised benefits that address underlying structural barriers to cycling
- Employment benefits: Both as an enabler of access to employment and education for transport-deprived residents, and as a means of attracting and retaining skilled labour and inward investment with lower staff absenteeism and turnover
- Local economic benefits: Increased retail spend density. Per sqm, parking provision for cycles generates 5x more retail spend than car parking (Lee A, and March A. (2010) 'Recognising the economic role of bikes: sharing parking in Lygon Street, Carlton'. Australian Planner. 47(2), 85–93)
- Public expenditure benefits: Typically low cost, high benefit, reduced spend on healthcare and school travel, and the potential of existing

- infrastructure, particularly if targeted at new cyclists
- Fiscal benefits: Increased revenues arising from agglomeration benefits, and specifically potential to reduce the opportunity cost of car parking space by giving more people access to on-street parking.

Potential issues	Mitigating actions
<p>Most cycle hangar units will be installed on the carriageway, replacing vehicle parking. They are approximately the same size as a standard car, therefore installing them in vehicle parking spaces should not cause visibility or obstruction issues for disabled people. Some may be placed in other areas such as on housing estates or on footway buildouts, in which case visibility and obstruction would need to be considered.</p> <p>There will be a fee for using the hangars and this might have a potentially negative impact on people of lower socioeconomic status.</p>	<p>Early engagement with disabled groups such as the RNIB and Possability People explaining the project and discussing any potential issues. Use standard guidelines for installing structures on the highway or footway.</p> <p>The fee is necessary to deliver desired level of service. If a space in the bike hangar will enable some people to rely on cycling as a main mode of transport it will provide a significant financial saving on alternative modes of transport. Review the impact the fee has on users and potentially introduce a sliding scale for fees, based on users income in future years.</p>
Actions planned⁶	
<p>Consultations – Once cycle hangar locations are decided upon they will be subject to statutory consultation in the form of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Letters with the location plans will also be sent to residents before the TRO is advertised. Alternative formats of any documentation used in any consultations will be available upon request (such as audible copies for blind people) as well as being made available in different languages.</p>	

EIA sign-off: (for the EIA to be final an email must sent from the relevant people agreeing it or this section must be signed)

Lead Equality Impact Assessment officer: Michelle Jamieson Date: 12/01/2022

Communities, Equality Team and Third Sector officer: Janice Markey Date: 14/01/2222

Appendix D- List of locations where a hangar will not be installed.

LOCATION	OBJECTIONS	CONTEXT OF OBJECTIONS
Bates Road	8	Loss of parking, already adequate cycle parking in properties.
Brunswick Place – Hangar 1 on Brunswick Rd	11	Parking loss, conservation, tourism, protected vista, not needed.
Brunswick Place – Hangar 2	12 2 Councillor Objections	Not needed, loss of parking, waste of money, not essential, listed building.
Brunswick Place – Hangar 3&4	37 2 Councillor Objections	Conservation/protected vista. Not needed, loss of parking. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses. Encourages break ins. Safety, high winds could affect the hangar doors.
Adelaide Crescent	10 2 Councillor Objections	Conservation, taking away parking/wrong solution to problem. Protected Vista. Hangars are ugly.
Brunswick Terrace – Hangar 1	36 2 Councillor Objections	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses.
Brunswick Terrace – Hangar 2	36 2 Councillor Objections	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Safety concerns. Negative effect on local businesses.
Brunswick Terrace – Hangar 3	36 2 Councillor Objections	Loss of parking, tourism, conservation, listed buildings. Hangars are ugly. Safety concerns. Negative effect on local businesses.
Brunswick Square – Hangar 1&2	41 2 Councillor Objections	Conservation/protected vista. Hangars are ugly. Negative effect on local businesses.
Montpelier Crescent – Hangar 2	6	Ugly/parking issues/listed building. Encourages graffiti. Concerns around access and value of properties. Conservation issues not needed.
Poynter Road – Hangar 1	19	Parking pressure. Not needed. People have gardens for their bikes. Congestion could worsen at j/w Sackville. Close to property window.
Poynter Road – Hangar 2	23	Parking pressure. Not needed. Ugly, graffiti. Other areas more suitable. Safety Concerns.
Hanover Street	9	Other hangars nearby/conservation area. Parking issues/narrow St/Delivery drivers. Not needed as most have front gardens. Close to properties that don't want it. Access issues.
Melbourne Street – 2 hangars together	7	No need/reduces parking. Looks unsightly. Waste of money.
Inwood Crescent – hangar 1	1	Too close to the 2 hangars on Compton Rd, which do not currently have waiting lists. <i>Hangar not installed for this reason. Hangar 2 installed only</i>
Southampton Street	2	Very close to property window, would obstruct as pavement is very narrow. Concerns around space on pavement. <i>Hangar not installed (due to some of these issues)</i>
York Villas – 1 hangar	1	Technical issue, install 1 on the footway nearby instead

