

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Parking Scheme Update Report</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>29<sup>th</sup> September 2020</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director, Economy, Environment &amp; Culture</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Catherine Dignan</b>	<b>Tel: 01273 292235</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Catherine.dignan@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>South Portslade</b>		

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

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Committee on the progress of the recent resident parking scheme detailed design consultation in South Portslade.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order for the smaller area in the South Portslade Area (Appendix A) as detailed in this report for a light touch parking scheme Monday to Friday 11-noon and 6-7pm.

**3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION****South Portslade**

- 3.1 Following Environment, Transport & Sustainability (ETS) Committee approval in November 2018. A letter was sent out to households in the South Portslade area in September/October 2019. This initial consultation was also advertised on the council's website, via social media and by a press-release. The results outlined that 60.4% of respondents were in favour of a Resident's Parking Scheme in the area based on a 36% response rate. The preference being for a 5 day light-touch scheme (56.5% of respondents wanted a light-touch scheme, 54.5% wanted a Monday to Friday scheme).
- 3.2 Following ETS Committee approval on 21st January 2020, it was agreed to write to residents and businesses in the South Portslade area to find out if there was support for Light Touch Residents Parking scheme Monday to Friday. It was decided to consult the whole area again (although a smaller area had higher support) as it would allow residents in the whole area to look at the detailed design and be aware of potential displacement issues if not included in the scheme.

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

4.1 The main alternative options are doing nothing which would mean that the parking scheme would not be taken forward or consulting on a different option.

4.2 It is, however, the recommendation of officers to proceed for the reasons that are outlined within the report.

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

5.1 Brighton & Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 2498 property address in the South Portslade area. A frequently asked question sheet and the detailed design was sent to each address. Respondents were asked to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal. Paper copies with a prepaid envelope were available to anyone should they need it. 567 (97.1%) responses received were online and by mail 17 (2.9%). The consultation was advertised on the council's website, via social media and by a press release to the local media. The consultation ran from 8 June to 17 July 2020.

5.2 Overall as a whole consultation area the results outlined that 42.7 % of respondents were in favour of a Resident's Parking Scheme in the area with 57.3% of respondents against the proposals based on a 23.4% response rate.

5.3 However, the results outlines that 82.3% of respondents support the idea of a resident parking scheme in the smaller area (as shown on Appendix A) based on a 15.9% response rate.

5.4 From this smaller area 48.1% respondents were happy with the hours of the scheme (Monday to Friday 11am-noon and 6pm-7pm) while 51.9% respondents wanted different hours although the suggested times varied a lot. Due to concerns about displacement of vehicles it is felt that the scheme should be the same times as the adjacent Wish parking scheme to avoid vehicles being moved at different hours.

5.5 Analysis undertaken of all the responses received from respondents and the full results analysis of the consultation including a road by road results plan is outlined in detail in Appendix B including the main comments.

#### **6. CONCLUSION**

6.1 Due to the consultation and reasons outlined in the report it is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order is advertised to allow the implementation of a South Portslade parking scheme but only for the smaller area shown in Appendix A

6.2 Officers have met with the South Portslade Ward Councillors who are happy to support the recommendations that we proceed to the Traffic Regulation Order stage in the smaller area although they have concerns about Southdown Avenue. Unfortunately, it's not possible to include this road as it's outside the proposed boundary of the smaller area.

- 6.3 Wish Ward Councillors have also been in discussion with officers as Boundary Road also falls within their Ward. They have outlined concerns that the south end of the road in their ward will remain unrestricted but appreciate that there will only be a smaller area of the South Portslade parking scheme going ahead which will not include Station Road / Boundary Road. Officers will continue to monitor this area and this section can be considered as part of any future review of the area with further discussions with the Ward Councillors.

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

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 It is expected that any additional costs associated with the recommendations of this report are absorbed within existing Parking Services budgets. This will be monitored as part of budget monitoring and setting.
- 7.2 Revenue income generated from on-street parking schemes is first defrayed against relevant costs with any surplus used for qualifying (as required under statute) transport and highways related expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares, Local Transport Plan projects 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.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Jess Laing*

*Date: 14/09/2020*

### Legal Implications:

- 7.3 The Council is not under a statutory duty to consult the public before making a traffic regulation order. However once the Council has decided to do so (even if consultation is voluntary) it must do so in a fair way. The consultation must take place when the relevant proposals are still at a formative stage, adequate information must be given to consultees to enable them properly to respond to the consultation exercise and they must be allowed enough time within which to respond to the consultation exercise. The Council, as decision maker, must give conscientious consideration to the consultees' responses and objections.
- 7.4 The recommendations in this report are based on the responses to the consultations for the South Portslade area and the consideration given to them.

*Lawyer Consulted: Stephanie Stammers*     *Date: 15/09/2020*

### Equalities Implications:

- 7.5 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 those local population. Engagement with a wide range of residents has been built into the process from the start. 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.

Sustainability Implications:

7.6 No sustainability implications identified.

Brexit Implications:

7.7 No Brexit implications identified.

7.8 Any Other Significant Implications:

None

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Appendix A – Plan of the area to be included in the proposed Traffic Regulation Order
2. Appendix B - Results of the proposed South Portslade area

**Background Documents**

1. Agenda Item 43 – Report to ETS Committee 27/11/18
2. Agenda Item 64 – Report to ETS Committee 21/1/20