

**ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY
AND TRANSPORT CABINET
MEMBER MEETING**

Agenda Item 105

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Various Changes to Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) Order, areas outside of CPZ Order and Seafront Order		
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:	Brunswick & Adelaide, 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 resident parking schemes and outside the resident parking schemes. 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 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 over 150 roads.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 The Cabinet Member 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* and Brighton & Hove Seafront (Various Restrictions) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment No.* 201* with the following amendments:

- a) The proposed relocation of permit parking bay in New Church Road is to be removed from the Traffic order due to reasons outlined in section 3.7
- b) The proposed extension to loading bay in Applesham Avenue is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.8
- c) The proposed removal of loading bay in Ashford Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11
- d) The proposed double yellow lines in Coombe Rise are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.13
- e) The proposed double yellow lines in Ovingdean Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.14
- f) The proposed extension to double yellow lines in St Aubyn's Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.16
- g) The proposed double yellow lines and single yellow lines in Hazeldene Meads and The Beeches are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.17
- h) The Proposed double yellow lines in Tongdean Rise are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.18
- i) The proposed removal of loading ban in Madeira Drive is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.19

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 This Combined Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 150 roads city wide. 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 are detailed in Appendix C.

3.2 In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Western Road (Brunswick & Adelaide/Regency – Controlled Parking Zones M & Z) – proposed loading ban
- b) St John's Road (Brunswick & Adelaide – Controlled Parking Zone N)
- c) Stanford Road (Preston Park – Controlled Parking Zone Q) – Proposed change of time to shared parking bays
- d) New Church Road (Wish – Controlled Parking Zone W) – proposed relocation of Permit Parking Bay

- e) Applesham Avenue (Hangleton & Knoll) – proposed extension to loading bay
- f) Lewes Road (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed loading bay
- g) Valley Road (North Portslade) – Proposed Loading Bay
- h) Ashford Road (Preston Park) – proposed removal of loading bay
- i) Livingstone Street/Hendon Street/Bute Street/Rochester Street (Known as Bakers bottom) (Queens Park) – Proposed double yellow lines at these junctions
- j) Coombe Rise (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed double yellow lines
- k) Ovingdean Road (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed double yellow lines
- l) The Garden/Garden Close (South Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
- m) St Aubyn’s Road (South Portslade) – proposed extension to double yellow lines
- n) Hazeldene Meads/The Beeches (Withdean) - proposed double yellow lines and single yellow lines
- o) Tongdean Rise (Withdean) – Proposed double yellow lines
- p) Madeira Drive (Queens Park - Seafront) – proposed removal of loading bay
- q) Madeira Drive (Queens Park – Seafront) – proposed double yellow lines

3.3 Letters of support were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Leicester Street (Queens Park – Controlled Parking Zone C) – proposed double yellow lines
- b) Somerset Street (Queens Park – Controlled Parking Zone C) – proposed removal of loading bay to extend disabled parking bays
- c) Lansdowne Road (Brunswick & Adelaide – Controlled Parking Zone M) – proposed extension to double yellow lines
- d) Stanford Road (Preston Park – Controlled Parking Zone Q) – Proposed change of time to shared parking bays
- e) Raphael Road (Westbourne – Controlled Parking Zone W) – proposed Motorcycle Bay
- f) Clifton Road (Regency – Controlled Parking Zone Y) – Proposed Doctor’s Parking Bay
- g) Manor Close (East Brighton) - proposed double yellow lines

- h) Hawkhurst Road/Nanson Road (Hollingdean & Stanmer) – proposed double yellow lines
- i) Bishops Road/The Droveaway (Hove Park) – proposed extension to double yellow lines
- j) London Road (A23) (Patcham) – proposed double yellow lines
- k) Livingstone Street/Hendon Street/Bute Street/Rochester Street (Known as Bakers bottom) (Queens Park) – Proposed double yellow lines at these junctions
- l) Garden Close/The Gardens (South Portslade) – Proposed double yellow lines
- m) Hazeldene Meads/The Beaches (Withdean) – proposed double and single yellow lines
- n) Channel View Road (Woodingdean) - proposed double yellow lines
- o) Downland Road (Woodingdean) – proposed double yellow lines

Summary of Objections

- 3.4 **Western Road** - there have been 5 objections to the proposed Loading Ban. This was requested by The Brighton & Hove Bus Company as indiscriminate parking along Western Road is causing considerable disruption to bus services. It is felt that this is one of the most congested urban roads in the city. The parked cars also have an impact on cyclists and other road users who must navigate around them.

