

Subject:	Lewes Road Triangle – Extension to Area J resident parking scheme.		
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:	St Peters & North Laine		

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 J resident parking scheme into the Lewes Road Triangle area. The proposed extension to the scheme would be Monday to Sunday 9am-8pm (Appendix A).
- 1.2 Permission to proceed with the consultation for the Lewes Road Triangle area parking scheme 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 J extensions)
 - b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment 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 Lewes Road Triangle 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. A number of requests have been received from this area and it is supported by Ward Councillors. Problems have recently been experienced with access by emergency services in these streets due to congestion and parking on the footways.

- 3.3 In April 2014 a leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for an extension to the Area J resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the area outlined (1247 Property addresses)
- 3.4 Plans could also be viewed at staffed exhibitions held at Calvary Evangelical Church (Wednesday 23rd April 1pm-5pm and Thursday 24th April 4pm - 8pm), and at The Salvation Army (Monday 28th April). An unstaffed exhibition was held at Hove Town Hall parking shop from Monday 31st March to Friday 9th May, 9am to 5pm.
- 3.5 287 responses were received giving a response rate of 23.0%.
- 3.6 61.0% of respondents were in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 39.0% of respondents were against the extension of the scheme. 11 roads are in favour of a scheme while 6 roads are against (including Lewes Road where residents / businesses would be eligible for a permit as part of the scheme but the road itself wouldn't be included in the controlled parking area).
- 3.7 Therefore, the recommendation on 1st July 2014 in the report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting was that this proposal is recommended to be advertised as a traffic order allowing further comments to be made from residents both within and outside the new proposal (Appendix A). 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.

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 proposals put forward proceed with for the reasons outlined within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 16th July 2014 with the closing date for comments and objections on 7th August 2014. The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.2 Notices with information about the proposal were erected within roads of the parking scheme for 16th July 2014. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on 16th 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 51 items of correspondence received on the proposals. All 51 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix B.
- 5.5 There were 25 items of correspondence in support of the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. 23 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals and a further 3 were general detailed comments.

Support

- 5.6 The 25 representations that supported the scheme contained 5 different types 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 11 representations in support as there are not enough parking spaces for local residents due to the competition with other types of parking.
- 5.8 There were 10 representations in general support for the resident parking scheme.
- 5.9 There were 5 representations outlining that the scheme is needed.
- 5.10 There were 5 representations in support as it would improve negotiation and safety due to the current pavement parking.
- 5.11 There were 2 representations in support subject to checking the validity of all dropped kerbs (see Para 5.22)

Objections

- 5.12 The 23 representations that objected contained 13 different types of reasons to object to the resident parking scheme proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 5.13 There were 16 representations that this is a waste of money for the Council, they do not want to pay to park and this will impose several restrictions.
- 5.14 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. The Council do have to charge residents for permits for the schemes as the schemes have ongoing costs i.e. Civil enforcement officers, maintenance of signage and lining, etc. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport and environmental improvements throughout the City.
- 5.15 There were 4 representations due to no parking problem being perceived in the area and no scheme was needed.

- 5.16 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.
- 5.17 There were 4 representations regarding the consultation process and / or that the process has been undemocratic / inadequate.
- 5.18 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.
- 5.19 There were 4 representations concerned that the proposals would affect local facilities and businesses due to the charges.
- 5.20 It is the opinion of council officers that the parking needs and comments on the design have been considered. In some cases alterations have been made to bays in the area such as more pay & display bays for visitors. There were also a number of parking policy issues which do not come under the remit of this consultation; however, comments have been passed onto the relevant department to take into consideration. As with all the parking schemes introduced into Brighton and Hove the objective is to find the right balance of residents, business and daily parking for a local area. The introduction of a scheme will require that all day parkers and visitors using parking places will pay for their use. The consultation on the parking scheme is reflecting the fact that too many vehicles are trying to use this area or may park in certain roads if a scheme is introduced in other roads and a system for managing this situation has been requested by local residents.
- 5.21 There were 3 representations received unhappy at the reduction of resident parking spaces available due to various reasons such as double yellow lines across driveways and at junctions.
- 5.22 Double yellow line restrictions will apply across all vehicle accesses. Whilst this means that residents or their guests will not be able to park across a garage or drive access, it will ensure that these remain unblocked and enforceable by the Civil Enforcement Officers at all times. Double yellow lines are also placed on junctions for safety reasons. If the scheme is approved Council officers will review the dropped kerbs and if there is clear evidence that no off-street parking is occurring then we will investigate each individual issue.
- 5.23 There were 3 representations regarding Traffic management issues and parking space locations.
- 5.24 Each individual request outlined in the objections will be considered although there may be valid reasons for the design of certain bays or traffic management. As outlined in the recommendations any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are proposed to be added to any agreed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

