



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER  
MEETING  
ADDENDUM**

**4.00PM, THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 2010**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
99. PUBLIC QUESTIONS	1 - 2
100. DEPUTATIONS	3 - 16



# **ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING**

## **Agenda Item 99**

Brighton & Hove City Council

### **WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

#### **(a) Mike Ring**

"Why are Yellow Lines being considered for Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road to counter a parking problem that does not exist, which can be confirmed as correct by photo evidence as already provided?"



**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Two deputations have been referred from Council on 28 January 2010. The Cabinet Member will note the response given at that meeting and provide an update where appropriate.

- (a) Deputation concerning Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads** – Mr John Towers (Spokesperson).
- (b) Deputation concerning Dangers of Crossing Old Shoreham Road at the Junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive** - Ms Paula Slinn (Spokesperson).

Two deputations have been submitted directly to the Environment Cabinet Member meeting. 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.

- (c) Deputation concerning the former Royal Alexander Hospital site Planning Brief** – Mr Mike Hales (Spokesperson)
- (d) Deputation concerning proposals for a loading bay in Portland Road, Hove** – Mr Stephen Eyton (Spokesperson)

## **100(a) Deputation concerning Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads - Mr John Towers (Spokesperson)**

“As residents of Painters Corner, we are deeply concerned about the nearby Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road crossroads. There are no pedestrian crossings on the north or southbound carriageways at the junctions on Neville and Sackville Roads. We have written to the Council many times about the dangers and the need for safe and effective pedestrian crossings, but no action has been taken.

### **Our petition**

We petitioned **212 residents** living in five roads in Painters Corner, and all but two signed. This shows **99% support** for pedestrian crossings as described above. **We attach their signatures as part of this document.**

Comments from residents included:

- Three children involved in accidents
- Eye-witness accounts of vehicle crashes
- Multiple examples of near misses of pedestrians by vehicles
- A blind person unable to cross at this junction
- Older children unable to cross unsupervised
- Elderly residents and their relatives frightened of crossing
- Traffic speeding and jumping red lights
- Confusing traffic light sequences making crossing hazardous
- Inadequate space on the central islands, especially for parents with buggies and small children
- No safety barriers on the central islands with speeding traffic dangerously close to pedestrians
- Pedestrians stranded in the central islands due to traffic light sequence giving priority to vehicles
- Concerns about increased traffic and pedestrian safety with Sackville Place development
- Written complaints to the Council by residents have to date achieved nothing.”

### **Response from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment, at Council on 28 January 2010.**

“I do welcome the way in which you have put the argument, if I may put it that way, this afternoon, very eloquently and thank you very much.

Things have moved forward since Councillor Burgess’s time because our design proposals do include the provision of controlled pedestrian crossing points on all arms of the junctions. We have the design, the proposals are there, they have been designed. What I will do because it is connected and you are right and you mention that in your speech to the development at Sackville Place. What I will do is I will ask the Planning Department to contact you and to give you an update as to exactly where that development is. I do appreciate the position that you and the other residents in your area are in and obviously I am very much hoping that the proposals that have been designed can be implemented as soon as possible.”



## **Brighton and Hove City Council**

### **Supporting Information**

#### **Deputation concerning road safety improvements for Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads, Hove**

The local community are deeply concerned about the Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road crossroads. This is because there are no safe pedestrian crossings at this junction. We want the Council to introduce measures to improve pedestrian safety. This deputation is being made as, to date, written complaints to the Council by residents have achieved no improvements.

A door to door petition of 212 residents in five roads in Painters Corner showed that 99% felt strongly that action must be done to improve pedestrian safety at these crossings.

#### **The dangers**

There are many reasons why this crossroads is dangerous for pedestrians. There are no pedestrian crossings on the north or southbound carriageways at the junctions on Neville and Sackville roads.

It is a complicated junction. The traffic light sequence and filter lanes are confusing to drivers, and vehicles often speed and jump red lights. Pedestrians of all ages and abilities put themselves at risk by having to negotiate these hazards.

There is inadequate space on the central islands for pedestrians, including parents with buggies and small children. Pedestrians are often stranded in the central islands due to traffic light sequences giving priority to vehicles. There are no safety barriers on the central islands, with speeding traffic passing perilously close to pedestrians.

