

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Citywide amendment Traffic Order: various traffic changes to Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) and areas outside of CPZ</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>4 October 2011</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director, Place</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3329</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Forward Plan No: ETSCMM22132</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>Brunswick &amp; Adelaide; Central Hove; East Brighton; Goldsmid; Hangleton &amp; Knoll; Hanover &amp; Elm Grove; Hollingdean &amp; Stanmer; Hove Park; Moulsecomb &amp; Bevendean; North Portslade; Patcham; Preston Park; Queens Park; Regency; Rottingdean Coastal; St Peter's &amp; North Laine; South Portslade; Westbourne; Wish; Withdean; Woodingdean</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The Parking Infrastructure Team receives a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zones and outside these areas. 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.
- 1.2 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals for overall 150 roads.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member for Transport & Public Realm, having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections, approves 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 removal of disabled parking bays in Prince's Terrace, Stirling Place, Denton Drive and Haig Avenue, are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are still required by local residents.

- b) The proposed double yellow lines in Manor Hill are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.4
- c) The proposed motorcycle bay in Stroudley Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.9.
- d) The proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Brownleaf Road and Abinger Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.10
- e) The proposed limited waiting in Matlock Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11.
- f) The proposed change to parking arrangements in Victoria Road is to be removed from the traffic order due to reasons outlined in section 3.12.
- g) The proposed extension to double yellow lines in Friar Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.16.
- h) The proposed motorcycle bay in Coleman Street is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.17.
- i) The proposed double yellow lines in Tongdean Rise are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.18.
- j) The proposed double yellow lines in the access road to Kingsmere, London Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.19
- k) The proposed double yellow lines in Oakdene Close are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.20.
- l) The proposed double yellow lines in Braybon Avenue are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.21.
- m) The proposed double yellow lines on Roedean Road from the A259 to the junction of The Cliff and Roedean Crescent are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.22.

### **3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**

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

3.2 In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Manor Road (East Brighton – Controlled Parking Zone H) – proposed relocation of motorcycle bay
- b) Manor Hill (East Brighton) – proposed double yellow lines
- c) Hanover Terrace (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed extension to motorcycle bay outside No.34
- d) Graham Close (North Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
- e) Drove Road (North Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
- f) Stroudley Road (St Peter's & North Laine – Controlled Parking Zone Y) - proposed motorcycle bay outside No.32
- g) Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road (Woodingdean) – proposed double yellow lines
- h) Matlock Road (Withdean) – proposed limited waiting
- i) Victoria Road (South Portslade) – proposed changes to swap parking restriction & parking bays from one side of the road to the other side
- j) Cromwell Road (Goldsmid) – Controlled Parking Zone O) – proposed disabled parking bay outside No.24
- k) Upper North Street (Regency- Controlled Parking Zone Z) – proposed motorcycle bay outside No.72
- l) Lullington Avenue (Hove Park) – proposed removal of a disabled parking bay
- m) Friar Road (Withdean) – proposed extension to double yellow lines
- n) Coleman Street (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed motorcycle bay outside No.75
- o) Access Road to Kingsmere, London Road (Withdean) – proposed double yellow lines

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

- a) Salisbury Road (Brunswick & Adelaide – Controlled Parking Zone N) – proposed extension to motorcycle bay outside No.36
- b) Manor Hill (East Brighton) – proposed double yellow lines
- c) Hanover Terrace (Hanover & Elm Grove) - proposed extension to motorcycle bay outside No.34

- d) Graham Close (North Portslade) - proposed double yellow lines
- e) Richmond Parade (Queens Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- f) Challoners Close (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed extension to double yellow lines
- g) Upper Lewes Road (St Peter’s & North Laine) – proposed removal of single yellow lines
- h) Stroudley Road (St Peter’s & North Laine – Controlled Parking Zone Y) – proposed motorcycle bay outside No.32
- i) Batemans Road (Woodingdean) – proposed disabled parking bay outside No.19
- j) Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road (Woodingdean) – proposed double yellow lines
- k) Hill Drive (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- l) Matlock Road (Withdean) – proposed limited waiting
- m) Roedean Road, Cliff Approach, Cliff Road, The Cliff & Roedean Crescent (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed double yellow lines
- n) Brading Road/Hartington Road (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed double yellow lines

