

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 107

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	City Wide Traffic Order Proposals: Various traffic changes to controlled parking zones (CPZ) and areas outside of CPZ		
Date of Meeting:	10 March 2011		
Report of:	Strategic Director, Place		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	E-mail:	charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	Yes	Forward Plan No: ENVCMM19310	
Wards Affected:	Central Hove; East Brighton; Hangleton & Knoll; Hanover & Elm Grove; Hollingdean & Stanmer; Hove Park; Moulsecomb & Bevendean; North Portslade; Patcham; Preston Park; Queens Park; Regency; Rottingdean Coastal; South Portslade; St Peter's & North Laine; Westbourne; Wish; Withdean; Woodingdean		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Parking Strategy Team receives a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zones and outside these areas.
- 1.2 These requests are most often from residents, but can also be from businesses, local members, or other teams within the Council such as Road Safety. After investigation, if it is decided that the request is justified then it is advertised on a Traffic Regulation Order. These amendments often help to improve sustainable transport, for example by providing additional motorcycle bays or improved accessibility for disabled people by providing disabled parking bays.
- 1.3 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals for over 150 roads. The large majority of the requested changes have been accommodated as outlined in Appendix C.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That, having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections, the Cabinet Member for Environment approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.* 201* with the following amendments:

- (a) The proposed relocation of motorcycle bay in Wyndham Street is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.9.
- (b) The proposed taxi rank in Eldred Avenue is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11
- (c) The proposed taxi rank in Portland Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.14.
- (d) The proposed limited waiting parking in Newlands Road is to be removed from the traffic order due to reasons outlined in section 3.15.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 This Combined Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 150 roads city wide. The comments, support and objections received are summarised and explained in detail in Appendix A and plans showing the proposals which have had comments/objections are shown in Appendix B. Also a summary of proposals to be put forward are detailed in Appendix C.

3.2 Letters of support following the consultation were received in relation to the following proposals:

- (a) Dyke Road (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (b) Hollingdean Terrace/Hollingdean Street (Hollingdean & Stanmer) – proposed double yellow lines
- (c) Old London Road (Patcham) – Proposed double yellow lines
- (d) St George’s Road (East Brighton – Controlled Parking Zone H) – proposed loading ban across entrance to Eastern Terrace Mews
- (e) Second Avenue (Central Hove) – proposed relocation of motorcycle bay
- (f) Springfield Road (Preston Park) – proposed extension to double yellow lines,
- (g) The Highway (Moulsecoomb & Bevendean) – proposed loading ban
- (h) Newlands Road (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed limited waiting and double yellow lines
- (i) Peel Road/Reading Road/ Marlow Road (East Brighton) – proposed double yellow lines

Summary of Objections and proposed actions (detailed locations in Appendix B)

3.3 **Dyke Road** - there has been 1 objection and 2 support for the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident as the pedestrian crossing point near the junction of Woodruff Avenue does not have double yellow lines and vehicles are parking half on the road and half on the pavement. The proposal would improve the visibility and safety for all road users and pedestrians crossing the road. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with double yellow lines.

3.4 **Hollingdean Terrace/Hollingdean Street** – there has been 1 objection and 1 support for the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident as vehicles park around this junction causing obstructions for both vehicles and

pedestrians. The proposal would improve visibility and safety for all roads users. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines.

