

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 67

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Elm Grove Safer Routes to School – The Brighton & Hove (St Leonard’s Road and Melbourne Street) (One Way Traffic and Prohibition of Turning) Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 200*		
Date of Meeting:	6 November 2008		
Report of:	Director of Environment		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Stephen Kelly	Tel: 29- 2475
	E-mail:	stephen.kelly@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	No	Forward Plan No. N/A	
Wards Affected:	Hanover & Elm Grove		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

The Road Safety Team is allocated funding through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to create safer routes to school across the city. The Elm Grove Safer Routes Scheme will benefit three schools in this ward. As part of this scheme a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised to prohibit a left turn onto Lewes Road from Melbourne Street and a one-way on St Leonard’s Road, westbound. Approval of the Traffic Regulation Order will allow a pedestrian crossing to be built on Lewes Road which will enable many school-children to cross Lewes Road on the way to school. Approval of the TRO will also significantly reduce congestion outside Fairlight Primary School and help create a safer route to school.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (1) That the Cabinet Member for Environment (having taken account of all duly made representations and objections), approves the making of the The Brighton & Hove (St Leonard’s Road and Melbourne Street) (One Way Traffic and Prohibition of Turning) Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 200* with no amendments.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The Elm Grove Safer Routes to School Scheme was approved at Environment Committee on 20 March 2008.
- 3.2 Approval was given by Committee to advertise the Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 3.3 Detailed designs were drawn up and stage one and stage two safety audits have been completed.

3.4 TROs were advertised on 8 September 2008 (see point 4.1 below)

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 12 September and 5 October 2008 on relevant Streets, comprising the notice and where to view plans. The TRO was also advertised in the Argus on 12 September. 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.
- 4.2 Ward Councillors for Hanover & Elm Grove were consulted throughout the development of the scheme, immediately prior to the advertising of the TRO and as part of the TRO process. Statutory consultees were also consulted.
- 4.3 Following the TRO process objections were received from a number of residents and businesses on Melbourne Street and from other groups. The objections were mainly concerned with restricted access and safety for cyclists especially with the proposed widening of the footway along the length of the proposed pedestrian crossing which would impinge slightly on the current cycle lane. Objections were also received from some residents and businesses of Melbourne Street who were concerned about having to travel more often around the Gyratory. Letters of Support were received from St Martin's Primary School and Fairlight Primary School. A summary of objections, letters of support and officer responses can be found in Appendix A.
- 4.4 Objections received through the TRO consultation process asked officers to re-consider the design of the proposed pedestrian crossing without the need for any increase in the width of the footway and without losing any of the width of the cycle lane. Following site visits and subject to safety audits we have achieved this. Both the original design and the proposed re-designs can be seen in Appendix B.
- 4.5 Following objections to the proposed one-way in St Leonard's Road the plans have been revised to include a cycle slip in to Pevensey Road which would give cyclists an alternative route of the same length through to Lewes Road.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Finance Implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the TRO and associated lining and signing work will be covered by the allocation of funding to Safer Routes to School Schemes within the 2008/09 Local Transport Plan.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 08/10/08

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. Also, 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 and securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.

- 5.3 Section 1 of the 1984 Act enables the council to make orders prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of roads. The various grounds for such action include safety, prevention of congestion and preservation of amenity and are not restricted to the roads mentioned in an order but can be for the benefit of other roads.
- 5.4 Before making orders, local authorities must consider all duly-made, unwithdrawn objections. In limited circumstances they must hold public inquiries & may do so otherwise. It is usually possible for proposed orders to be modified, providing any amendments do not increase the effects of the advertised proposals. Authorities also have powers to make orders in part and defer decisions on the remainder. Orders may not be made until the objection periods have expired and cannot be made more than 2 years after the notices proposing them were first published. Orders may not come into force before the dates on which it is intended to publish notices that they have been made. After making orders, the steps which authorities must take include notifying objectors and putting in place the necessary traffic signs.
- 5.5 No human rights implications have been identified which appear to preclude the Council from proceeding with the recommended proposals.

Lawyer consulted:

Elizabeth Culbert

Date: 11/10/08

Equalities Implications:

- 5.6 The proposed measures will be of benefit to many road users and in particular to many school-aged children including those with special needs and mobility difficulties.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.7 The proposed measures will encourage more children to walk to and from school and reduce the number of car journeys, reduce congestion and improve air quality.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.8 Although this proposal may lead to an increase in anti-social driving ie: drivers going against the one-way signage, it is felt that this will be minimal. One of the targets of the Community Safety and Crime Reduction Strategy is to improve the safety of the public environment (built environment and street safety) across Brighton and Hove. The Safer Routes Scheme has a part to play in achieving this.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.9 Any risks will be monitored as part of the overall project management. If the scheme does not go ahead then there is a risk that future funding for Safer Routes to School Schemes could be compromised as a significant underspend in the allocated budget will result.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 The scheme will aid the safer movement of pedestrians on the journey to and from school and therefore contribute towards meeting the City Council's corporate priorities on Safety.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 Alternative options have been considered but have been rejected on Health & Safety grounds. These include locating the proposed crossing nearer to the junction with Hartington Road, but this would mean that motorists turning right onto Lewes Road would be 'on top' of the crossing. We have also considered two-way cycling on the St Leonard's Road (proposed one –way Westbound) and this was discussed fully at Environment Committee on 20 March. The Committee decided not to have two-way cycling.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Approval of the TRO is sought in order that the scheme can progress to completion.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – summary of representations received
2. Appendix B – Plans showing the proposals and revised proposals (following TRO Consultation)

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

None

