

Subject:	Bakers Bottom area (Extension to Area U resident parking scheme) TRO consultation.		
Date of Meeting:	7th October 2014		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	Email:	Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Queens Park & East Brighton		

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation orders. The traffic orders outline a proposed extension of the Area U resident parking scheme into the Bakers Bottom area. The proposed extension to the scheme would be Monday to Sunday 10am-11am & 2pm-3pm (Appendix A).
- 1.2 Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member meeting on 9th November 2011.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;
 - (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order 2008 No.* 201* (Area U extension)
 - (b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201*
 - (c) Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201*
- 2.2 That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 At the Transport Committee Meeting on 15th January 2013 it was agreed to consult residents to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.
- 3.2 The Council had received a number of complaints and petitions from residents in the Bakers Bottom & Craven Vale area about general difficulties in parking and the belief that this was at least partly caused by displacement from other schemes introduced in the last few years. Therefore it was agreed that consultation on a resident parking

scheme should take place as soon as possible within the timeframe set out in the committee report.

- 3.3 In March / April 2014 a leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for an extension to the Area U resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the two areas outlined.
- 3.4 Plans could also be viewed at staffed exhibitions held at The Vale Community Centre (1pm – 5pm Wednesday, 2 April 2014 and 4pm – 8pm Thursday, 3 April 2014) and an unstaffed exhibition held at the Hove Town Hall Parking Information Centre from 24 March 2014 to 2 May 2014, 9am to 5pm.
- 3.5 182 responses were received giving a response rate of 31.6%.
- 3.6 Of these 182 respondents 61.0% were in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 39.0% of respondents were against the extension of the scheme. The results have been broken down further into the two distinct areas and it was clear that residents in the Bakers Bottom area were in favour of a scheme with 77.8% of respondents in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 22.2% against. Within the Craven Vale area there is a distinct difference with only 31% of respondents in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 69% of respondents against the scheme.
- 3.7 Therefore, the recommendation on 1st July 2014 in the report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee Meeting was to take forward an extension of the Area U resident parking scheme into the Bakers Bottom area but not to include the Craven Vale area. The Bakers Bottom area (Appendix A) was recommended to be advertised as a traffic order allowing further comments to be made from residents both within and outside the new proposal. Leaflets were also sent directly to residents making them aware of the traffic order and how to make their views known. All comments would be reported back to this Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting.
- 3.8 Officers also discussed the results with all the Ward Councillors who either voiced their support for this way forward or responded with no concerns with the recommendations being taken forward. East Brighton Ward Councillors did have concerns about possible displacement into the Craven Vale area if the Bakers Bottom scheme proceeds. Therefore, as part of the proposals the Council advertised no verge parking on the east side of Queensway where verges are being damaged and buses have difficulty getting through. Bollards were considered along the verge to prevent overrun but this would require significant funding to implement and maintain and it was felt that the verge parking ban should be monitored to see how it works.

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The alternative option is doing nothing or a re-consultation which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward and /or re-consulted on. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals proceed with for the reasons outlined within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 31st July 2014 with the closing date for comments and objections on 22nd August 2014. The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.2 Notices were erected within roads in the scheme for 31st July 2014 which outlined the proposal. The legal notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on 31st July 2014. Detailed plans and the Traffic Regulation Order were available to view at the Customer Service Centres at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. A plan detailing the proposals is shown in Appendix A.
- 5.3 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.
- 5.4 There were 11 items of correspondence received on the Bakers Bottom area proposal. All 11 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix B.
- 5.5 There were 3 items of correspondence in support of the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. 8 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals.

Support

- 5.6 The 3 representations that supported the scheme contained 3 different sets of reasons to support the resident parking proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 5.7 There were 2 representations outlining that the scheme is needed.
- 5.8 There were 2 representations in support as it would improve negotiation and safety due to the current pavement parking.
- 5.9 There was 1 representation outlining support for the proposal but would prefer the restrictions to be longer.

Objections

- 5.10 The 8 representations that objected contained 9 different sets of reasons to object to the proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 5.11 There were 5 representations concerned that the parking bays should be on the other side of the road and that this was a change to the original proposals. Particular concerns were made about loss of light during daylight hours.
- 5.12 The parking arrangement changed from the initial design as when further site visits were carried out for the TRO stage officers were able to create more parking bays by switching around the initial design. This helped create a few more parking spaces and by creating a chicane effect with parking on either side it is used as a natural traffic calming measure which was discussed and agreed with the Road Safety Team.