Data from Mark Prior, Assistant Director Sustainable Transport, confirms that *'during the three year period to 30 November 2009 there were 10 reported injury collisions at these crossroads. Two were classed as 'serious injury collisions' and eight were classed as 'slight injury collisions'. From these collisions, there were four pedestrian casualties, two of which were serious.'* These figures undoubtedly mask a larger number of unreported and near accidents.

#### **The impact on the community**

Many people cross here every day. This includes hundreds of children going to schools in Hove Park, Blatchington Mill, Aldrington, Cottesmore St Marys, and Cardinal Newman, as well as many employees who work in the immediate vicinity, and those using Hove Park.

Because of the present dangers many people are fearful of crossing or do not cross here at all. Elderly people and their relatives reported that they are frightened to cross, many older children are not permitted to cross unsupervised, and for anyone with a disability this junction presents a major obstacle.

**Action needed**

Whilst we understand that the Council is waiting for the developers of the Sackville Place Retail Park to fund road safety improvements at this junction, we cannot wait indefinitely for a private finance solution. We have seen no guaranteed time frame for this development nor a prioritised schedule of work as regards road safety improvements included in it. We therefore ask the Council to consider immediate and urgent action.

We need an immediate safety audit to be undertaken on week days at peak times (e.g. school times) to identify the problems. Protective railings need to be installed on the central islands and traffic calming measures introduced. Above all we need a green man crossing system to be introduced.

**John Towers (spokesperson)**

**28 January 2010**

**100(b) Deputation concerning Dangers of Crossing Old Shoreham Road at the Junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive - Ms Paula Slinn (Spokesperson).**

“We wish to raise the issue of the dangers of crossing the Old Shoreham Rd at the junctions with The Upper Drive and The Drive. Some 3000 school children are at school around these junctions and there is no provision to enable them to safely cross the road at these junctions. We ask that the Cabinet Member for Environment agrees to review the situation and consider taking action to safeguard the welfare of the children and others who wish to cross the road.”

Deputation to Council

In support of Petition being presented by Cllr Melanie Davis to improve safety at Upper Drive/Old Shoreham Road Junction and The Drive/Old Shoreham Road junction

My name is Paula Slinn. I am a resident in Hove, having lived in two streets leading off the Old Shoreham Road (Bigwood Avenue and Chanctonbury Road) which are at opposite ends of the stretch of the Old Shoreham Road between BHASVIC – Dyke Road and the Upper Drive for over 11 years. I have two children – a 13 year old who attends Cardinal Newman and a 10 year old who attends Somerhill Junior School. I have concerns about the safety of the crossing at the Upper Drive/Old Shoreham Road and the lack of crossing at the Drive/Old Shoreham Road.

I am also a Planning and Highways Solicitor and have often thought that there should be greater road safety measures implemented along this road.

It is clear that both junctions are very busy, and the Upper Drive junction is used predominantly by school children.

At the junction with the Drive, there are no pedestrian traffic signals. There is no time delay between the change of lights to allow school children or other pedestrians to cross safely.

At the junction with the Upper Drive, there is a crossing, however, there have been many incidents recently of cars speeding through this crossing to avoid the lights changing and actually driving through red lights, crashing into railings or narrowly avoiding pedestrians. My neighbour and her daughter were nearly killed at this crossing before Christmas, and my window cleaner was nearly run over by a speeding car last week. I myself was involved in a car collision in December caused by a speeding car that was overtaking a stationary line of traffic just before the crossing. She unfortunately lost control of her car and careered on to the pavement on the other side of the road just before the crossing, hitting a tree and just missing the bus shelter. This was at 8.45 am. Had it happened 5 minutes earlier, it may have affected school children.

The design of the Old Shoreham Road is, I consider, partly to blame. The carriageways are wide and they encourage overtaking. There are also bus stops immediately before the crossing on either side of the road and when buses stop, cars overtake at the crossing. In fact, the whole stretch of the Old

Shoreham Road just before the Upper Drive and up to The Drive is wide and motorists appear to treat it like a dual carriageway with the accompanying speeds.