- 5.25 There were 3 representations concerned that the scheme would reduce the amount of parking spaces available.
- 5.26 The amount of parking bays would be slightly reduced due to the requirement for double yellow lines at junctions and across driveways. However, we are proposing more parking in Upper Lewes Road and also transferring Union Road from Area Y to Area J to allow more spaces for Area J resident permit holders and visitors to park.
- 5.27 There were 3 representations that further reviews of different transport related matters were required e.g. Public Transport provision, Vogue Gyrotory work, low emission energy savings, cycle lanes, etc., alongside the parking scheme consultation.
- 5.28 The Transport department work closely together to ensure that different proposals and policies are connected and also liaise closely with private companies such as the Brighton & Hove Bus Company. Many of these policies and projects are reviewed as part of the Local Transport Plan which is presented to the members of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.
- 5.29 There were 2 representations received who were not content about the hours / days of the scheme or requested that a Light Touch parking scheme should be considered.
- 5.30 In the Citywide Parking Review report that was presented to Transport Committee on 15th January 2013 it was approved that no new further stand alone light touch schemes are proposed. This is due to a number of issues outlined in the report including increased displacement and lack of flexibility for visitors. The hours proposed during the week are in line with the current Area J resident parking scheme and also nearby schemes such as Area Y to prevent displacement from that scheme particularly in the early evenings.
- 5.31 There were 2 representations requested both sides of Lewes Road to be part of the scheme.
- 5.32 The proposals for the Lewes Road Triangle area do not include any physical changes to Lewes Road itself apart from a small section of a loading ban near the Elm Grove junction. However, as part of the proposals it has been agreed to allow residents and businesses living on the west side of Lewes Road to be eligible for permits as they do not have the ability to park in Lewes Road itself and may need to use the side roads within the scheme.
- 5.33 There were 2 representations outlining that the area should be a separate zone while another representation was concerned there was no guarantee of getting a permit.
- 5.34 When putting together the detailed design officers took into account the pros and cons of different options. An extension to Area J was felt the most appropriate proposal as it allowed residents to park within a larger zone where resident permits were currently underutilised. This would mean that most residents should be able to get two or more resident permits whilst a new separate scheme would

possibly mean that residents would not be guaranteed getting more than one resident permit.

- 5.35 There was 1 representation concerned about the new parking arrangement on Upper Lewes Road as it would prevent the free flow of traffic.
- 5.36 Parking proposals within Upper Lewes Road were investigated as a part of the Lewes Road Triangle consultation process with assistance from colleagues within Road Safety and utilising Department for Transport guidelines regarding recommended carriageway widths for various parking arrangements. Site visits took place where carriageway widths were measured to ensure they met the recommendations within the guidelines and with the recent introduction of a 20mph speed limit and relocation of existing north side communal refuse bin it is felt that the proposals are viable.

General comments

- 5.37 A further Petition was received with 103 signatures from residents and businesses in the area requesting an additional half hour tariff within the pay & display bays.
- 5.38 This is a proposal that would need to be considered as part of the annual fees & charges review as it would be a change to the current tariff structure within Brighton & Hove Council policy.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The recommendation is that this parking scheme proposal including a small section of loading ban on Lewes Road 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 £185,000 in the current financial year. Annual income generated from the scheme is expected to be approximately £220,000, which after the recurring costs of managing the scheme would generate sufficient surplus income to fund the borrowing repayments.

- 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	4,348	34,589	33,406	32,138	30,869	29,600	28,332	27,063
Revenue Income	109,000	217,325	221,672	226,105	230,627	235,240	239,944	244,743
Revenue Expenditure	41,923	83,587	85,258	86,963	88,703	90,477	92,286	94,132
Net (surplus)/ deficit	-62,729	-99,150	103,008	107,004	111,056	115,163	119,326	123,549
Total (surplus) / deficit								840,985

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford

Date: 03/09/14

Legal Implications:

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 Where there are unresolved objections to the traffic orders, then the matter is required to return to the Transport Committee for a decision.
- 7.5 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

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

Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.10 None identified

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

- Appendix A – Lewes Road Triangle area Plan
- Appendix B – List of Objections / Comments

Background Documents

- 1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9th November 2011
- 2. Item 17 – Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee Meeting Report – 1st July 2014.