



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER
MEETING
ADDENDUM**

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 2009

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM

Page

56. DEPUTATIONS

1 - 4

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which the Cabinet Member may speak in response. The deputation will be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

(i) Deputation concerning traffic flows in Carlyle Street, Brighton.

Mr Gerry Kassab (Spokesperson)

I believe the local authority has a “duty of care” to successfully manage traffic flows and to minimise the adverse impact of traffic into residential areas i.e. keeping traffic moving along the main arterial roads within the city.

In our case, Carlyle Street is being used as a rat run to avoid the traffic lights at the intersection of Elm Grove and Queens Park Road.

The local authority must have undertaken a risk assessment and monitored traffic volumes and concluded that Carlyle Street needed to be a 20mph and a one-way street with speed bumps.

My assertion is whilst these measures were appropriate at the time; they are now ineffective in dealing with the increase in traffic speeds, volumes and types of vans/trucks and lorries using our street.

Also, the elapse time of disturbance is much longer – we are not only dealing with traffic disturbances, noise/vibration and pollution, during the peak rush hour periods but this can extend throughout the night and into the early hours.

The level of minor damage caused to our parked cars – wing mirrors being hit and minor scrapes, which normally go unreported to the police, is forcing more residents to park their cars onto the pavements, not only obstructing our pavements but inadvertently making it easier for vehicles to speed up the street.

All of the above are significantly adversely impacting on our quality of life and we wish to work with the Council’s traffic experts to find a rapid solution.

RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR THEOBALD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

Provided at the meeting of the Full Council on 8 October 2009.

Thank you for raising this issue and I really do appreciate you offering to work with the council to try and find a solution. We acknowledge your concerns and I note that you have previously corresponded with officers on this matter. The current traffic calming measures were implemented after careful consideration and are a standard approach to dealing with the problems that existed in Carlyle Street and other similar roads within the city.

As I mentioned at my last Cabinet Member Meeting we will be embarking upon the next phase of the speed limit review shortly, once the Department for Transport has issued new guidance on the setting of speed limits. However, if you have any specific ideas of what measures could be taken to alleviate the situation in Carlyle Street, the council will consider these in the light of any supporting evidence.

Listening to your deputation both the Director and the Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport are here and I am actually going to invite the Assistant Director to have a word with you afterwards to start a sort of, I won't say 'get together', but you will understand what I mean and he will have a word with you afterwards.

(ii) Deputation concerning the London Road Controlled Parking Zone Consultation.

Mr Robert Rosenthal (Spokesperson)

This deputation is made on behalf of residents of Springfield Road, Florence Road and nos 1, 3, 5 & 7 Southdown Avenue, who together form the block of housing most closely bordering the railway line and 'Southern' area of the London Road CPZ consultation (otherwise known as 'Viaduct Rise' area).

Within the 'Northern' CPZ area, Springfield has the highest dwelling densities and experiences similar problems to residents of Ditchling Rise; this makes our block distinctive within the 'Northern' zone where dwelling densities and parking problems decrease northwards. We are also most affected by London Road station parking. As the block of streets contiguous to the Southern area and that most likely to be affected by displacement from a CPZ in Viaduct Rise, we are dissatisfied with the recent CPZ consultation process in our block and request the Council to re-conduct it. We believe it was inadequate for the following reasons:

1. Information was not properly circulated to all dwellings. For example residents 80, 82 and 84 Springfield Road received no information leaflets during the consultation. Other unknown dwellings may also have been omitted.
2. The information leaflet provided insufficient appropriate information to allow residents to make a measured judgement:
 - (a) While it presented details of what a CPZ might look like, it completely omitted to provide any contextual information. In particular it failed to mention that adjacent Preston Park Avenue had just become a designated CPZ or that a resident's group in the Viaduct Rise area had long-since been requesting a CPZ. This contextual information would be fundamental to any judgement about whether or not one wanted a CPZ since the displacement that each of these would cause would be material to residents' judgements. Indeed, a number of residents who at the time responded negatively to the consultation have subsequently, on finding out about these issues written to you to say they have

changed their minds or that had they known they would have been motivated to respond.

- (b) It did not make clear that schemes could be introduced on an area-by-area and block-by-block basis. This was only known to some individuals including myself as a result of conversations with officers. As a result many of those in the North who responded negatively to any change in the area may have re-considered if they had known that a scheme in the South could become a reality through Southern votes alone.
3. No public meeting was arranged or publicised as part of the consultation; the meeting that finally arose as a result of public requests took place AFTER the closure of the consultation process and could not therefore inform resident's responses. Indeed it was used by officers to announce the 'result'.
4. The consultation response rate was low (Springfield 23% and Florence 35%). Re-stated, the opinions of 77% of residents in Springfield and 65% in Florence have not been heard. This suggests that, for what has become such a contentious issue people were given insufficient opportunities to discuss or consider the significance of the issues. While the Council's reading of this consultation suggests that both streets were narrowly against parking management, it is important to note that this reflects the sentiment of just 12% of Springfield and 19% of Florence residents; with 10% in Springfield and 16% in Florence stating support for a CPZ. Both low turn-out and closeness of opinions suggest a second and more carefully conducted consultation is required.
5. The consultation response slip did not indicate that it would be treated, as it is being, with the finality of a 'vote'. Some residents have told us that they thought the consultation referred to the specific proposals mapped out in the information leaflet and so expressed objection because they disliked the configuration of the parking arrangements described, although they would like some form of CPZ. Others have told us that they did not think it necessary to reply because they agreed with the scheme and thought they only needed to respond if they were opposed to it. There is a widespread sense of indignation that residents' opinions have been assumed from the outcome of an inexplicit and incomplete process.

OUR REQUEST

We would therefore request that our block (Florence, Springfield and 1, 3, 5 & 7 Southdown Avenue) be re-consulted as soon as possible so we can be included in any agreed Viaduct Rise CPZ. During the consultation period, although it was not mentioned in any printed information I was verbally assured by Council officers that traffic management could be introduced on a *block by block* basis so long as the blocks are contiguous to existing CPZ like ours would be to Viaduct Rise. We are prepared and willing to support the logistics of this re-consultation through canvassing and leafleting should this be seen as helpful.

