

Subject:	Parking proposals within the event day (Community Stadium) parking schemes		
Date of Meeting:	14th March 2017		
Report of:	Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	Email:	Charles.field@brighton-hove.go.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Hollingdean & Stanmer and Moulsecoomb		

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

- 1.1 The Parking Infrastructure Team has received a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions within the event day parking schemes associated with the Community Stadium.
- 1.2 These requests have been investigated by officers and a number of proposals have been advertised on a Traffic Regulation Order funded by the football club.
- 1.3 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals for 5 roads within the event day parking schemes associated with the Community Stadium.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee (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:
 - b) That the proposed double yellow lines in Ashurst Road be amended on this Traffic Regulation Order due to the concerns outlined in para 3.3

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 This Traffic Regulation Order includes proposed restrictions to 5 roads. Overall two objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order which are both in connection with double yellow lines proposed in Ashurst Road.
- 3.2 The comments, support and objections are summarised and explained in detail in Appendix A and plans showing the proposals are shown in Appendix B. A summary of the proposals to put forward are detailed in Appendix C.

- 3.3 The first objection relates to a concern that by stopping the double yellow lines at No.78 this would encourage vehicles to park nearer a driveway. This would make it difficult for residents to exit their driveways without being obstructed by parked vehicles.
- 3.4 Having taken into account this objection it is recommended to reduce the double yellow lines by 2 metres to the eastern boundary of property No.78 Ashurst Road to allow more space for the vehicle to park away from nearby driveways.
- 3.5 The second objection outlined concerns about the loss of parking in a layby due to proposed double yellow lines.
- 3.6 This objection has been considered but it is felt the double yellow lines are required as this lay-by can be used as a passing point. There is also a dropped crossing to a residential property in the middle of this lay-by and the yellow lines would stop vehicles obstructing or over-hanging the access.

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.
- 4.2 However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 2nd December 2016 and 23rd December 2016.
- 5.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.3 Notices were also put on street for the 5th December 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 2nd December 2016. Detailed plans and the order 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.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 It is proposed that the proposals are taken forward and the Officer recommendations agreed.
- 6.2 This includes reducing the double yellow lines by 2 metres to the eastern boundary of property No.78 Ashurst Road.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The cost of advertising the Traffic Regulation Order has been funded by the football club. Any further costs associated with implementing the report recommendations will be met from existing Parking Infrastructure revenue budgets within the Transport department. Parking income will be unaffected by the proposals.

Finance Officer Consulted: Gemma Jackson

Date: 10/02/17

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 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. 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.
- 7.3 The recommendations detailed in this report will help to demonstrate that the Council is complying with its statutory duty

Lawyer Consulted: Stephanie Stammers

Date: 14/02/2017

Equalities Implications:

- 7.4 There are no equalities implications that officers are aware of.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.5 There are no sustainability implications that officers are aware of.

Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.6 There are no other significant implications that officers are aware of.

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

None

Background Documents

None