

# Brighton & Hove City Council

## Cabinet Member Decision

**Subject:** South Hollingdean Area Residents' Parking Scheme

**Date of Decision:** 14<sup>th</sup> January 2026

**Report of:** Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure

**Contact Officer:** Name: Anthony Patchett Corporate Director- Operations

Email: [anthony.patchett@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.patchett@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

Name: Cath Dignan Corporate Director- Operations

Email: [catherine.dignan@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:catherine.dignan@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** Hollingdean & Fiveways;

**Key Decision:** No

**For general release**

### 1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to set out the results of the consultation following the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order proposing the introduction of the residents' parking scheme in the south Hollingdean area.
- 1.2 The report seeks Cabinet Member approval to make the Traffic Regulation Order and to thereafter implement the proposals contained within it. Such approval is being sought due to there being more than five unresolved objections to the proposals.
- 1.3 Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2024 Amendment Order No.\* 202\* (TRO-16a-2025)

### 2. Recommendations

The **Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:**

- 2.1 Having taken account of all the duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed with the making of the Order and implementation of the proposals outlined within it.

### 3. Context and background information

- 3.1 The parking scheme consultations were undertaken in accordance with the parking scheme priority timetable programme, which was agreed at Committee following various petitions and deputations.
- 3.2 A detailed design consultation took place between 26 January and 9 March 2025. A summary of the results from this consultation are showed in the table below.

Number of properties mailed	1688
Consultation response rate	646 (38%)
Support for a residents parking scheme	476 (74%)
Against a parking scheme	170 (26%)

- 3.3 Due to strong support for a parking scheme, a report was presented seeking cabinet member approval to move to advertising a traffic regulation order.

#### **4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options**

- 4.1 The main alternative options are doing nothing, which would mean that the parking scheme consultation would not be taken forward or consulting on a different option.
- 4.2 It is, however, recommended by officers to proceed with the recommendations for the reasons that are outlined within the report.

#### **5. Community engagement and consultation**

- 5.1 Following informal cabinet member approval in July 2025, it was agreed to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to allow the implementation of the South Hollingdean Area parking scheme. The TRO was advertised on 8th August 2025 with the closing dates for comments and objections on the 29th August 2025. The Ward Councillors for the area were consulted as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.2 The notice was published in the Argus newspaper on 8th August 2025. Detailed plans and the draft TRO were available to view online. Notices were put up in the roads within the consultation boundary.
- 5.3 We received 150 items of correspondence to the proposals. This included 45 support, 99 objections, and 6 comments. From residents who live within the proposed zone, there were 44 items of correspondence in support of the proposals. From local workers, there were 71 objections. There were 19 objections from residents who live within the proposed zone, 4 objections from residents who live outside of the proposed zone, and 5 residents did not provide their address.
- 5.4 The comments are listed in Appendix A alongside an outline of the officers comments.
- 5.5 Officers have attended meetings with Ward Councillors to discuss the results and the way forward.

#### **6. Financial implications**

- 6.1 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.

- 6.2 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.
- 6.3 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.

Name of finance officer consulted: David Wilder Date consulted: 07/11/25

## **7. Legal implications**

- 7.1 Before a Council can confirm traffic regulation orders, it must take into account all relevant objections received as a result of the required consultation process and come to a decision whether or not to confirm the orders having weighed up the relevant material considerations and having taken into account its duty under section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Name of lawyer consulted: Katie Kam Date consulted: 16/10/25

## **8. Risk Implications**

- 8.1 Potential displacement of parking into the north area if the south area parking scheme is implemented. Residents in north Hollingdean were consulted at the same time as residents in south Hollingdean and were made aware of the potential risk during the consultation.

## **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.
- 9.2 Brighton & Hove City Council have a vision for parking that aims to make the City a more accessible place, with schemes in place that support residents, and also that are developed in consultation with residents in line with our approach as a listening council.

## **10. Sustainability implications**

- 10.1 Parking schemes can help to encourage less polluting travel options and reduce emissions. In addition, congestion can affect the reliability of journey times and long-term parking can reduce accessibility. Parking schemes can help to encourage alternative transport choices and higher turnover of

spaces. Better accessibility through a high turnover of vehicles being parked helps to support local businesses.

## **11. Health and Wellbeing Implications:**

- 11.1 For residents who purchase a permit, parking schemes can improve access and accessibility for residents by increasing opportunities to park in the locality of their residence.
- 11.2 If a parking scheme was implemented, residents would have the option of purchasing a 12 or 3 month permit. A 3 month permit allows residents to spread the cost throughout the year.

## **Other Implications**

## **12. Procurement implications**

- 12.1 No procurement implications.

## **13. Crime & disorder implications:**

- 13.1 Parking schemes can help to reduce dangerous and antisocial parking by formalising parking spaces, using national guidelines from the Department for Transport.
- 13.2 Motorists are required to hold a resident/visitor permit or paid parking session during the hours of operation. This reduces the number of abandoned vehicles.

## **14. Cabinet Member Conclusion**

- 14.1 The concurrent public consultations on the proposed controlled parking zones (CPZs) for both south Hollingdean and north Hollingdean, completed earlier in the year have been carefully examined. The review confirms and reaffirms support to proceed with the south Hollingdean CPZ and to proceed with no change for north Hollingdean.
- 14.2 The two areas were clearly distinguished by the public consultation, as stated and illustrated in the data presented in maps for both locations.
- 14.3 From the public consultation carried out between 26<sup>th</sup> January and 9<sup>th</sup> March 2025:

Support for the proposed CPZ in south Hollingdean reached 74% in favour and 26% against, with 1,688 respondents (a 38% consultation response rate). This demonstrates strong support in south Hollingdean for a CPZ during the detailed design public consultation. Support for retaining the present arrangement in north Hollingdean was 72% against the proposed parking scheme and only 28% in favour, with 735 respondents (a 57% consultation response rate). This clearly indicates that residents supported maintaining the current parking arrangements in north Hollingdean, with no further action required in that area.

- 14.4 This has been carefully reviewed, including the recommendations based on the outcome of the more recent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) public consultation for south Hollingdean, conducted between 8<sup>th</sup> August and 29<sup>th</sup> August 2025. Consultation comments and the officers' assessment of respondent residency have been examined in detail, as these factors are material to the recommendation.
- 14.5 Following this review of the TRO consultation, the assessment concludes that reasonable grounds exist to accept the recommendation to proceed. Most objections originated from workers at the depot, who raised concerns about workplace parking. In contrast, the majority of residents living in south Hollingdean who responded to the TRO consultation expressed support, reaffirming the findings of the earlier consultation. Mitigation of most objections will be resolved through changes to workplace parking arrangements at the depot.
- 14.6 The conclusion reached is that the Council should proceed with a controlled parking zone for south Hollingdean, reflecting the consistent and repeated support expressed by residents across several successive public consultations.

## **Supporting Documentation**

### **1. Appendices**

1. Appendix A – Traffic Regulation Order comments and officer response.