

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Cromwell Road Pedestrian Crossing TRO Objection</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>11 October 2016</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director – Economy, Environment &amp; Culture</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Tracy Beverley</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3813</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Tracy.beverley@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>Goldsmid Ward</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE****1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 At the 26th May 2011 Environment Cabinet Member Meeting the pedestrian crossing assessment methodology was approved and permission granted to carryout assessments to produce the first pedestrian crossings request list within the financial year 2011/12.
- 1.2 Since the introduction of the Pedestrian Crossing Priority List, 38 locations have benefited from improvements to the Highway through various funding streams including Local Transport Plan, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, and Better Bus Areas.
- 1.3 Cromwell Road near Selbourne Place, Hove was included as a priority location within the 2014/15 priority list and recommendations were put forward to introduce a pedestrian island to assist pedestrians crossing at this location
- 1.4 The associated Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (ref: TRO-3-2016) was advertised on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2016. One objection was received by a resident relating to the relocation of a disabled parking bay and loss of parking.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the committee supports the advertised Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (ref: TRO-3-2016).

**3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 Requests for new pedestrian crossings are received regularly from members of the public and local Ward Members. Subject to the availability of funding, potential crossing locations were previously prioritised based on the number of pedestrian accidents in the immediate vicinity. At the Environment & Community Safety Overview Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2010, Members requested a review of this process. It was felt that the existing methodology did not consider the social issues associated with a lack of safe crossing points, nor did it consider the perceived danger of crossing the road.

- 3.2 Following the initial 21<sup>st</sup> July 2010 ECSOSC meeting officers undertook an investigation of pedestrian crossing assessment procedures used by other authorities in the South East region and proposed a point scoring system to enable a more wide ranging assessment to take place, taking into account the social factors in addition to collision history. Following this investigation a new robust pedestrian crossing methodology was proposed to assess crossing requests. This improved new methodology considers a range of important social factors which effect pedestrian movement such as public perception of danger, the impact of crossings on community cohesion, access to key services and green space and improvements for mobility impaired people.
- 3.3 In publishing the results of the crossing assessments on an annual basis the new methodology enables a more transparent approach to assessing pedestrian crossings and a more proactive approach to responding to requests from Ward Members and the public.
- 3.4 As part of the implementation process it is often necessary to make amendments to the existing parking/ loading restrictions this is formally carried out by the TRO process to support highway improvements. In the case of Cromwell Road, Hove the TRO was advertised to restrict parking directly within the extent of the proposed pedestrian island which has a knock on effect to the disabled parking bays situated outside no.92 Cromwell Road.
- 3.5 During the consultation period one objection was received. This objection was made although the resident supports a safe place for crossing they object to the loss of the equivalent of 2 parking spaces on the north and south side of Cromwell road resulting in additional competition for the remaining spaces. The respondent is a Blue Badge holder and therefore is also concerned that the disabled bays would be moved further away. The respondent believes this would exacerbate personal conditions. However, support from the applicant of the existing two disabled parking bays was received in writing.

#### **4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 4.1 Officers have been in contact with the respondent recommending that the resident applies for a disabled parking bay outside of their property and also that they might be eligible for a reduced rate permit.
- 4.2 There is an option to relocate one of the disabled parking bays located outside number 92 to the west of the proposed crossing. This would involve additional costs to redesign and advertise the associated TRO. It is also unlikely that the applicant of the disabled parking bay would support this relocation as it currently supports an existing care home and is regularly in use.
- 4.3 The council's city wide policy regarding disabled parking is to provide a disabled bay in a residential area within 50 meters of the user's destination. Considering the proposal is to relocate the disabled parking bay 5.5m to the east the bay would still be within 20m of the respondents address.
- 4.4 Officers have advised that Blue Badge holders may park within mixed use bays (P&D and Permit holders) which exist along Cromwell Road for free or use the

existing disabled spaces of which there are two within 20m of the respondents address.

## **5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The TRO amendment was advertised in the local press on 15 April 2016 and notices were posted in the locality in accordance with standard procedures. Details of the amendment have been sent to the full list of statutory consultee and relevant council officers.
- 5.2 Comments from the applicant of the original disabled bay holder supported the proposals in writing. Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company submitted a comment regarding available road width which was responded to and supported. No other comments have been received.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 Considering the options and comments received officers recommend that the Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (ref: TRO-3-2016) is supported and implemented as advertised.

## **7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The cost of the recommended advertisement of the TRO is estimated to be approximately £1,000 and will be funded from the approved freestanding Crossings budget within the Local Transport Plan capital programme 2016-17. The costs associated to officer time to support the advertisement for the TRO will be met from existing revenue budgets within the Transport service.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford*

*Date: 08/09/16*

### Legal Implications:

- 7.2 Before making Traffic Orders the Council must consider all duly made unwithdrawn objections. Where there are unresolved objections to a Traffic Order then the matter is referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.
- 7.3 The Council's powers and duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic including pedestrians.

*Lawyer Consulted: Stephanie Stammers*

*Date: 12/09/16*

### Equalities Implications:

- 7.4 None

Sustainability Implications:

7.5 None

Any Other Significant Implications:

7.6 None

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. TRO - Statement of Reasons