Brighton & Hove City Council

Transport & Sustainability Committee

Agenda Item 82

Subject: Retender of Supported Bus Service Contracts

Date of meeting: 26th March 2024

Report of: Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture

Contact Officer: Name: Owen McElroy
Tel: 01273 296393
Email: owen.mcelroy@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

For general release

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 To seek approval and permission to delegate authority to procure and award service contracts to the Executive Director Economy Environment & Culture for the:
- supported school bus services, and
 - supported bus services.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy Environment & Culture to extend the existing contract for supported school bus services up to and including 4 September 2025 and agree any necessary amendments to such contract.
- 2.2 That Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy Environment & Culture:
- 1) to procure and award the supported bus service contracts referred to in paragraph 3.4 of this report for a term of four years with the option to extend for a further four years.
 - 2) to extend such contracts for period(s) of up to a total maximum of four years should the Director consider it appropriate at the relevant time.

3. Context and background information

- 3.1 The Council supports a network of eight school routes and eight socially necessary routes run by a variety of local bus operators. The last tendering exercise was carried out in 2017, with contracts being extended during the Covid 19 pandemic and then extended and varied again in 2023 to meet the commitments of the Department of Transport (DFT) funded Bus Service Improvement Plan.

- 3.2 As set out in the Council's Corporate Plan 2023 – 2027 the relevant priorities are:
- A Responsive Council with well-run services, “protect the most vulnerable from the effect of reduced council funding, rising demand and the increasing complexity of needs.”
 - Living and ageing well, “work with local partners to develop plans to help people to be physically active and maintain a healthy weight “
- 3.3 Some of the supported services were enhanced with additional weekend and Sunday services in 2023 as part of the Council's three-year Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP).
- 3.4 With the exception of the school routes, which are contracted until 4th September 2024, the current supported services contracts cover the period up to and including 31st March 2025, when the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) funding is due to end. For all new contracts beyond this period, it is proposed to offer a term of 4 years + 4 years, with a notice period clause.
- 3.5 A cut in council funding for supported services of £58,000 was approved at Budget Council in February 2024 and has been implemented in the budget for 24/25. That amount funds two of the Breeze up to the Downs routes 77 (Devils Dyke) and 79 (Ditchling Beacon).
- 3.6 It is proposed to ask operators to put forward their service options based on pre-BSIP timetables and to confirm that they would have capacity to provide enhancements at the current BSIP levels, if/when further BSIP funding is confirmed and available. This will be outlined in their contract. It is proposed to retender the services in the following lots.
- Lot 1: Route 21
 - Lot 2: Route 37/37B
 - Lot 4: Routes 16, 47 and 52.
- 3.7 For the school bus services, it is proposed to extend the existing contracts with Brighton & Hove Buses up to the 4th September 2025, and then retender from this date for a term of 4 years (+ 4 years), with a notice period clause. Prior to the tender process the school routes will be reviewed to ensure they meet the requirements of schools and users, subject to resources and priorities.
- 3.8 The original Contract (of 2017) with Brighton & Hove Buses was extended through a 'Deed of variation' up to and including 3rd September 2024.
- 3.9 Historically Brighton & Hove Buses were the only operator to submit a tender for the school routes, as these services are provided as an adjunct to their existing commercial routes and no other provider has been able to

make a competitive bid since they would have to provide a dedicated double decker bus that only runs for the morning and afternoon school times.

- 3.10 The new contract must be in place from 4th September 2024, so that the school bus services are in operation from this date.
- 3.11 School bus services are not BSIP funded but increases are affordable at least until September 2024 within the current budget. There is no option for school bus services to be funded by the BSIP.
- 3.12 The potential costs of the retendering exercise is set out in the financial implications paragraph (7).

