

7 July 2015

Brighton & Hove City Council

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of depositions from members of the public. Each deposition may be heard for a maximum of five minutes.

Deputations received:

(i) Deputation: Controlled Parking Zone: Hanover & Elm Grove

As the result of the transport and parking survey undertaken by residents via the Hanover & Elm Grove Local Action Team (HEGLAT), with 1101 surveys returned, we the residents, now ask Brighton & Hove City Council to undertake the development of a mutually agreed proposal. This to be followed by a consultation on a Controlled Parking Zone in the area, based on the Community Parking Plan as devised and proposed by the residents and HEGLAT. The outline of this Community Parking Plan having already been discussed with, and positively and constructively received by council officers and councillors in meetings prior to this representation

Presented for and on behalf of the Hanover & Elm Grove Local Action Team by:

Chris Taylor (lead spokesperson)
William Johnson
Nick Adams
Deborah Cain
Charlotte Aspinall
Gerry Kassab
Chris Margerison
David Hearn
Tessa Pawsey

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

HANOVER & ELM GROVE CPZ PROPOSAL

1. Residents have shown us that on a ratio of about 2:1 they are in favour of “some kind of CPZ” but NOT the usual Heavy Touch 9am to 8pm as found in other areas of the city.
2. A Light Touch scheme as found in some areas would not necessarily solve the problems as the survey highlighted that one of the most difficult times to park is early in the evenings, and so a new kind of CPZ is getting most support.

MEDIUM TOUCH SCHEME

3. A **Medium Touch** Scheme covering Hanover Main - the area bordered by Albion Hill, Queen's Park Rd, Elm Grove and Lewes Rd.

Whilst residents north of Elm Grove are still generally against and controlled parking as their problems are not as bad as Hanover Main, they do appreciate that any CPZ will impact on them and so they might be ready to accept a **Light Touch** scheme with restricted hours of 11am-12pm and 7pm-8pm.

Times for **MEDIUM TOUCH** restrictions 10am – 11am, 2pm – 3pm and 7pm – 8pm.

4. This would be 7 days a week if accepted by the group and after full consultation with relevant interested parties.
5. Pay and Display during each restricted hour and only during that restricted hour. No roll-over to the next one. *Available in 30 minute increments also.* As a result of Elm Grove Meeting.
6. Bays available near businesses and shops FREE for up to 30mins.
7. Extra permits for self-employed people with a van + private vehicle. Note; there are now many more self-employed tradesmen than ever before and they have a van for business and a private car for family use also. We cannot be putting people's livelihoods and family life at stake by over-restricting their vehicles.
8. More streets should be made One-Way to allow for extra parking spaces – enabling parking on both sides of the road.
9. Close look at “Passing Points” in certain streets where Two-Way traffic is maintained.
10. Close look at proper secure Bike Storage rather than just Open Racks.
11. The introduction of “Floating permits” for businesses who have a need for several vehicles to be around their premises such as garages and businesses with a fleet of vehicles. These are essential to the lifeblood of the area.
12. The Triangle ie; Carlyle St, Lynton St, Arnold St, Baxter St, Cromwell St – where there are very specific problems with capacity and rat-run issues. Work has been done on this and should be looked at. It is an area with very specific needs due

to the narrowness of the roads and because in the original Council Consultation 2010, they were going to lose so many spaces. This area cannot afford to lose this many and compromises through working with the residents are going to have to be found. **Otherwise they may well REJECT any plan outright.**

13. Pankhurst Estate and IOW Triangle (Carisbrooke, Ryde, Sandown, Totland, St Helen's Rd) need full community consultation asap.

14. North of Elm Grove being consulted now.

These areas to be offered the possibility of joining after ONE year if they stayed out to start with.

15. People on Council Tax Benefit to be able to pay half of full cost of a permit.

16. More traffic calming to slow traffic on rat-runs. Eg. Angled sleeping policemen or build-outs. This is a major problem in many streets.

17. Possibility of Chevron Parking in other streets wide enough to accommodate it.

ELM GROVE

The council must look at layout and parking on Elm Grove as part of the overall plan. Consider chevron parking as a viable way of improving parking capacity on Elm Grove. It is allowed already towards the top of the road so why not towards the bottom. Many of the safety issues have disappeared now due to the introduction of the 20mph speed limit.

There is a plan and layout that has been developed by residents that was not considered by ET&S Committee.

Above all else the community was thinking 'together' about the impact that any CPZ would have on themselves as residents, their neighbours and businesses in the area. Each road would need to be looked at individually as needs differ widely.

What might work for one street would not necessarily work for the next street on.

Some businesses would prefer to keep double yellow lines outside their premises as it would leave space for large vehicle deliveries; eg Archer's Butchers on Islingworth Rd and some of the pubs with their need for large Drays to be able to get close.

Delivery Bays are often abused by all and sundry.

The Medium Touch Scheme would leave nine hours during the day for people to have visitors for FREE.

People who run businesses from home; the elderly and disabled who need family visits (and not by professional carers who get some dispensation on being able to park for short periods.);

The survey showed that in reality, as opposed to perception, not that many people have more than one vehicle.

The community did not want to make it any more difficult for tradesmen to come and do work at their houses.

There are areas of the city where tradesmen simply will not go to because of parking restrictions and costs.

Some (albeit limited) consultation was done with people living in areas where there are already CPZs to see how their scheme worked or did not work for them.

Lastly – the residents did not want to simply introduce a scheme that would have a devastating negative impact on other areas, as has happened in the past. Every CPZ

so far has had a negative impact on neighbouring areas.

Any CPZ in Hanover and Elm Grove will ultimately generate a lot of income for the council and the residents here feel that they should get something in return. Initial investment in road infrastructure will help to ensure that residents and businesses do not feel that they are simply being used as a cash cow. Things could return to a negative attitude if the residents feel that their Community Consultation has been a waste of time.