

APPENDIX A - Summary of representations received

Citywide Traffic Regulation order

Who	Road / Ward	Object / Support	Contents	Comments/Recommendations
Resident	Springfield Road – Controlled Parking Zone J	Objection	<u>Relocation of Motorcycle Parking Place in Springfield Road</u> – Objects to relocation due to the slight bend in the road and the speed of some drivers using this one-way stretch of Springfield Road. At the existing site, there is clear visibility up the road for both the motorcycles parking and re-joining the carriageway and the drivers of vehicles coming down the road. Alternatives area available rather than this proposal.	<u>Relocation of Motorcycle Parking Place</u> – This was requested by a couple of residents who use the motorcycle bay and have had their vehicles damaged from driver’s exiting and entering Wellend Villas. The relocation would reduce the frequency of accidents and damage to vehicles.
Resident	Medina Place – Controlled Parking Zone N	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Permit Parking Place in Medina Place</u> - Objects as it is not necessary to remove the whole of the bay as reducing in size which would not block the entrance. There are only 3 spaces for approximately 20 houses; to remove this space would cause difficulties for the residents of this street.	<u>Removal of Permit Parking Place</u> – This was requested by a resident whose entrance to their property was blocked by vehicles parked in this space. However we have decided to shorten the bay by 1.3 metres rather than removing an entire parking space.
Resident	Medina Place – Controlled Parking Zone N	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Permit Parking Place in Medina Place</u> - Objects to this parking bay being removed. Residents on the road need these bays for parking and this bay could be reduced which would solve the issue.	<u>Removal of Permit Parking Place</u> – As Above

Resident	Regency Square & St Margaret's Place - Controlled Parking Zone Z	Support	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places & Proposed Motorcycle Parking Places in Regency Square and Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret's Place</u> – Supports the proposal to remove the parking . This will facilitate movement around the square when there are cars queuing to enter the Regency Square car park. Several residents and businesses have been inconvenienced at weekends and during hot days as they have been unable to access their premises via the western carriageway. Also supports the creation of on-street motorcycle bays as a move toward preventing motorcycles parking on public gardens of Regency Square. Support the removal of the loading bay as it is unacceptable to have a loading bay situated immediately outside a loading bay area.</p>	
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places & Proposed Motorcycle Parking Places in Regency Square</u> - Objects to the proposal for removing the parking. The traffic hold-up caused by vehicles waiting to enter the underground car park is a relatively very rare occurrence and the scheme to remove parking entirely will place an unduly heavy burden on us residents. There will be undue pressure on residents for parking spaces which are already at a tight premium.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking & Proposed New Motorcycle bays</u> – The removal of Shared Parking and the new Motorcycle bays were requested by the Regency Square Area Society to remove parking from the west side (nearest the gardens) to improve traffic flow round the square. However, if we remove all the parking on the west side of the Square then</p>

			<p>Making it even easier for cars to queue for the underground car-park will, in addition, further increase the noise and pollution in the Square at the cost. Do not object to the addition of two relatively small places for motorcycle parking. However, would strongly suggest that illegal parking be pursued and prohibited on the Square itself in the vicinity of the War Memorial.</p>	<p>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. The provision of motorcycle bays would stop motorbikes parking on the hard standing in the lower gardens near to the war memorial.</p>
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places & Proposed Motorcycle Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the removal of residents spaces in Regency Square. The parking here is a problem already and there is a car park available in the square. The reason to remove parking is to ease pressure on the car park is which not a problem at all. Also the proposal to remove the motorcyclist from the gardens and installation of motorcycle bays is a problem as a bay is directly opposite a residential block, This is a disaster as it is bad enough as the noise they make early in the morning at the weekends is horrendous.The</p>	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking & Proposed New Motorcycle bays –</u> As above.</p>

			motorcyclist don't just park and then walk away like car users. They sit chatting and revving their engines for ages and ages. Why not put them on the other side of the square outside the restaurants where they will not disturb the residents. Motorcycles and residents do not mix and should not even be put in residential areas.	
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. There is great pressure on parking in the square so cannot afford to lose these spaces. To remove these spaces for a very occasional traffic queue is not necessary.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal as it will make parking even more difficult for residents than it currently is, every day of the year. The purpose of the proposed change is to reduce the very infrequent queues, on the occasional summer weekend, on the west side of Regency Square when the Regency Square car park is full. Such queues to access the car-park are an occasional irritation, but are very rare indeed.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> –As Above.

Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects as this proposal removes far too many residents parking spaces from Regency Square. This will only give a temporary buffer for the queues that occur during the summer month weekends. Where residents will be suffering parking issues everyday all year. Suggest patrols at weekends so that drivers obey the do not queue sign or better yet an electronic sign to say what the waiting time is to stop drivers blocking the road.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on Residents Parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to permanently removing resident permit/parking bays along the western side of Regency Square which is both unfair to permit holders in the area, unnecessary and actually increases the potential for traffic gridlock.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> –As Above.

Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> –As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.

Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove the shared parking bays on the west side of the square. The removal of the parking spaces for resident is unjustified for the infrequent occasions when a queue develops for the car park. Removal of the car parking bays, without replacement parking bays elsewhere, will detrimentally affect the residents of the square.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.

Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that on rare occasions, Bank Holidays and some summer weekends when the Regency Square car park is full there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on Residents Parking in the square and for those living nearby. To remove 13	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places</u> – As Above.

			spaces for a very occasional traffic queue which only lasts from probably 1 to 3pm when the car park is full is not necessary.	
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<u>Proposed Removal of Shared Parking Places in Regency Square</u> – Objects to the proposal to remove parking bays on the west side of Regency Square without replacing them. The reason for this is that there are only rare occasions when the Regency Square car park is full and there is a queue down the east side of Regency Square. There is great pressure on parking in the square and for those living nearby.	<u>Removal of Shared Parking Places – As Above</u>
Resident	Regency Square – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Support	<u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret’s Place</u> – Supports the proposal to remove the loading bay as its current use increases the risk to pedestrians by restricting and sometimes blocking the pavement causing them to use the road. This is hazardous, particularly, for wheelchair users and parents with children in push chairs and also sometimes abused as overnight parking of trucks and vans takes place.	<u>Removal of Loading Bay</u>
Resident	St Margaret’s Place – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Support	<u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret’s Place</u> – Supports the proposal to remove the loading bay as the retention of the bay encourages cars and trucks to park (no loading taking place) for extended periods and sometimes overnight.	<u>Removal of Loading Bay</u>

			<p>The bay has encouraged bad parking behaviour infringing on residents need for peace and quiet. The bay has compromised access to St. Margarets Place for emergency vehicles. Frequent parking (not unloading) within and outside the bay severely restricts the road width.</p>	
Residents	St Margaret's Place – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Support (Petition 4 signatures)	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret's Place</u> – Residents in support to removal of loading bay : as outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Loading bay is not being used in the way it is intended. Simply by expanding activities into the street. 2) The loading bay has made the problem of rogue parking and unloading worse. 3) The loading bay abused has caused stress to residents wishing to enjoy peaceful occupation of their homes. 4) The residents would like to see a loading ban on the whole street. 5) Loading bay causes difficulties for pedestrians and residents restricting safe passage around vehicles parked in an inappropriate way. 6) Emergency vehicles access is compromised by hazardous parking in the street. 7) Trucks up to 44 Tonnes are unsuitable in these circumstances. 8) Damage to buildings has occurred in the past. 	<u>Removal of Loading Bay</u>

			<p>9) Vehicle use in St Margaret's Place is out of character for the area.</p> <p>10) Fun fair equipment disrupts life in the street with its size, noise and pollution and should be banned.</p>	
Councillor	St Margaret's Place – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Support	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret's Place</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it causes noise and smoke pollution for residents opposite • it blocks the hotel's own loading area, resulting in hotel lorries queuing up in the street • if impedes access for emergency vehicles • there is a perfectly adequate loading area further up the street towards Sussex Heights • the residents have had to put up with a lot from the various activities of the hotel's conferencing business (not the hotel's fault necessarily - I know they go to great lengths to reduce impact on residents but inevitably there are still adverse impacts) and this would be a positive step towards a more sustainable equilibrium where residents and the hotel can co-exist peacefully. 	<u>Removal of Loading Bay</u>

Resident	St Margaret's Place – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret's Place</u> – Objects to the removal of the loading bay as vehicles will still park on the double-yellow, including local residents loading/unloading their own vehicles, and that's already the case despite the Loading bay, some residents of St Margaret's Place park on double-yellow on their side of the street. Keep the bay as it is also useful to local residents.</p>	<p><u>Removal of Loading Bay</u> - This removal was requested by a local resident as the loading bay was being misused by nearby business and vehicles who are parking in the bay overnight.</p>
Business	St Margaret's Place – Controlled Parking Zone Z	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Removal of Loading Bay in St Margaret's Place</u> – Object to the removal of the 2 loading bays in St Margaret's place which are used by Sussex heights and the business and the loss of both would hinder both properties greatly. To lose this loading bay directly outside of the loading area would be a massive financial lost to the business as well as any potential business they could bring to Brighton and this loading in and out is a selling point for any major conference wishing to be based at Brighton. There are already bookings in the system for the remaining of 2016 running through to 2018 where the loss of the loading bays would mean a loss of revenue for the business and would dent reputation in being able to deliver promises. Bookings would have to be cancelled and refund any money already taken and in some cases possibly pay out any compensation due to the</p>	<p><u>Removal of Loading Bay</u> - This removal was requested by a local resident as the loading bay was being misused by nearby business and vehicles who are parking in the bay overnight.</p>