There are no signs indicating that there are schools along this part of the Old Shoreham Road (the only signs being halfway up the Upper Drive). I find this quite shocking bearing in mind that there are 3 schools located at this junction (Cardinal Newman, Brighton & Hove High Junior School, and Cottesmore Primary School) with approximately 3000 children attending. There is also no speed camera, no traffic signal camera and no device which advises motorists to slow down. All of these are present on other roads in the City.

It is alarming that school children have to cross a busy road that is effectively being used as a dual carriageway.

I have spoken to many parents in the area, including parents at Somerhill Junior School for which I am a parent governor, and they too raise their concerns about this stretch of the Old Shoreham Road and the safety of their children attending the secondary schools. Many reported incidents of their children being very upset having been stuck in the middle of the roads whilst cars speed by, or having to throw themselves out of the way whilst crossing.

There are measures that can be taken. I have taken advice from a highways engineer who advises that the simplest measure would be to erect school signs just before the junction of the Upper Drive approaching south, east and west. Secondly, to prevent overtaking, and to slow the traffic down and prevent the Old Shoreham Road being treated like a dual carriageway, the carriageways could be physically narrowed, or if that is too expensive, hatching could be placed in the middle between the carriageways to prevent overtaking. Thirdly, a slow down device could be erected. Lastly, if this stretch of the Old Shoreham Road was reduced to a 20 mph zone, the traffic would slow down. As this road has a school crossing, that would be a good reason to make this part of the road 20 mph. If signs are too expensive, road markings could indicate this.

As parents, we like our children to attend their local schools and to be able to walk to school rather than be driven. However, we want them to be able to walk to school safely.

We need the crossing and the junction to be made safer by slowing down the traffic and making motorists aware that the crossing is a school crossing.

Therefore, I would ask the Council to support this Petition.

Signed: Paula Slinn

Date: 21 January 2010

**Response from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment, at Council on 28 January 2010.**

“Once again, can I congratulate you like your predecessor on putting the case very strongly and very well indeed.

As with the other junction, again I know it extremely well and what I will do is to arrange for an officer to come out and meet with you on the site and discuss some of these points, because it may be that one or two of them we would be able to do. You have already alluded to the fact that my Cabinet Member meeting is on 25 March and again there is a follow-up there, so no doubt we will meet again on 25 March. I hope in the meantime an officer will meet with you and have a discussion and take on board some of the points that you have made.”

**100(c) Deputation concerning the former Royal Alexander Hospital site  
Planning Brief - Mr Mike Hales (Spokesperson).**

See attached supporting information.

**100(d) Deputation concerning proposals for a loading bay in Portland Road,  
Hove – Mr Stephen Eyton (Spokesperson)**

I write in relation to the proposal to create a loading bay on the north side of Portland Road, between Shelley Road and Rutland Road.

The proposal to create this loading bay was put forward as the most appropriate delivery solution to support the opening of a Sainsbury’s Local store at 123-125 Portland Road. In reaching this conclusion detailed consideration was given to the available options.

We investigated the potential for using the existing service yard to the rear of the unit. However, the dimensions are such that the largest vehicle that could turn around within it would be a transit van or similar. The shortest delivery vehicle in our fleet is 10.7 metres in length and could only get into the service yard by reversing from Shelley Road, which is inappropriate from a safety perspective.

We also looked at whether it would be possible to deliver from the double yellow lines (DYL) protecting service yard entrance. However, they are 10 metres long and there are on-street parking bays on either side. Even if you assume that the parking bays are empty and you could get a delivery vehicle into position, it could not turn around within the carriageway of Shelley Road. This means that in getting to/from the DYL the delivery vehicle would have to travel along the length of Shelley Road and other residential streets.

For these reasons it was considered that the best strategy for deliveries would be to take them from the lay-by immediately outside the site on Portland Road, which currently provides parking for 5 or 6 cars. There is no restriction on loading from these bays and if they were empty we could take deliveries from this location.