4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

- 4.1 One option would be to further extend these contracts beyond 31st March 2025, but this is not reasonably feasible as we do not know what the funding situation will be after 31st March 2025, and given the Council's financial situation, an assessment of priorities needs to be carried out as soon as possible.

5. Community engagement and consultation

- 5.1 Community engagement and consultation will take place prior to the tender process, and the results of that engagement will be considered in drawing up the specification for the services and again following the outcome of the tender process once the prices can be compared against the funding envelope.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The new contract for the school bus services needs to be in place for the beginning of the next academic year; 4th September 2024.
- 6.2 All the remaining supported bus service contracts need to run from 1st April 2025
- 6.3 The timescale for undertaking a procurement of supported services is very tight, as it usually takes 12 months including mobilisation. The school services need to be operational from the beginning of the Autumn term, to ensure the same level of service provision meets the transport needs of school children.
- 6.4 The sustainability of long-term funding due to above inflationary costs, can be addressed through a service review, related to the outcome of the tender process.
- 6.5 An extension of school contracts for one year is proposed together with a retender of all services to commence 1st April 2025.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 The annual budget for supported bus services for 2024/25 is £1.128m covering existing Supported School Bus services and base service component of Supported Bus Services.
- 7.2 For existing non-schools Supported Bus Services, each contract has a base service component and an enhanced BSIP component. .
- 7.3 To maintain the current level of base services without any BSIP enhancements at 23/24 pricing would cost £1.9m. This would lead to a budget shortfall of at least c.£1.133m.
- 7.4 With BSIP enhancements, the cost is c£3.496m at 23/24 pricing. There is sufficient BSIP funds to cover expenditure until March 2025 but after this time further funding would be dependent on BSIP or other supported bus funding being made available.
- 7.5 Costs of the supported services (pre-BSIP) amount to more than the annual budgeted amount of £1.128m due to:
- Cost increases during the Covid 19 pandemic but at that time Covid 19 Bus Recovery Grant was paid directly by the government to cover the increased costs. This grant is now no longer present and annual core budgets are not sufficient.
 - A spike in driver, vehicle and fuel costs post pandemic.
 - Supported services budgets are partly topped up by the government's £172,990 Bus Service operators grant, but this amount has been frozen since it was introduced in 2011.
- 7.6 Extending the School services contract will allow the service to continue for a further year while the service goes through the process of re-tendering the lot. This cost fits within existing budgets and is not dependent on the continuation of BSIP for its funding. The remaining lots are to be awarded on a two-tier system, the base service, and the base service with BSIP enhancement. In the event that BSIP funding ends and no further supported bus funding is awarded in 2025/26, the council will be able to default to the base service, though additional service pressure funding would be required depending on the outcomes of tender exercise. If BSIP or other Supported Bus funding continues at current BSIP levels it would be anticipated the funding elements will cover the enhancements, but service pressure funding may still be required to maintain the base service or potentially review and prioritise services if funding is limited.

Name of finance officer consulted: David Wilder Date consulted 14.03.24.

8. Legal implications

- 8.1 The original 2017 contract for school's services was for an initial term of 4 years from 4th September 2017 with the option of extensions totalling a

further 4 years. The original contract was first extended up to and including 3rd September 2022 and then further extended until 3rd September 2024. There is therefore the option of extending the original contract again up to 4th September 2025.

- 8.2 If a new contract is required, a full procurement process would be required because the total value of the contract would be above the current threshold for the purposes of the procurement regulations. An exemption might possibly be available in the very limited circumstances set out in regulation 32(2)(b)(ii), namely where competition is absent for technical reasons, but that exemption might be difficult to argue here and would not be without risk of challenge.
- 8.3 In relation to the procurement and award of new contracts for supported bus services above the relevant financial services for thresholds for services, the Council will be required to comply with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 or, depending on the date of coming into force, the Procurement Act 2023.

Name of lawyer consulted: David Fairfield Date consulted 27.02.24.

9. Equalities implications

- 9.1 The Council has an Accessible City Strategy 2023 to 2028. An accessible city is one where people with access requirements, who live, work, and visit the city, have, independent, inclusive, and barrier-free access to council services, the city's public spaces and areas, facilities, transport, retail, leisure infrastructure, learning opportunities, support networks, health, safety, and care provisions.
- 9.2 Should contracts not to be extended and services withdrawn, an Equalities Impact Assessment would be required. However, owing to the nature of the services and distance to alternative commercial routes, it is likely that older, less mobile, and vulnerable residents would be more negatively affected by the withdrawal or reduction in frequency of council supported services.