- 5.13 In terms of loss of light it is important to note that the majority of high sided vehicles would not be able to park within resident permit bays as they would not be eligible for a resident permit as there are height restrictions as well as length and weight.
- 5.14 There were 3 representations regarding the consultation process and / or that the process has been undemocratic / inadequate.
- 5.15 The consultation process has been extensive and is clearly outlined in this report and the background papers outlined below. All households that would be eligible for resident permits / visitor permits were included in the result of the consultation.
- 5.16 There were 3 representations objecting to the pedal cycle bay being too long and / or the motorcycle bays.
- 5.17 Pedal cycle parking places (PCPP) are approximately 9 metres in length, this is a standard length which we use in all other parking schemes, the build outs are included within this distance. One of the reasons PCPP are longer than Motorcycle bays (MC bays) is that there is normally only one or two within a scheme, MC bays are normally on each street and do not have to be as long, unless requested by residents.
- 5.18 The Local Transport Plan's package of measures are designed to deliver a number of targets, which are linked to performance related funding from central government. Brighton & Hove City Council has a target to deliver a 5% year-on-year growth in usage on existing sections of the cycle network. Providing good quality, end of trip cycle parking facilities is a core contributing factor to this target. Good quality cycle parking in carefully considered and well planned locations can de-clutter the streetscape and create a good level of cycle security.
- 5.19 Ensuring there is sufficient cycle parking provision in Brighton & Hove forms a key contribution to any cycling level increase through the provision of quality cycle parking in residential areas & at destinations such as shopping parades.
- 5.20 Brighton & Hove characteristically has a high number of narrow pathways and streets in residential areas and the town centre. The lack of opportunities for cycle parking located on the pavement, has highlighted the need for 'on-carriageway' cycle parking provision, officially called 'pedal cycle parking places' (comprising a minimum of 5 cycle stands/capacity for 10 bicycles).
- 5.21 A new area will set aside some roadside for motorcycle parking on every road if possible and this provision is important to ensure adequate space for motorcycle users as they cannot park within other bays in a Controlled Parking Zone under current Council policy.
- 5.22 There was 1 representation received not content at the reduction of resident parking spaces available due to double yellow lines at junctions.
- 5.23 The length of the double yellow lines at junctions is 6 metres in length which is to increase visibility at junctions and allow vehicles room to manoeuvre and turn into roads with ease with no parked vehicles.
- 5.24 There was 1 representation objecting as they did not know the previous results.

- 5.25 The results of the previous consultation were reported to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 1st July 2014. Leaflets were also sent directly to residents making them aware of the committee report, the upcoming traffic order and how to make their views known.
- 5.26 There was 1 representation outlining that the area should be within Area C and not Area U.
- 5.27 When putting together the detailed design officers took into account the pros and cons of different options. An extension to Area U was felt the most appropriate proposal as it allowed residents to park within a larger zone where resident permits were currently underutilised.
- 5.28 The Bakers Bottom is being proposed as an extension to Area U as it adjoins this parking scheme area and it would be confusing to extend it to another zone such as Area C. We would have to re-consult residents in other roads within Area U to become part of Area C instead and this is unlikely to be popular as there are not currently any issues within this zone.
- 5.29 There was 1 representation concerned about displacement into the Craven Vale area.
- 5.30 There was 1 representation concerned about the verge parking proposal in Sutherland Road and would prefer the verge to be “tarmaced”.
- 5.31 There was 1 representation due to no parking problem being perceived in the area and no scheme was needed.
- 5.32 Several residents in this area have been requesting parking controls to the Council and that is the why the Council agreed to include this area in the resident parking scheme priority timetable. Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member meeting on 9th November 2011.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The recommendation is that this parking scheme proposal and the verge parking proposal be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background and following the consideration of all the consultation responses.
- 6.2 Any additional amendments to the approved schemes deemed necessary through the formal consultation will be introduced during the implementation stage and advertised through a traffic regulation amendment order.
- 6.3 As part of the consultation undertaken in the scheme regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the schemes but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the areas and existing parking provisions in the areas.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The capital costs associated to the creation and extension of controlled parking schemes are funded by unsupported borrowing, with appropriate repayments made over a seven year period funded from the revenue income generated. It is anticipated that the capital costs of the scheme will be approximately £25,000 in the current financial year. Annual income generated from the scheme is expected to be approximately £2,500, which after the recurring costs of managing the scheme would not generate sufficient surplus income to fund the borrowing repayments. The deficit between borrowing repayment costs and income generated is expected to be between £2,000 and £3,000 annually and will be managed within existing revenue budgets.
- 7.2 Revenue income generated from on-street parking schemes is first defrayed against relevant costs with any surplus used for qualifying transport and highways related expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares and Local Transport Plan projects.

	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Loan Repayment	588	4,674	4,514	4,342	4,171	4,000	3,828	3,657
Revenue Income	-1,042	-2,500	-2,550	-2,601	-2,653	-2,706	-2,760	-2,815
Revenue Expenditure	401	962	981	1,000	1,020	1,041	1,062	1,083
Net (surplus)/ deficit	-53	3,136	2,945	2,742	2,539	2,335	2,130	1,925
Total (surplus) / deficit								17,698

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford

Date: 03/09/14

Legal Implications:

- 7.3 The Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act") must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic including cyclists and pedestrians.
- 7.4 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; and any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 7.5 The Council has to follow the rules on consultation set out 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 properly taken into account in finalising the proposals.
- 7.6 Where there are unresolved objections to the traffic orders, then the matter is required to return to the Transport Committee for a decision.
- 7.7 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention

Equalities Implications:

- 7.8 The proposed measures will be of benefit to many road users.
- 7.9 The legal disabled bays will provide parking for the holders of blue badges wanting to use the local facilities

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.10 The new motorcycle bays and pedal cycle parking bay will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.
- 7.11 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.12 None identified

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

- 1. Appendix A – Bakers Bottom area Plan
- 2. Appendix B – List of Objections / Comments

Background Documents

- 1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9th November 2011
- 2. Item 19 – Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee Meeting Report – 1st July 2014.