

**ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND
SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
MEETING**

Agenda Item 38

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Amendment Traffic Order		
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:	Brunswick & Adelaide, Central Hove, East Brighton, Goldsmid, Hangleton & Knoll, Hanover & Elm Grove, Hollingdean & Stanmer, Hove Park, Moulsecoomb & Bevendean, North Portslade, Patcham, Preston Park, Queens Park, Regency, Rottingdean Coastal, St Peter's & North Laine, South Portslade, Westbourne, Wish, Withdean, Woodingdean.		

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. 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 100 roads.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

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 removal of a disabled parking bay in Valley Road, Portslade is to be removed from the Traffic Order as this bay is still required by a local resident.

- b) The proposed disabled parking bays in Grange Road, Granville Road, Parkmore Terrace and Pembroke Crescent are to be removed from the Traffic Order as they are no longer required by the original applicants.
- c) The proposed no loading Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm in Camelford Street is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.4
- d) The proposed car club bays in Second Avenue are to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.11
- e) The proposed changing of single yellow lines to double yellow lines in Medina Place is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.6
- f) The proposed loading bay in Lorna Road is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.12

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 This Combined Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 100 roads and 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 where no objections were received during the consultation period are detailed in Appendix D.
- 3.2 In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:
 - a) Camelford Street (Queens Park – Controlled Parking Zone C) – proposed no loading Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm.
 - b) Clyde Road (St Peter’s and North Laine – Controlled Parking J) – proposing to change shared parking to permit parking only.
 - c) Medina Place (Central Hove – Controlled Parking Zone N) – proposing to change single yellow lines to double yellow lines.
 - d) Wordsworth Street (Westbourne – Controlled Parking Zone R) – proposed disabled parking bay.
 - e) Sutherland Road (Queen’s Park – Controlled Parking Zone U) – proposed removal of disabled parking bay
 - f) Trafalgar Street (St Peter’s and North Laine – Controlled Parking Zone Y) – proposed no loading/unloading Monday to Sunday 7am to 10pm and 4pm to 7pm Carden Avenue (Patcham) – proposed double yellow lines.
- 3.3 Letters of support were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Medina Place (Central Hove – Controlled Parking Zone N) – Proposing to change single yellow lines to double yellows.

Summary of Objections

- 3.4 **Camelford Street** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed No Loading - Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm. This was originally requested by a resident as large vehicles were parking outside their property on the pavement causing obstruction to the entrance. The proposal would prevent vehicles loading/unloading and parking on the pavement causing obstruction and damage. We have had discussions with both the business and the resident about this issue. It has been agreed that the No Loading would not be put outside the public house to allow deliveries and only outside of the residential properties. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with an amended proposal as shown in Appendix C.
- 3.5 **Clyde Road** – there has been 1 objection to the proposed changing of shared parking bays to permit only bays. This was requested by a Ward Councillor after feedback from local residents. Changing these shared parking spaces would provide more parking for residents in the vicinity therefore it is proposed to proceed with changing the shared parking to permit parking only.
- 3.6 **Medina Place** – there have been 24 objections and 3 items of support for the proposed changing of single yellow to double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident as they were having difficulties manoeuvring in out of their driveway when vehicles were parked on the single yellow lines opposite. However, following consultation many residents felt that this would take away valuable parking spaces during the evening as there are only a few parking bays in this road. Therefore, we are recommending not to take forward this proposal.
- 3.7 **Wordsworth Street** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed disabled parking bay. A resident in the vicinity applied for this bay and met all the requirements of the application. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with this disabled parking bay.
- 3.8 **Sutherland Road**- there has been 1 objection to the proposed removal of a disabled parking bay. This bay was no longer required by the original applicant and no other resident in the vicinity has made an application for the bay. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the removal of the disabled parking bay.
- 3.9 **Trafalgar Street** - there have been 2 objections to the proposed no loading/unloading Monday to Sunday 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm. This was requested by a Public Transport Officer due to the obstruction of vehicles loading/unloading in this road at peak times. Therefore, we are recommending to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.10 **Carden Avenue** – there has been 1 objection to the proposed double yellow lines. The lines were requested by the Road Safety Team as the double yellow lines are to prevent obstruction when a new central pedestrian refuge is installed outside Mayfield Manor Care Home. Therefore, we are recommending to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.11 **Second Avenue** – We recently received a request from a resident asking if we could rearrange the proposed car club bays and existing motorcycle bay in this road so that

the motorcycle bay would be north of the car club bays instead of its existing location south of the proposed car club bays. This was requested at it would protect motorcycle parking in this space from the wind element and vehicles parking in the bays. Therefore, we recommend proceeding with the new proposed layout as shown in Appendix C.

- 3.12 **Lorna Road** – We recently received objections a month after the deadline to the proposed loading bay in Lorna Road, but have taken their comments into consideration regarding the loading bay being time restricted rather than 24 hours. After contacting the business requesting the loading bay we have agreed to the loading bay being Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm during their working hours. Therefore, we are recommending to proceed with this amended proposal as shown in Appendix C.

4. ANALYSIS / EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 4.1 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 proceed for the reasons outlined within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 20th June 2014 and 11th July 2014. The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.2 Notices were erected at each location for the 20th June 2014; these comprised of the official notice as well as a plan showing information about the proposal. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on the 20th June 2014. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Customer Service Centres at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.
- 5.3 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 It is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial implications:

- 7.1 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: Jeff Coates

Date: 18/08/2014

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 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, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.
- 7.5 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.
- 7.6 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention at this stage.

Lawyer consulted: Katie Matthews

Date: 14 August 2014

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

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

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

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

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

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

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None