

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Various Traffic Regulation orders</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>11<sup>th</sup> October 2016</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director – Economy, Environment &amp; Culture</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3329</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>Brunswick &amp; Adelaide, Central Hove, East Brighton, Goldsmid, Hollingdean &amp; Stanmer, North Portslade, Patcham, Preston Park, Regency. Rottingdean Coastal, St Peter's &amp; North Laine &amp; Wish</b>		

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

- 1.1 The Parking Infrastructure Team receive a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zones. These requests are most often from residents, but can also be from businesses, local members, or other services within the Council. After investigation, if it is decided that the request is justified then it is advertised within a Traffic Regulation Order.
- 1.2 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals for overall 35 roads alongside two Traffic Regulation Orders relating to new restrictions.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:****Citywide Order**

- 2.1 That the Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:
- a) Approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* with the following amendments:
- The proposed removal of the permit parking bay in Medina Place, is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.7.
  - The proposed removal of the shared parking bays in Regency Square, is not to be taken forward on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.8.
  - The proposed removal of the loading bay in St Margaret's Place, is not to be taken forward on this Traffic Order and put on hold due to the reasons outlined in section 3.10.

### **Cityclean Order**

2.2 That the Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:

a) Approve the Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. \* 201\* with the following amendments:

- The proposed double yellow lines on the east side of Lyminster Avenue, is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11

### **Manor Hill Order**

2.3 That the Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:

- Approve the Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment Order No.\* 201\*.

## **3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

3.1 Three Traffic Regulation orders have been advertised recently which have received objections. The comments, support and objections are summarised and explained in detail in Appendix A and plans showing the proposals which have received comments or objections are shown in Appendix B. A summary of proposals are detailed in Appendix C.

### **Citywide Order**

3.2 This Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions to over 35 roads citywide. A number of objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

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

- a) Medina Place (Central Hove – Controlled Parking Zone N) – Proposed removal of permit parking place.
- b) Regency Square (Regency – Controlled Parking Zone Z) – Proposed removal of shared parking places
- c) St Margaret's Place (Regency – Controlled Parking Zone Z) – Proposed removal of Loading Bay
- d) Regency Square (Regency – Controlled Parking Zone Z) - Proposed Motorcycle bays

### **Cityclean Order**

- 3.4 This Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions to over 10 roads citywide following requests from CityClean due to difficulties with parked vehicles obstructing CityClean vehicles. A number of objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.
- 3.5 In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:
- a) Lyminster Avenue (Patcham) – Proposed double yellow lines.
  - b) Overdown Rise (North Portslade) – Proposed double yellow lines
  - c) Mile Oak Road (North Portslade) – Proposed double yellow lines

### **Manor Hill Order**

- 3.6 This Traffic Order proposes double yellow line restrictions to Manor Hill to prevent frequent incidents of inconsiderate parking that has prevented bus operators from being able to offer a reliable service. Two objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

### ***Summary of Objections***

#### **Citywide Order**

- 3.7 **Medina Place** – There have been 2 objections to the proposed removal of a permit parking place. This was requested by a resident as they were having difficulties entering and exiting their property and the proposal would prevent vehicles parking in front of this entrance. However, during the consultation a couple of residents outlined that we should shorten the bay instead of removing a valuable parking space as there are only a few parking bays in this road, which is inadequate for the amount of residential properties. Therefore, as an amendment we are recommending to reduce the size of the parking place by only 1.3 metres which should reduce the difficulties.
- 3.8 **Regency Square ( Parking Bays)** – There have been 13 objections and 1 item of support to this proposal. This was requested by the Regency Square Area Society who requested parking be removed from the west side of the square (nearest the gardens) to improve traffic flow round the square. It was outlined this would reduce congestion when traffic is queuing to get into the car park. However, if we remove all the parking on the west side of the Square then potentially the double yellow lines may be used by blue badge holders up to three hours and, therefore, could still cause an obstruction with queuing traffic from the car park. The objections received from a number of residents have also outlined their concern regarding the loss of parking in a high demand area so it proposed to remove this proposal and keep the current situation. Further discussion will take place on any other options available.
- 3.9 **Regency Square (Motorcycle Bays)** – There has been 1 objection and 2 items of support. This was requested by the Regency Square Area Society to provide

motorcycle parking bays as currently motorcycles are being parked in the gardens near the war memorial. Therefore, due to this need in the area we are recommending to proceed with this proposal.

