

Subject:	Elm Drive/Rowan Avenue TRO		
Date of Meeting:	8th October 2019		
Report of:	Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Stacey Hollingworth	Tel: 01273 293536
	Email:	stacey.hollingworth@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Hangleton & Knoll;		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections relating to a draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The order outlines the proposed introduction of double yellow line restrictions at the junction of Elm Drive and Rowan Avenue to address safety and traffic flow concerns.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee, having taken account of all duly made representations, approves as advertised the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-4-2019)

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 Concerns have been raised by local residents via their ward councillor about parking congestion at the junction of Elm Drive/Rowan Avenue. Vehicles regularly park on the corners and on the footways outside the local shops which reduces visibility for drivers and impedes traffic movements. The parking behaviour at this location also poses a safety risk to children who are travelling to and from school and to Knoll Park which is in the vicinity.
- 3.2 The proposed double yellow line restrictions at this junction will prevent dangerous parking on the corners to address the safety concerns whilst maintaining parking opportunities for the local shops within the two existing laybys. Appendix 1 includes a plan of the proposed changes.
- 3.3 Two objections have been received to the planned safety improvements and the details are summarised below:
- 3.4 **Objection 1**
Parking pressures have increased over the last 10 years and as a result the resident's driveway is often blocked by people visiting the shops and parents dropping off their children for school. Introducing parking restrictions will reduce the amount of available space for parking which will make the situation worse.

They do not believe there have been any accidents at this junction and they believe the visibility at the junction is not a problem. They believe the restrictions are being proposed to raise money for the Council. The spaces should be retained for vulnerable people visiting graves, parents of children attending the sports clubs (football and bowling), parents of children visiting Knoll Park, parents dropping and collecting children to and from school and for shop customers. To deprive these people of space to park their car would be immoral. Buses for a family are expensive and so people have to drive.

3.5 Objection 2

While accepting the need for some restriction of parking to improve the sightlines the proposals are excessive to achieve this objective. Items 4, 5 & 9 shown on the plan in Appendix 1 are not required and item 3 should be shortened to terminate outside No. 90. The remaining space should be restricted to 1 hour maximum stay to ensure that it is available for access to the shops rather than all day parking.

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The proposed double yellow line restrictions were originally requested by a group of local residents via their Ward Councillor. They raised concerns about the safety of children in the area due to the parking congestion as well as concerns about the visibility for drivers when they rejoined Elm Drive. Once the proposals were drawn up a meeting between the Ward Councillor and the residents took place and the plans were amended at their request to extend the double yellow line on Elm Drive by a further 5m to the north outside No. 119 and to remove a proposed double yellow line opposite No. 4 Rowan Avenue. A further request was made by residents at the time to reduce the double yellow line outside No. 90 Elm Drive (spur) however this amendment was rejected by officers as parking at this location on the carriageway would obstruct traffic movements when a car was also parked legitimately in the parking layby on the south side.
- 4.2 Objection 1 identifies a range of vulnerable road users, many of who will be travelling on foot and will therefore benefit from the improved safety that is delivered by these proposals. Whilst there have been no collision at this location in the past three years, the number of vulnerable road users in this location justify the proposals in this instance. The residents primary concern appears to be about parking congestion and access to their drive way. The resident may apply for a white line to be marked across their drive way which would offer them protection against vehicles blocking their drive. Officers are happy to contact the resident and offer the marking of a white line as part of these works if they deem it suitable.
- 4.3 Objection 2 is primarily concerned about maximising parking availability along the spur. Any vehicles parked on the carriageway on the north side of the spur outside Nos. 82-84 and Nos. 90-92 (items 3 and 4 in Appendix 1) would cause an obstruction to the carriageway. Any vehicles parked on the footway outside these properties would cause a safety risk to pedestrians accessing the shops.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Prior to advertising the TRO, the local Ward Councillor engaged with three local residents regarding these proposals. The initial discussion took place at the request of a resident who had been lobbying for these restrictions for some time. A further meeting gave the local representatives an opportunity to review the proposals. As a result amendments were made to the plan as set out in paragraph 4.1.
- 5.2 The TRO amendment was advertised in the local press on 9 August 2019 and notices were posted in the locality in accordance with standard procedures. Details of the amendment have been sent to the full list of statutory consultee and relevant council officers. No other comments have been received.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Consideration has been given to reducing the proposals however the restrictions represent the minimum needed to ensure traffic movement through the spur whilst maintaining safe visibility not only for drivers but also for pedestrians. The proposals protect against parking on the footways outside the shops which will improve safety for children and other pedestrians on the footway. The proposals also address concerns raised directly by local residents to their Ward Councillor prior to the traffic order being advertised. Overall there have been three residents in favour of the proposals and two residents who have objected.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 There are no additional financial implications associated with the recommendations of this report as the proposal is, after consideration of the objections raised, that the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders are implemented as originally advertised. The associated budgets will be monitored and reviewed as part of budget monitoring and budget setting processes.

Finance Officer Consulted: Jess Laing

Date: 16/09/2019

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 Before making Traffic Orders the Council must consider all duly made unwithdrawn objections. Where there are unresolved objections to a Traffic Order then the matter is referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.
- 7.3 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places the Council under a duty to exercise its functions under that Act so as far as practicable to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic including pedestrians. The proposals in this report are put forward as part of the continuing programme works undertaken in accordance with that duty.

Equalities Implications:

- 7.4 An Equality Impact Assessment has not been carried out on the advertised TRO, but the consultation process allows for representations to be made by, or on behalf of, people or groups who are defined as having 'protected characteristics' by existing equality legislation.

Pavement parking and parking on corners can cause considerable danger and inconvenience to pedestrians and wheelchair users in the city and is occurring more frequently.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.5 There are no immediate sustainability implications arising from this report.

Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.6 There are no other significant implications arising from this report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Plan of TRO-4-2019

Background Documents

None