

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Various parking restrictions including verge parking ban.</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>27<sup>th</sup> June 2017</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.go.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>Patcham</b>		

**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 Patcham.
- 1.2 These requests have been investigated by officers and a number of proposals have been advertised on two proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 1.3 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders, which contain proposals for new double yellow lines, limited waiting and a verge parking restriction.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Committee (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:

Approve the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* and Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.\* 201

**3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 These Traffic Regulation Orders include;

- Proposed double yellow lines in 5 roads.
- Limited waiting by the parade of shops in Carden Avenue.
- A verge parking ban in a section of Carden Avenue.

There were 22 emails to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders supporting the restrictions in Eastfield Crescent, 1 support for the verge parking and 1 support for the double yellow lines in Carden Avenue. Overall 5 objections were received; 3 to the limited waiting in Carden Avenue, 1 to the double yellow lines in County Oak Avenue and 1 to the double yellow lines in Eastfield Crescent.

- 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 objections relate to a concern that introducing limited waiting at the shops it doesn't take into account the fact that residents live above the shops.
- 3.4 Having taken into account the objections it is recommended to proceed with the limited waiting as the shops requested this to allow for a turnover of customers. There is an opportunity for residents to park in the surrounding area and outside of the restrictions. There is off-street permit parking available to the rear of the properties for residents to park which is managed by the Housing Services.
- 3.5 The second objection outlined concerns about the loss of parking in County Oak Avenue particularly at school pick up and drop off times.
- 3.6 This objection has been considered but it is felt the double yellow lines are necessary to prevent cars parking and restricting the flow of traffic at the build outs in County Oak Ave.
- 3.7 The third objection relates to the restriction of the parking in Eastfield Crescent to one side only.
- 3.8 This objection has been considered but it is felt the placing of double yellow lines on one side only is the most suitable for emergency services and is supported by 22 residents.

#### **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 were advertised between the 17<sup>th</sup> February 2017 and 10<sup>th</sup> March 2017.
- 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 16<sup>th</sup> February 2017; 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 17<sup>th</sup> February 2017. 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.

- 5.4 The costs for this traffic order will be funded from the income received from any Penalty Charge Notices issued for illegal parking.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 It is proposed that the proposals are taken forward and the Officer recommendations agreed due to the reasons outlined in the report.

## **7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The cost of implementing new parking restrictions will be met from within the existing parking and transport revenue budgets. Ongoing costs associated with the scheme will also be met from future existing budgets.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Rob Allen*

*Date: 22/05/17*

### Legal Implications:

- 7.2 The Council's powers and duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Road Traffic Act 1984 must be exercised to ensure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic.
- 7.3 The recommendations contained in this report demonstrate that the Council is exercising its powers in order to comply with its statutory duties
- 7.4 Before making Traffic Orders the Council must consider all duly made unwithdrawn objections. The Council can decide to make a Traffic Order unchanged, to make it with modifications or not to proceed with it. Proposed orders can usually be modified provided any amendments do not increase the effects of the advertised order.

*Lawyer Consulted: Stephanie Stammers*

*Date: 26/05/17*

### Equalities Implications:

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

### Sustainability Implications:

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

### Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.7 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**

1. None

### **Background Documents**

1. None