The Bus Company are actually in favour of more restrictive proposals on both sides of the road. However, the Council are aware of the importance of allowing servicing to shops and businesses along the route, which is why as a compromise we are proposing a “peak hours only” loading prohibition, on one side of the road only (between Holland Road and Montpelier Road). The intention is to implement a no loading restriction between 7am-10am and 4pm-7pm during peak period hours on the north side of the road (except where there are bus stops which have a different current loading restriction). There are currently double yellow lines “no waiting at any time” restrictions. Officers have been out on site and have discovered that there are two stretches of single yellow lines on the north side of Western Road between Norfolk Road and Temple Street. This section of single yellow lines will not have a loading ban.

The aim of this proposal is to ease some of this congestion during peak periods while still allowing the opportunity for businesses to load and unload on one side of the road during these periods and on both sides of the road outside these periods. Therefore, it is recommended that this proposal is taken forward.

- 3.5 **St John’s Road** – there have been 2 objections (one of the letters is signed by 5 Businesses) to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by residents via a petition signed by 11 people, which was presented at an Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 26th May 2011.

An Officer met with a Ward Councillor on site and spoke to some of the businesses who want the proposed double yellow lines on the west side opposite Nos. 17-11 St John's Road changed to single yellow lines. This was agreed so the Council will be proceeding with the new section of single yellow lines alongside the existing single and double yellow line proposal.

- 3.6 **Stanford Road** – there have been 2 objections and 1 item of support to the proposed change of times to shared bays to allow paid parking for up to 11 hours. This was requested as staff at the nearby school can only park for four hours and have to keep moving their vehicles. The proposal will benefit staff at the nearby school and currently the shared bays are under used. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with the change of times.
- 3.7 **New Church Road** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed relocation of permit parking bay. This was requested by a resident as they were having problems exiting their drive safely due to parked cars. However moving this bay slightly would risk a “knock on” effect on neighbouring properties all wanting the same change. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.8 **Applesham Road** - there have been 2 objections to the proposed extension to the loading bay. This was requested by a business as the existing loading bay would need to be extended to accommodate 10.35 metre rigid delivery vehicles. However, following consultation with the Ward Councillors it was felt that this would take away a parking space which is limited around this area. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal
- 3.9 **Lewes Road** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed loading ban. This loading ban is to replace the existing Urban Clearway which should only be introduced where there are no other on-street parking controls. There are now loading bays on this stretch of Lewes Road, making the Urban Clearway restriction inappropriate. The Loading Ban will improve traffic flow at peak times on this major arterial road. The Transport Planning Team will be looking at providing further loading bays in this area in the near future to improve the situation for businesses. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with this proposal
- 3.10 **Valley Road** – there has been 1 objection to the proposed loading bay. This loading bay was request by a PCSO via a Ward Councillor as delivery vehicles were double parking on the junctions of The Crossways/Valley Road causing an obstruction to all road users.

Officers met with both Ward Councillors on site to discuss the proposed loading bay. Officers feel that the proposed loading bay is in an ideal location where there is a parade of shops with a number of deliveries and this would also deter delivery vehicles from parking in more dangerous locations. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with this proposal.

- 3.11 **Ashford Road** - there have been 3 objections to the proposed removal of a loading bay. This was requested by a resident with a letter containing 8 signatures stating that the loading bay was no longer in use. The loading bay is still in use by nearby businesses and if the loading bay was removed delivery vehicles would have to

double park on this busy road by the junction with Ditchling Road. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal and the loading bay would remain.