- 3.5 **St George's Road** - there has been 2 objections to the proposed loading ban. This was requested by a resident and a petition of 21 signatures supporting a loading ban which was received prior to advertisement of the traffic regulation order. This proposal will prevent vehicles blocking the access to Eastern Terrace Mews and also improve the visibility and safety when emerging into St George's Road. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the loading ban.
- 3.6 **Gloucester Street** - there has been an objection to the proposed double yellow lines opposite gated entrance to flats. The request was received from a resident to allow vehicles to enter and exit safely as this is quite a narrow road. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with double yellow lines.
- 3.7 **Westdene Drive/Mill Rise** - there has been an objection to the proposed double yellow lines at this junction. The request was received by Ward Councillors as vehicles park around this junction making visibility for all road users very difficult. This proposal would improve the visibility and safety for all road users. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines.
- 3.8 **Victoria Road, Brighton** - there have been objections to the proposed change of times to the doctor's parking bays. The signage on site is 24 hours. This is incorrect and does not match the current Traffic Regulation Order which is Mon-Sat 8am-7pm. The request for change was received from a resident as there is a shortage of on-street parking in this area and the doctor's bays are empty at night and over the weekend. After consultation with the surgery prior to advertising it was agreed to change the times to Mon-Fri 7am-8pm and Sat 7am-1pm. If problems emerge with vehicles parking in the bays then we will request increased enforcement. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the change of times.
- 3.9 **Wyndham Street** - there have been 4 objections to the proposed relocation of the motorcycle bay. This was requested by a resident in the area as the road slants at an angle which makes it impossible to park larger motorcycles. The new location would also shelter the motorcycles from the wind. However following consultation residents were concerned about the relocation due to pollution and noise and they feel that the current location is more appropriate. Therefore we are not proposing to proceed with the relocation of the motorcycle bay.
- 3.10 **Peel Road/Reading Road/ Marlow Road** – there have been 2 objections and support from City Clean staff for the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident as parking around these junctions is causing obstruction to all vehicles especially city clean vehicles. The proposal would prevent obstruction and improve the visibility and safety for all road users. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines.
- 3.11 **Victoria Road, Portslade**- there has been an objection to the proposed limited waiting. The request was received from the Road Safety Team to provide extra

parking for the school and nearby facilities. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the limited waiting.

- 3.12 **Eldred Avenue** – there have been objections from the Ward Councillors. This request was received from the taxi forum. This will provide alternative public transport provision in areas that are poorly served and to decrease waiting times for passengers in these areas. This proposal will be withdrawn from the order for further investigation and discussions with the Ward Councillors.
- 3.13 **Wilmington Way/Greenfield Crescent** – there has been an objection to the proposed double yellow lines at this junction. This was requested by a resident as vehicles park dangerously around this junction. The proposal would improve visibility and safety for all roads users. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines
- 3.14 **Portland Road** – there has been an objection from a Ward Councillor. This request was received from the taxi forum. This will provide alternative public transport provision in areas that are poorly served and to decrease waiting times for passengers in these areas. After a site visit with the Ward Councillor it was agreed to withdraw this from the order for further investigation.
- 3.15 **Newlands Road** – Due to a number of late objections from residents about the limitations of parking this will cause and displacement the Ward Councillors have requested this is put on hold so this can be investigated further.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 3rd December 2010 and 24th December 2010.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 4.3 Notices were also put on street for the 3rd December 2010, these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reasons for it. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on the 3rd December 2010. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library and at the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the order and having the lining and signing amended will be covered from the existing traffic budget.

Finance officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 21/01/10

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 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 all types of traffic including cyclists and pedestrians. As far as is practicable, the Council should have regard to any implications in relation to:- access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public services vehicles; securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 5.3 The Council has to follow the rules on consultation promulgated by the government and the courts. The Council must ensure that the consultation process is carried out at a time when proposals are still at their formative stage, that sufficient reasons and adequate time must be given to allow intelligent consideration and responses and that results are conscientiously taken into account in finalising the proposals.
- 5.4 After the proposals are formally advertised, the Council can, in the light of objections / representations received, decide to re-consult either widely or specifically when it believes that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of any associated orders. Where there are unresolved objections to the Traffic Orders, then the matter is required to return to Environment CMM for a decision.

Lawyer consulted:

Carl Hearsom

Date: 21/01/10

Equalities Implications:

- 5.5 The proposed measures will be of benefit to many road users.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.6 The new motorcycle bays will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.7 The proposed amendments to restrictions will not have any implication on the prevention of crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.8 Any risks will be monitored as part of the overall project management, but none have been identified.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.9 The legal disabled bays will provide parking for the holders of blue badges wanting to use the local facilities.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 For the majority of the proposals the only alternative option is doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined in Appendix A and within the report.
- 6.2 For the proposals outlined as being removed from the order in the recommendations the only alternative option is taking these forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are not taken forward for the reasons outlined in the recommendations.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To seek approval of the Traffic Order with amendments after taking into consideration of the duly made representations and objections.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

- 1. Appendix A – summary of representations received
- 2. Appendix B - Plans showing the proposals
- 3. Appendix C – Summary of proposal put forward

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

None