### ***Summary of Objections***

- 3.4 **Manor Road** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed relocation of a motorcycle bay. This was requested by a resident as the location of current motorcycle bay is not a very safe place as it is right at the end of the road and nearly on the corner. Motorcycles can be knocked down. The proposal will allow motorcycles to park safely and this would encourage a more sustainable method of transport. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the relocation of the motorcycle bay.
- 3.5 **Manor Hill** – there have been 2 objections and 1 item of support for the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident as parking in this location causes an obstruction to cars, buses and larger vehicles. Double yellow lines would make it easier for vehicles to pass. The Road safety Team have commented that this proposal would open the road up and vehicle speeds will increase. At present it is a natural traffic calming measure and has reduced speeds dramatically. If residents with driveways are having problems with vehicles parking over them they can apply for a white return line. Therefore, due to the objections and comments from the Road Safety team we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.6 **Hanover Terrace** – there have been 3 objections and 4 items of support for the proposed extension to a motorcycle bay. This was requested by a resident as the

bay is always full to overflowing with motorbikes. The proposal will allow more motorcycles to park and this would encourage a more sustainable method of transport. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the extension of the motorcycle bay.

- 3.7 **Graham Close** - there has been 1 objection and 5 items of support to the proposed double yellow lines. The request has come from residents via their Ward Councillor as vehicles parking in this turning area cause an obstruction for other road users. The proposal would improve visibility and safety for all roads users. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines.
- 3.8 **Drove Road** - there has been an objection to the proposed double yellow lines. The request was received from a Ward Councillor to prevent congestion. This road is quite narrow and when vehicles park it is difficult for traffic to pass. The proposal would improve visibility and safety for all roads users. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the double yellow lines
- 3.9 **Stroudley Road** - there have been 6 objections and 1 item of support to the proposed motorcycle bay. The request was from a worker in the area as there are no motorcycle bays within the vicinity only disabled parking bays. However following consultation residents were concerned about this proposal due to pollution and noise that this would create in a residential street. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.10 **Brownleaf Road / Abinger Road** – This proposal was previously deferred to investigate further. This proposal was re-advertised and there have been 2 objections and 1 item of support to the proposed double yellow lines. The lines were requested by a resident as cars should not be parking on the junction and these lines would improve safety, pedestrian access and visibility. Due to the comments received we have been in contact with City Clean and they have stated that they have not had a problem at this junction A Ward Councillor is also opposed to this proposal. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.11 **Matlock Road** - there have been 24 objections and 2 items of support to the proposed limited waiting bays. This was requested by a business in the area to enable visitors and customers using the local shops and facilities to park for a limited time. However following consultation residents were concerned that this would take valuable parking spaces and it was felt that there was already sufficient limited waiting opposite this location. Therefore, we are recommending not proceed with this proposal.
- 3.12 **Victoria Road, Portslade** – there has been a petition of 47 signatures objecting to the proposals and 3 objections to the proposed change to parking layout (swapping the parking to the north and the single yellow lines to the south side). The request was originally received from a Ward Councillor and was accompanied by a petition of 57 signatures supporting swapping the parking to the north side of the road and the single yellow lines to the south side. A number of addresses signed both petitions and some of the parking issues seem to now be resolved by allowing parking for vehicles overnight in the park. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.

