

Subject: Resident Parking Scheme Consultations
Date of Meeting: 27 March 2012
Report of: Strategic Director, Place
Contact Officer: Name: Charles Field Tel: 29-3329
E-mail: Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: No
Wards Affected: Queens Park

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the public consultations undertaken recently. The first is for a proposed extension to the Area C Residents Parking Scheme (Queens Park area) into the Richmond Heights area (Appendix A). The second is for a proposed extension to the Area H resident parking scheme (RSCH area) into Canning Street (Appendix B). 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 the Cabinet Member approves:

- (a) That the extension of the Area C Residents Parking Scheme (Richmond Heights area) be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised.
- (b) That the extension of the Area H Residents Parking Scheme (Canning Street) be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised.
- (c) That an order should be placed for all required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the extension of the proposed parking schemes if agreed is undertaken as programmed.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 In September 2009 a letter plus short questionnaire about parking issues was sent to all property addresses in the Hanover and Elm Grove Area. In addition workshops had also been held in the local area with residents and stakeholders to establish sufficient demand to proceed to informal consultation on the introduction of a residents parking scheme. Maps and plans for consultation on a proposed parking scheme for Hanover and Elm Grove area were designed,

based on evidence gathered in these 3 exercises, and also from on-street parking surveys conducted by Mott MacDonald (traffic engineering and transport planning consultancy) and in consultation with ward councillors.

- 3.2 It was decided not to proceed with a scheme for the Hanover and Elm Grove area due to the level of residents' objections to a proposed scheme for the overall area.
- 3.3 However, respondents from a segment of the wider area in the Richmond Heights area and in Canning Street were broadly in favour of a scheme.
- 3.4 At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9th November 2011 it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.

4. CONSULTATION

Richmond Heights area.

- 4.1 Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 1086 property addresses in the Richmond Heights Area of Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. For the first time in a BHCC Residents Parking Scheme Consultation, respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: 21 respondents (8.5%) chose this method.
- 4.2 Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at: St Mary's Church Hall, 61 St James' Street, Brighton on Tuesday 10 January, 2012, 1.30pm to 5.30pm and Thursday 12 January, 2012, 3.30pm to 7pm. There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Tuesday 3 January, 2012 to Tuesday 31 January, 2012, 9am to 5pm. There are 17 streets in the proposed scheme area.
- 4.3 253 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 23%. Responses from outside the area (x1) or where no street name was given (x8) have been removed from the analysis but included in Appendix C.
- 4.4 Overall, 148 (61%) respondents support the proposed extension of the Area C scheme and 96 (39%) are not in favour.

Canning Street

- 4.5 Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was again used to provide 67 property addresses in Canning Street, Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. 5 respondents (15%) chose the survey online method.
- 4.6 Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at: St Mary's Church Hall, 61 St James' Street, Brighton on Tuesday 10 January, 2012, 1.30pm to 5.30pm and Thursday 12 January, 2012, 3.30pm to 7pm. There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Tuesday 3 January, 2012 to Tuesday 31 January, 2012, 9am to 5pm.

- 4.7 34 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 51%.
- 4.8 Overall, 30 (88%) respondents support the proposed extension of the Area H scheme and 4 (12%) are not in favour.
- 4.9 The full results analysis of both consultations is outlined in Appendix C & D.

Conclusions

Richmond Heights area

- 4.10 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the Richmond Heights area with sufficient public support for the proposed Area C extension, based on the new scheme boundary. Therefore, the recommendation is that the revised Area C Residents Parking Scheme extension into the Richmond Heights area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order. Ward Councillors have been consulted and are happy for this to proceed to Traffic Order consultation stage.

Canning Street

- 4.11 There is a positive opinion from the vast majority of respondents within Canning Street with sufficient public support for the proposed Area H extension, based on the new scheme boundary. Therefore, the recommendation is that the revised Area H Residents Parking Scheme extension into Canning Street be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order. Ward Councillors have been consulted and are happy for this to proceed to Traffic Order consultation stage.
- 4.12 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 area and existing parking provisions in the area.
- 4.13 As part of the new one way systems the Transport Planning section will also be investigating the possibility of exemptions for cyclists. Any proposal taken forward would be advertised through a Traffic Regulation order for Consultation.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 Revenue: The full cost of advertising the traffic regulation order will be covered from existing traffic revenue budgets. The financial impact of the revenue from the proposed new schemes, along with associated ongoing maintenance costs, has been included within the proposed budget for 2012-13 which will be submitted to Budget Council in February 2012.

- 5.2 Capital: New parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £100,000 per scheme over 7 years.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date 16/02/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.3 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.
- 5.4 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.

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 CMM for a decision.

Under the Road Traffic Regulation Act the Council may acquire, whether by purchase or by hiring, such parking meters and other apparatus as appear to it to be required or likely to be required for the purposes of its functions in relation to designated parking places.

Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsom

Date:15 February 2012

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.7 The new motorcycle bays and on-street pedal cycle bays will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.
- 5.8 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

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

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 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 are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To seek approval to advertise the Traffic Order after taking into consideration the consultation reports. These proposals are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – Map of proposed extension of Area C (Richmond Heights area)
2. Appendix B – Map of proposed extension of Area H (Canning Street)
3. Appendix C – Richmond Heights area consultation report
4. Appendix D –Canning Street consultation report

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9th November 2011