However, the existing restriction on parking within the bays only applies between the hours of 09:00-20:00 Monday-Sunday. A survey of the usage of the parking bays was conducted between 07:00-10:00 on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> August 2009. The results showed that there was at least one car parked throughout the entire survey period, which corresponds broadly to the daily delivery window for a Sainsbury’s Local store. If one of our delivery vehicles arrived at

the site and could not get into the lay-by there is no realistic alternative location from which we could take deliveries.

This meant that we needed to pursue the creation of a loading bay to ensure we could deliver to a store in this location. We were conscious that it would result in the loss of up to 4 car parking spaces and, as such, undertook a survey to determine the existing demand for on-street parking in the vicinity of the site. The methodology and extent of the survey zone were agreed with Catherine Dignan of the Council's Parking Strategy Team. The streets covered included Shelley Road, Rutland Road, Portland Road, Rutland Gardens and Modena Road.

The number of cars parked on each of these streets was counted at 10:00, 12:00 and 14:00 on Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> July and 09:00, 11:00, 13:00, 15:00 and 17:00 on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2009. The results (see enclosure) showed that there was sufficient spare on-street capacity nearby to mitigate the loss of up to 4 parking spaces resulting from the introduction of a loading bay outside the site.

Therefore, upon consideration of the above, it is considered that there are no traffic or transport reasons why the proposed loading bay should not be approved.

Stephen Eyton  
Highways Executive  
Sainsbury's

*Submitted to the Environment cabinet, Brighton and Hove City Council : March 25th 2010*

## Planning brief for the Royal Alex site - A deputation by residents of the Alex Triangle

The Alex Triangle is the area of land within the Montpelier and Clifton Hill conservation area that is enclosed to the rear of properties on Dyke Road, Clifton Hill and Clifton Road. The Triangle includes the Royal Alexander hospital site at its southern apex. 2-300 residents have homes that look out into the Triangle. In December 2009, Triangle residents submitted comments during the Council's consultation on the Royal Alex Planning Brief (*Conservation and amenity inside the Alex Triangle - A submission by neighbouring residents on requirements for the planning brief for the Royal Alex site*, 15 December 2009).

In this deputation we summarise the four main issues highlighted in that submission and ask the Cabinet Member for Environment to describe how the Planning Brief addresses each of them.

### **Our question**

With regard to each of the four issues summarised below, we ask the Cabinet Member to describe:

- a) How the planning brief addresses this issue; and
- b) What force the brief has, to guarantee outcomes on this issue, not only at the present time but also with regard to development of the site in future years?

### **Four issues**

#### *1 An amenity issue - new development on the crown of Clifton Hill*

The sector enclosed by the north and west boundaries of the Alex site contains the highest point of Clifton Hill, and ground falls away steeply to the north and west. Any development in this sector of the site will potentially loom over all adjacent properties, since the fall of the land means that a three-storey building at Alex ground level is effectively five stories or more when viewed from the back doors and gardens of neighbouring properties in the Triangle. In our submission we suggested that height limits should be specified in the Planning Brief, that pitched - not flat - roofs should be specified, and that set-back of new buildings from the north and west boundaries should also be specified.

#### *2 A commercial viability issue - densities in the north-west sector of the site*

The area of the Alex site adjacent to the north and west boundaries contains no conservable buildings, and conservation of buildings in other parts of the site implies that, in order to achieve commercial viability, a developer will wish to achieve higher densities in this part of the site. In view of the issue of height and dominance over adjacent properties outlined in 1 above, we would like to know how the Brief deals with this pressure to stack units in the north-west sector of the site.

3 *A conservation issue - the character of this part of the Conservation Area as an open space*  
The Triangle is an unexpectedly large area of land behind the street frontages, with long sight lines and an open aspect punctuated only by mature trees; apart from trees, nothing rises higher than two storeys (plus roof) above Alex ground level. In our submission we argued that this quality of shared open space, opening out to the north and west, should be conserved and enhanced, as a valuable and beneficial characteristic of the environment, not only for the 2-300 current residents (including 100-or-so occupants of retirement flats) but also for occupants of 100-or-so future homes and users of other facilities (eg a GP surgery) that may be created by development on the Alex site.