			<p>inconvenience and time spent looking for another venue. Have reviewed with Brighton & Hove City Council (Environmental Health and Planning Enforcement) the code of conduct already agreed and with exemption of an event in Oct 2015 have always stuck to the agreed terms. The business has put in a lot of time and money to try to resolve any issues and happy to work with Council and residents to ensure a smooth operation during these times and no disturbance to be caused.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Who	Road / Ward	Object / Support	Contents	Comments/Recommendations
Resident	Lyminster Avenue - Patcham	Objection	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Lyminster Avenue</u> - Objects to the double yellow lines outside their property as use the garage for work purposes on a daily basis, the double yellow lines will restrict access to garage and driveway. Could the Council at least consider just suspending parking for the day of the week collection is required. It is unfair and disproportionate that parking outside the property all week and access to garage for the sake of one quick visit each week, that City clean are currently already able to do.	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines</u> – These were requested by Cityclean due to obstruction of parked vehicles and refuse vehicles being unable to access properties to collect refuse. However, through discussions with City clean 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 rear of properties.
Resident	Lyminster Avenue - Patcham	Objection	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Lyminster Avenue</u> – Objects to this proposal as there has never been an access problem for HGV,s servicing the new development who are entitled to use the private access road in question. All HGV's using this private access road, including refuse collection vehicles, have always backed down it from the northern side of its junction with Lyminster Avenue and then turned left, (north), when exiting the junction. The access problem has therefore clearly been caused by the new development. To conclude, the double yellow lines herein referred to need to be placed north of the	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines</u> – As Above.

			northern kerb-line of the private access road and not south of its southern kerb-line, as the Council propose.	
Resident	Overdown Rise - North Portslade	Objection	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Overdown Rise</u> – Objects to the proposal although appreciate why the double yellow lines are being placed there, and do not disagree with the entire plan. The double yellow lines on the left hand side of the road (on the southern side on the bend) are perfect. That corner is dangerous, as you could not get an ambulance down our street when cars are parked there. However, do not agree with the double yellow lines proposed on northern side as there is never anywhere to park on this street as it is. Those yellow lines will take away a lot of parking space. Many of the residents on the street have driveways, and more than one car but do not use their driveways. The issue of where to park on the road is becoming ever more distressing, and the placement of these yellow lines is making it worse.	<u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines</u> – These were request by City clean due to obstruction of parked vehicles and refuse vehicles being unable to access properties to collect refuse.
Resident	Mile Oak Road – North Portslade	Objection	<u>Proposed extension to Double Yellow Lines in Mile Oak Road</u> – Objects to the proposal as it is already a complete nightmare to park. The extension of the double yellow lines would make getting to a car even more difficult and would be more dangerous than getting to a car now.	<u>Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines</u> – This was requested by Ward Councillors as they have received complaints about Mile Oak Rd 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

Resident	Mile Oak Road – North Portslade	Objection	<u>Proposed extension to Double Yellow Lines in Mile Oak Road</u> – Objects to the proposal as have never witnessed a collision on this part of Mile Oak road in the last 6 years. Extending the double yellow lines will not solve this problem, it will just force residents to park their cars further up the hill. This will not help drivers to see up the road any better. It will only bring them closer to the brow of the hill, giving oncoming traffic less time to see them and react.	<u>Proposed Extension to Double Yellow Lines</u> – As Above
----------	---------------------------------	-----------	---	---

Manor Hill Traffic Regulation Order proposal

Who	Road / Ward	Object / Support	Contents	Comments/Recommendations
------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------

Resident	Manor Hill – East Brighton	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Manor Road</u> - Objects to this proposal as it is actually somewhat of a race track at quiet times such as overnight. This is disruptive enough as it is and certainly shouldn't be made easier. Removing parking spots only to add artificial traffic calming measures, may as well just leave the parking there. It's difficult enough around here.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines –</u> These were 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 here 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 out of the area. Ensuring the expedient 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.</p>
Resident	Manor Hill – East Brighton	Objection	<p><u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Manor Road</u> – Objects to this proposal as clear highway will encourage drivers</p>	<p>Proposed Double Yellow Lines – As above.</p>

			<p>to speed very fast up Manor Hill faster than 30 mph which could result in a serious road traffic accident. Cars are speeding at various times in day and at night already. Speed humps should be put in Manor Hill to stop speeding cars etc. The islands in middle of road don't work. The single yellow line at top of Manor Hill should be removed if double yellow lines are opposite to allow cars to park on one side of Manor Hill. Staggered parking is good and forces cars not to speed approaching the residential area. People walk their dogs at top of Manor Hill and hospital staff need to park around here as there are limited spaces and many people on cannot afford permits so need as many parking spaces as possible to park in Manor Hill as well as visitors & tradesman.</p>	
Business	Manor Hill – East Brighton	Support	<p><u>Proposed Double Yellow Lines in Manor Road –</u> Supports this proposal as at present parked vehicles make it extremely difficult for buses on route 21 to pass along this road, causing delays to passengers both in this area and in other parts of the city. Delays have happened on 14 occasions this year in Manor Hill when buses have been stuck for more than 20 minutes. This proposal will improve bus reliability.</p>	