

Subject:	Blakers Park Road Safety Scheme – TRO		
Date of Meeting:	30th April 2013		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Jo Brooksbank	Tel: 291819
	Email:	Jo.Brooksbank@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Preston Park		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 In November 2011 the Transport Committee approved proposals to implement infrastructure improvements on several roads in the Blakers Park area, including Cleveland Road, in response to a petition from local residents. The measures are designed to improve the safety and quality of walking routes to Blaker's Park and for pupils attending Balfour Primary, Downs Junior and the Montessori Schools,
- 1.2 Consultation with local residents resulted in broad support for the scheme which narrows the southern end of Cleveland Road at its junction with Stanford Avenue, retains existing School Keep Clear markings outside the Cleveland Road entrance to the Montessori School and deters unsafe parking and maintains good visibility for pedestrians on the corners of the junction.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to consider comments and objections received in response to the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order which extends existing waiting restrictions, introduces a short section of additional double yellow lines and amends the position of School Keep Clear markings along the newly created kerb line, to achieve the objectives above.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee, having taken into account all duly made representations and objections, approves as advertised the Brighton & Hove (Waiting and loading/unloading restrictions and parking places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.*20** (TRO-7-2013)

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS

- 3.1 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order relates to one location, the junction of Cleveland Road and Stanford Avenue, as indicated in the original plan of the proposals shown in Appendix A. Appendix A1 shows the revised plan, redrawn after the school relocated its pedestrian entrance during the consultation period and to overcome the objections received from residents. Of the comments received, four are in objection to the extent of waiting restrictions proposed and one is in support of the proposed extension to School Keep Clear markings outside the Montessori School. All comment, support and objections are summarised in Appendix B. The majority of objections received refer to the extent of double yellow lines proposed to control parking on the east side of Cleveland Road, outside the school.
- 3.2 The extent of these waiting controls has been determined to both support the objectives of the Safe Routes to School measures, whilst also concurring with guidance on safe parking contained in the Highway Code (rule 243) viz.: Drivers should not park i) near a school entrance; ii) within 10 metres of a junction; iii) where a kerb has been lowered to assist wheelchair users; or iv) in front of an entrance to property.
- 3.3 The double yellow lines proposed on the corners of the junction seek to provide clear sight lines for pedestrians crossing the road, to see and be seen and for motorists throughout the whole day and night. These double yellow lines are close to the school entrances on both Cleveland Road and Stanford Avenue; they cover an area 10m either side of the junction and include drop kerbs on Cleveland Road and also on Stanford Avenue adjacent to the pedestrian island.
- 3.4 The length of double yellow lines north of the School Keep Clears will not now be implemented and will allow for further parking opportunities at all times, thereby accommodating objections from residents.
- 3.5 The School Keep Clear restrictions are to provide clear sight lines for motorists, children and their parents, as well as other road users, outside the school entrance during the extended school day (Mon-Fri, 8am – 6pm except August). They provide a clear area in which children and adults can cross the road more safely.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 1st March 2013 and 22nd March 2013.
- 4.2 Ward Councillors for the area were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as emergency service organisations and public transport operators.
- 4.3 Notices advertising the proposals and the reasons for them were placed on-street on 2nd March 2013; including a layout plan. Formal notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on 1st March 2013. Detailed layout plans and a copy of the

proposed Traffic Regulation Order were available for public inspection 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 open for public response on the Council website.

5 FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The cost implications for advertising and making the Traffic Regulation Order can be met from the 'Access to Parks' budget of £60,000 which forms part of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital allocation.
- 5.2 Any changes to the Traffic Regulation Order, traffic signs and road markings will result in additional officer time and this will be funded from with the current available budget.

Finance Officer Consulted:

Jeff Coates

.....
Date: 18.4.13

Legal Implications:

- 5.3 The Council has power to make traffic orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The orders have been advertised in accordance with the relevant procedure regulations. As there are unresolved objections they are now referred to this meeting for consideration.
- 5.4 Relevant Human Rights to which the Council should have regard are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

.....
Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsom

.....
Date: 17.4.13

Equalities Implications:

- 5.5 The proposed measures will be of universal benefit to all regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, sexuality, etc. They should be of particular benefit to more vulnerable members of society, including young and elderly pedestrians and people with disabilities.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.6 The Safer Routes to School initiative seeks to increase use of sustainable travel modes to and from school by increasing the quality and safety of walking, cycling and scooting on specific routes to schools.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.9 There are no corporate/citywide implications for the decision.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.10 Public realm improvements, including the installation of double yellow lines at this junction will encourage more families to walk, especially those on the school run to and from local schools on this busy route. The increased visibility and additional kerbside space made available by the proposed waiting restrictions will help pedestrians feel safer when crossing the road. Increased walking and safety both contribute to improved public health.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 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 the report.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – plan showing the proposals as advertised with the TRO
Appendix A1 – revised plan showing the amended proposal
Appendix B – summary of representations received

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None