- 3.12 **Livingstone Street / Hendon Street / Bute Street / Rochester Street** – there have been 26 Objections and 12 items of Support to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by residents via an e-petition and accompanying paper petition signed by 103 people, which was presented at an Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 31st March 2011. These double yellow lines will reduce the parking spaces for residents, but would improve safety, visibility and prevent obstruction to all road users. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with this proposal and all the Ward Councillors are supportive of this way forward.
- 3.13 **Coombe Rise** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by a resident who has now objected to the proposal as they state their original request was very vague and they did not want double yellow lines in the entire turning area. Therefore they have asked that this proposal be withdrawn and they send in a more detailed request to be advertised on the next available Traffic Order.
- 3.14 **Ovingdean Road** – there have been 3 objections to the proposed double yellow lines. This was in regard to the proposed double yellow lines encouraging vehicles to increase their speed as the road would be clear of obstruction. This was originally requested by a resident as people are parking on a section of Ovingdean Road and it is causing a hazard especially to those cycling or walking as there is no pavement and the road is very narrow. However, due to the objections received it is recommended not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.15 **The Garden /Garden Close** – there have been 2 objections and 1 item of support to the proposed double yellow lines. This was originally requested by a resident through their Ward Councillor as there is a problem in this road with vehicles parking. This causes problems for residents entering and exiting their properties where there is limited space to manoeuvre. Therefore, it is proposed to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.16 **St Aubyn's Road** – there have been 4 objections to the proposed extension to double yellow lines. This was requested by a business as damage was regularly being caused to parked vehicles as there was not enough room to manoeuvre large vehicles that delivered to the site. However, following consultation residents felt that this would take away parking spaces in an area that already has a shortage of spaces and the double yellow lines were previously shortened to provide extra spaces. Therefore, due to the objections we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.17 **Hazeldene Meads/The Beeches** – there have been 17 objections and 4 items of support to the proposed double and single yellow lines. This was requested by residents with a 12 signature petition. However following consultation residents felt that other roads in the vicinity had severe parking problems and that they would benefit from a resident's parking scheme and this proposal would only make the situation worse. Also these two roads have hardly any local traffic which parks on them. Therefore, we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.18 **Tongdean Rise** – there have been 5 objections. This was requested by City Clean as refuse vehicles were having difficulties entering this section of Tongdean Rise.

This is being withdrawn from the order as City Clean and the residents have had several meetings and have come to an agreement and compromise.

- 3.19 **Madeira Drive**– there have been 2 objections to the removal of the loading ban. This was requested by the Parking Enforcement Team due to lots of blue badge holders receiving PCNs as they were parked outside the disabled toilets. However the loading ban seems to have been implemented less than 2 years ago after consultation between the highways department & all the traders in the colonnade. This was to prevent obstructions to other vehicles and causing a gridlock due to vehicles parking on these double yellow lines especially in the summer when the road is busy. Also there is a stretch of disabled parking bays on the opposite side of the road that blue badge holders can use. Therefore we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.20 **Madeira Drive** – there has been 1 objection to the proposed double yellow lines due to the loss of a parking space. This was requested by a business to open up the frontage to the shops. Also with this proposal there would be no loss of any parking spaces. Therefore it is proposed to proceed with this proposal.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 25th November 2011 and 16th December 2011.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 4.3 Notices were also put on street for the 25th November 2011; these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reasons for it. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on the 25th November 2011. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library, the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.
- 4.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the order and having the lining and signing amended will be met from the existing traffic revenue budget.

Finance officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 29/02/12

Legal Implications:

The traffic orders have been advertised according to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the relevant procedure regulations. As there are unresolved objections and representations they are now referred to this meeting for resolution. There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention.

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

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

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.6 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 in Appendix A and within the report.
- 6.2 For the proposals outlined as being removed from the order in the recommendations the only alternative option is taking these forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are not taken forward for the reasons outlined in the recommendations.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To seek approval of the Traffic Order with amendments after taking into consideration of the duly made representations and objections.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

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

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None