- 3.10 **St Margaret's Place** – There have been 2 objections, 2 items of support and a petition of support with 4 signatures to the proposed removal of the loading bay. This was requested by a resident outlining that the loading bay was being misused by a nearby business and vehicles were parking in the bay overnight. This is a difficult issue and we have also recently received a letter from the caretaker of Sussex Heights on behalf of residents requesting that the loading bay remain. It is proposed, therefore, that we put a hold on this proposal and consult residents in the area through a leaflet drop including Sussex Heights to get their views on this proposal.

### **Cityclean Order**

- 3.11 **Lyminster Avenue** – There have been 2 objections to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by CityClean due to obstruction by parked vehicles with vehicles being unable to access properties to collect refuse. However, following discussions with CityClean and the resident it was agreed to change the double yellow lines on the east side to single yellow lines (Monday to Friday 9am to 12pm) and the double yellow lines to remain as proposed on the west side by the access road to the rear of properties. Therefore, it is recommended to proceed with single yellow lines on the east side and double yellow lines on the west side of the road.
- 3.12 **Overdown Rise** – There has been 1 objection to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by CityClean due to obstruction by parked vehicles and vehicles being unable to access properties to collect refuse. Therefore, it is recommended to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.13 **Mile Oak Road** – There have been 2 objections to the proposed extension of double yellow lines. This was requested by Ward Councillors as they have received complaints about Mile Oak Road at the junction of Chalky Road and how dangerous it is due to a number of vans parked directly by this junction which causes visibility issues. Therefore, it is recommended to proceed with this proposal.

### **Manor Hill Order**

- 3.14 There have been 2 objections to the proposed double yellow lines. This was requested by the Brighton & Hove Bus Company as Manor Hill is an important bus route in the city and the inconsiderate parking that has occurred in this location has prevented local bus providers from being able to offer a reliable service on many occasions. Buses have become stuck for some time, unable to squeeze between parked vehicles and traffic islands put in for traffic calming / road safety measures. There have been instances of two buses meeting each other with one having to be reversed.
- 3.15 Ensuring the expeditious movement of traffic on the road network is a duty placed upon the Authority and the Traffic Manager by the Traffic Management Act 2004, therefore, appropriate efforts to ensure the movement of buses on this

network through the placement of double yellow lines is a reasonable and necessary action. Therefore, it is recommended to proceed with this proposal

#### **4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 4.1 The main alternative option is doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward or going ahead with a proposal where it has been recommended not to proceed.
- 4.2 However, it is the recommendation of officers that the recommended proposals are agreed for the reasons outlined within the report.

#### **5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Detailed plans and all the orders were available on the Council website and could be viewed using the public computers at Customer Service Centres at Bartholomew House, Bartholomew Square, Brighton and Hove Town Hall, Ground Floor, Norton Road, Hove.
- 5.2 The Ward Councillors for each area were consulted for all three Traffic Regulation orders, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.

##### **Citywide Order**

- 5.3 The Citywide Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 and 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2016.
- 5.4 Notices were also put on street for the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016; 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 Brighton Independent newspaper on the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016.

##### **Cityclean Order**

- 5.5 The CityClean Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016 and 15<sup>th</sup> July 2016
- 5.6 Notices were also put on street for the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016; these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reason for it. The notice was also published in The Brighton Independent newspaper on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2016.

##### **Manor Hill Order**

- 5.7 The Manor Hill Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016
- 5.8 Notices were put on street for the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2016; these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reason for it. The notice was published in The Brighton Independent newspaper on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2016.

## 6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 It is proposed that the recommendations are agreed due to the detailed reasons outlined in the report.

## 7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The costs associated to the report recommendations will be funded from the existing Parking Infrastructure revenue budget within the Transport service.
- 7.2 Any potential impact on parking income associated with the recommendations will have financial implications on the existing Parking revenue budget within the Transport service. It is difficult to estimate the potential impact on parking income as it is unknown whether vehicles will be displaced elsewhere or be discouraged from parking. It is estimated that the impact on parking income would be immaterial and therefore not require any amendments to current budgeted assumptions; however, this will be reviewed as part the Targeted Budget Monitoring process.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford*

*Date: 13/09/16*

### Legal Implications:

- 7.3 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on local traffic authorities to manage the road network with a view to securing, as far as reasonably practicable, the expeditious movement of traffic.
- 7.4 The action which a traffic authority may take in performing this duty include any action which they consider will contribute to securing a more efficient use of their road network or the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on their road network.

The recommendations detailed in this report will assist in demonstrating that the Council is complying with its statutory duty

*Lawyer Consulted: Stephanie Stammers*

*Date: 14/09/16*

### Equalities Implications:

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

### Sustainability Implications:

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

### Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.7 No other significant implications identified.

## **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.