4 *A second conservation issue - the architectural qualities of structures in different sectors of the redeveloped Alex site*

Within the Triangle, at the 'back' of the Alex site, the scales, rhythms and textures of structures are distinct from those at the 'front' of the site, especially on Dyke Road. The diversity and greater intimacy of rear extensions, flint walls, gardens and other small-scale features within the Triangle contrast with the grander proportions of Victorian buildings facing into Dyke Road, and constitute the charm of this particular kind of off-the-street townscape within the Conservation Area. In view of the nature of previous development proposals for the site, which applied a standard structural module and exterior style across the entire site regardless of these characteristic variations, our submission argued that the Brief should assert a '360-degree' view of the conservation of urban space, taking into account the differing rhythms, textures and scales of the Victorian environment in different sectors of the Alex site.

*March 15th 2010*

Members of the deputation, on behalf of Alex Triangle residents:

*Dr M Hales, 73 Homelees House, Dyke Road/Clifton Road, BN1 3JP*

*Mr M Smith, 33 Homelees House, BN1 3JP*

*Mr J Tyson, 3 Clifton Road, BN1 3HP*

*Mr T Cook, 18 Clifton Road, BN1 3HN*

*Ms S Kennedy, 19 Clifton Hill, BN1 3QH*

*Ms P Sankey, 20 Clifton Hill, BN1 3QH*



Tuesday 14th July

Location	Control	Available Space (m)	Capacity (spaces)	No of parked vehicles (Beat Beginning)				
				09:00	11:00	13:00	15:00	17:00
Shelley Road (W)	Residents	122	22	7	9	9	7	9
Shelley Road (E)	Res/P&D	126	23	8	11	10	10	12
Rutland Road (W)	Residents	132	24	15	17	17	12	14
Rutland Road (E)	Res/P&D	90	16	14	14	11	11	9
Portland Road (N)	Res/P&D	140	25	17	19	20	20	18
Portland Road (S)	Res/P&D	127	23	16	18	19	14	15
Rutland Gardens (W)	Residents	131	24	12	13	12	11	14
Rutland Gardens (E)	Res/P&D	122	22	22	16	15	14	16
Modena Road (W)	Residents	167	30	20	21	21	19	17
Modena Road (E)	Res/P&D	174	32	20	24	21	20	21
<b>Totals</b>			<b>242</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>145</b>
			<b>%</b>	<b>62.4%</b>	<b>66.9%</b>	<b>64.0%</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>59.9%</b>

Capacity calculated using length of bay divided by 5.5m (rounded) (excludes m/c and disbled spaces)

See survey map for particular road lengths included in the survey

<b>Loading Bay Location</b>	Res/P&D	31	6	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
			<b>%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>53.2%</b>

Capacity calculated using length of bay divided by 5.5m (rounded) (excludes m/c and disbled spaces)

See survey map for particular road lengths included in the survey



Saturday 11th July

Location	Control	Available Space (m)	Capacity (spaces)	No of parked vehicles (Beat Beginning)		
				10:00	12:00	14:00
Shelley Road (W)	Residents	122	22	14	12	15
Shelley Road (E)	Res/P&D	126	23	13	14	19
Rutland Road (W)	Residents	132	24	14	16	13
Rutland Road (E)	Res/P&D	90	16	14	14	13
Portland Road (N)	Res/P&D	140	25	20	19	21
Portland Road (S)	Res/P&D	127	23	19	19	20
Rutland Gardens (W)	Residents	131	24	17	19	18
Rutland Gardens (E)	Res/P&D	122	22	17	20	16
Modena Road (W)	Residents	167	30	16	16	15
Modena Road (E)	Res/P&D	174	32	19	19	18
<b>Totals</b>			<b>242</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>168</b>
			<b>%</b>	<b>67.4%</b>	<b>69.4%</b>	<b>69.4%</b>

Capacity calculated using length of bay divided by 5.5m (rounded) (excludes m/c and disabled spaces)

See survey map for particular road lengths included in the survey

<b>Loading Bay Location</b>	Res/P&D	31	6	4	5	6
			<b>%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Capacity calculated using length of bay divided by 5.5m (rounded) (excludes m/c and disabled spaces)

See survey map for particular road lengths included in the survey