- 3.13 **Cromwell Road** - there has been an objection to the disabled parking bay. This was requested by a resident who has been assessed for the disabled bay on mobility grounds. This bay will allow them to park close to their home and enables them to carry out tasks which might otherwise be very difficult. Although the bay is put in at the request of the applicant anyone with a blue badge is entitled to park in this bay. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with the disabled parking bay.
- 3.14 **Upper North Street** – there have been 2 objections to the proposed motorcycle bay. The request was from a resident in the area, as the nearest is in Regent Hill, which is very impractical for parking motorbikes, because the hill is quite steep and is also a windy section of the road, so some motor bikes have been blown over. Due to the low provision of motorcycle bays in the town centre, this would allow more motorcycles to park, encouraging a more sustainable method of transport. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the motorcycle bay.
- 3.15 **Lullington Avenue** – there have been 2 objections to the proposed removal of a disabled parking bay. The requirements for applying for a disabled parking bay are that you have a blue badge, you are the driver of the vehicle or the driver lives at the property. The reason this bay is being removed is that the resident does not have a blue badge (they have not applied for one) and the driver of the vehicle does not live at the property. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the removal of the disabled parking bay
- 3.16 **Friar Road** – there has been an objection to the proposed extension to double yellow lines. The request was from a resident in the area as vehicles parked at this junction making it dangerous for motorists, especially when turning left into Friar Road from Ditchling Road. This proposal has been discussed and was felt that extending the double yellow lines would be excessive as there are already 15 metres of double yellow lines, which is quite sufficient. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.17 **Coleman Street** – there has been an objection to the proposed motorcycle bay. This was requested by a resident as there were several motorcycle users in this road. However, this proposal is being withdrawn from the traffic order due to the request of the resident as many of the other motorcyclists have moved away.
- 3.18 **Tongdean Rise** – there have been 3 objections. This was requested by City Clean as refuse vehicles were having difficulties entering this section of Tongdean Rise. This is being withdrawn from the order as the location on the advertised plan and description on the Traffic Order showed the proposed double yellow lines in the wrong location. This proposal will be re-advertised in the November 2011 order and the objections and support received for this order will be included in that report. Residents who have e-mailed or written in have been informed of this.
- 3.19 **Access Road to Kingsmere, London Road** – there has been a petition with 43 signatures from the Kingsmere Residents Association objecting to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by City Clean as the refuse vehicles are having problems gaining access to the bin stores because of parked cars on the bend near the entrance. However following consultation residents were concerned that this would result in further congestion of the estate causing

obstruction that would impact on emergency services. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.

- 3.20 **Oakdene Close** – This was requested by a Ward Councillor and a PCSO to prevent obstruction from parked vehicles. The Ward Councillor had a meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2011 with residents of Oakdene Close along with two PCSOs. They reached a conclusion that it would be better to have a further look at the lining and withdraw the proposal from this Traffic Order and advertise a new proposal on the next Traffic Order.
- 3.21 **Braybon Avenue** - This was requested by a resident as at the junction with Greenfield Crescent there was a visibility black spot and over the year there had been several accidents. The proposed location was incorrect and the resident apologises that he had not clearly stated the correct location. Therefore this proposal has been withdrawn. The correct location will be investigated and advertised in our next Traffic Order.
- 3.22 **Roedean Road** – The Double Yellow lines throughout Roedean Road were advertised alongside a Coach park proposal to allow alternative parking for coaches.

An officer met with representatives of the local resident association who wanted the double yellow lines throughout Roedean Road. The reason for this was that they felt the coaches caused a safety issue on the road with a lack of visibility for vehicles passing through. They also explained that there were pedestrian safety issues on the stretch between the Cliff and Roedean Crescent junction down to the traffic lights with Wilson Avenue which were not connected to coach parking but other vehicles parking dangerously.

However, the Coach park proposal is not being taken forward at this time so the proposal for double yellow lines from the A259 to the junction of The Cliff and Roedean Crescent needs to be removed from the Traffic order as there are now no alternative arrangements for coaches and there are concerns about coaches displacing into surrounding roads if no arrangements are in place. This displacement may cause increased safety risks due to the coaches possibly moving to smaller residential roads.

The Double Yellow lines from the junction of The Cliff and Roedean Crescent down to the traffic lights with Wilson Avenue will be implemented as this section is a safety issue for pedestrians when vehicles are parking in this location.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2011 and 11<sup>th</sup> July 2011.
- 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 17<sup>th</sup> June 2011; 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 17<sup>th</sup> June 2011. 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 revenue budget.

*Finance officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw Date: 22/08/11*

### 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.
- 5.5 Relevant Human Rights Act rights to which the council should have regard in exercising its traffic management powers are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and therefore there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances. There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention at this stage.

*Lawyer consulted: Carl Hearsom Date: 24/08/11*

### Equalities Implications:

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



Sustainability Implications:

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

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 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:**

Appendix A – summary of representations received

Appendix B - Plans showing the proposals

Appendix C – Summary of proposal put forward

### **Documents in Members' Rooms**

None

### **Background Documents**

None