10. Sustainability implications

- 10.1 Promotion of public transport promotes active and sustainable travel.
- 10.2 Through the council supporting local bus services this helps local employment as bus operators employ local drivers.

11. Other Implications [delete any or all that are not applicable]

Social Value and procurement implications

- 11.1 Supported services provide access to employment, education, community, and leisure activities which would otherwise not be accessible to deprived communities.

11.2 Procurement rules require that social value attributes 10% of scoring to social value criteria.

Public health implications:

11.3 The sustainability implications outlined above also apply to air quality and therefore public health.

Supporting Documentation

1. **Appendix A Further information about supported services.**

Appendix One

Additional information on supported services

School Routes: 72, 74, 75, 76, 76A, 91, 95 & 95A

The following table summarises the school buses supported by the council. All are administered by the public transport team. The 72 is a legacy arrangement related to the closure of the Comart School in Whitehawk in 2005.

Contracted School Service	Route	School served
72	Whitehawk to Longhill	Longhill
74	Bevendean to Patcham	Patcham High
75	Bevendean to Patcham	Patcham High
76	Saltdean Vale to Longhill	Longhill
76A	Patcham to Longhill	Longhill
91	Ovingdean to The Upper Drive Hove	Cardinal Newman
95	Hangleton to The Upper Drive Hove	Cardinal Newman
95A	Mile Oak to The Upper Drive Hove	Cardinal Newman

Detailed BSIP enhancements to supported services

The information below outlines the BSIP enhancements to the supported services.

21 – Brighton & Hove Buses Improvements to the service, effective from Sunday 11 June 2023

City Centre – Queens Park - Manor Hill – Whitehawk – Wilson Avenue – Brighton Marina Section of Route (the Eastern Section):

The service has doubled in frequency to every 15 minutes during the daytime on Mondays to Saturdays. The Monday to Saturday late evening service are improved to run half-hourly, with the last bus from Churchill Square at 23.55.

City Centre – Furze Hill – The Drive - Shirley Drive – Goldstone Valley, Woodland Avenue & King George VI Drive Section of Route (the Western Section):

The service has doubled in frequency to every 30 minutes during the daytime on Mondays to Saturdays. A Monday to Saturday late evening service was introduced: buses run hourly in the late evenings, with the last bus leaving Churchill Square at 23.05.

The route is simplified between Furze Hill and George Street (Goldstone Villas) to run direct via Eaton Road - instead of via Selborne Road, Church Road and Tisbury Road - which makes many people's journeys quicker.

All journeys are numbered 21. Journeys on the western section of route continue across the city to Brighton Marina. The additional journeys on the eastern section run to and from Churchill Square.

**37/37B – Compass Travel Improvements to the services, effective from Sunday 29
January 2023**

The 37/37B was improved to provide the same level of service on Sunday daytimes as it provided during the week.

This now means a more frequent Sunday daytime service for Bristol Estate and Meadowview, and a new Sunday service for communities along the 37B route - e.g. Southover Street, Pankhurst Avenue, Hartington Road, and Bear Road.

There were some minor weekday timing changes to improve reliability – and the 37B bus will now also serve Hartington Road at school finishing times, on its way to Meadowview.

**The Big Lemon Improvements to the services, effective from Monday 24
April 2023**

The **16** was improved to provide a new later evening service on Mondays to Saturdays, with the last bus from Portslade at 21.00.

The **47** was extended to run up to approximately 23.45 on Mondays to Saturdays to allow evening departures from the city centre after 2300 in both directions.

A new Sunday service was introduced, running between approximately 09.00 and 19.30. This means a Sunday service for the Hollingbury and Patcham section of route for the first time, as well as a more direct link for the Saltdean section of the route.

The **52** was extended to run up to approximately 23.45 on Mondays to Saturdays to allow evening departures from the city centre after 2300 in both directions.

A new Sunday service was introduced, running between approximately 09.00 and 19.30. This will mean a completely new Sunday link from Woodingdean to Brighton Marina and Royal Sussex County Hospital, and a Sunday service for the first time for the Hangleton & Knoll section of the route.

Service **57** was withdrawn, as it was replaced by new Sunday services on routes 47 and 52.

