

# ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

## Agenda Item 109

Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Various changes to Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) Order and areas outside of CPZ</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>25 March 2010</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Director of Environment</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel:</b> 29-3329
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>No</b>		
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Parking Strategy Team receives a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zones and outside the Controlled Parking Zones. These requests are most often from residents, but can also be from businesses, local members, or other teams within the Council such as Road Safety.
- 1.2 After investigation, if it is decided that the request is justified then it is advertised on a Traffic Order. These amendments often help to improve sustainable transport, for example by providing additional motorcycle bays or can improve accessibility for disabled people by providing disabled parking bays.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That, having taken into account all of the duly made representations and objections, the Cabinet Member approves the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\* 200\* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.\* 200\* with the following amendments:
  - (a) The proposed removal of disabled parking bays in Godwin Road and Hollingdean Terrace, are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are still required by local residents.
  - (b) The proposed double yellow lines in Woodland Avenue are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in the report.
  - (c) The proposed double yellow lines in Court Farm Road are to be changed to single yellow lines from the shops northwards to the double yellow lines at the traffic lights due to reasons outlined in the report
  - (d) The proposed removal of limited waiting bays in Old London Road (Patcham) are to be removed from the traffic order due to the reasons outlined in the report.

- (e) The proposed loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R) is to be deferred in accordance with Paragraph 3.11.

### **3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**

3.1 This Combined Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 150 roads city wide. A number of objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders. The objections are summarised and explained in detail in Appendix A and plans showing the proposals, which have had comments/objections are shown in Appendix B. In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:

- (a) Meadow Parade (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed double yellow lines
- (b) Woodland Avenue (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (c) Old London Road (Patcham) – proposed removal of limited waiting bays
- (d) The Droveaway (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (e) Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road (Woodingdean) – proposed double yellow lines
- (f) Windmill Street (Queens Park) – new motorcycle bay
- (g) Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R) – proposed loading bay
- (h) Withdean Road (Withdean) – proposed double yellow lines
- (i) Court Farm Road (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (j) Court Farm Road/Nevill Road Triangular Island (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (k) Richmond Parade (Queens Park) – proposed limited waiting
- (l) The Rise (North Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
- (m) Mile Oak Road (North Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
- (n) Woodruff Avenue (Hove Park) – proposed double yellow lines
- (o) St Luke’s Terrace (Controlled Parking Zone U) – new motorcycle bay
- (p) Rose Hill Terrace (Controlled Parking Zone Y) – new motorcycle bay
- (q) Bankside (Withdean) – proposed double yellow lines
- (r) Auckland Drive – relocation of disabled parking bay

3.2 Letters of support were received to the following proposals:

- (a) Surrenden (Preston Park – proposed double yellow lines),
- (b) Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road (Woodingdean – proposed double yellow lines),
- (c) Franklin Road (Hanover & Elm Grove – proposed double yellow lines),
- (d) Court Farm Road (Hove Park – proposed double yellow lines),
- (e) Nevill Avenue (Hove Park – proposed double yellow lines),
- (f) Union Road (Controlled Parking Zone Y – proposed doctors bays),
- (g) Osborne Road (Preson Park – new motorcycle bay),
- (h) Portland Road/Westbourne Gardens (Controlled Parking Zone R – proposed loading ban),
- (i) Dyke Road (Hove Park – proposed double yellow lines),
- (j) Laburnum Avenue (Hangleton & Knoll – proposed double yellow lines),
- (k) Tivoli Crescent/Tivoli Crescent North (Withdean – proposed double yellow lines),
- (l) Withdean Road (Withdean – proposed double yellow lines),
- (m) Thornhill Rise (North Portslade – proposed reduction of double yellow lines),

- (n) Nevill Way (Hove Park – proposed single yellow line), St Luke’s Terrace (Controlled Parking Zone U – new motorcycle bay),
  - (o) London Road Service Road by Curwen Place (Withdean – proposed double yellow lines).
- 3.3 There have been 10 objections to the proposed no waiting at any time in Woodland Avenue, Brighton. The majority of the objections are from residents who feel that that the speed of vehicles will increase on the approach to the junction with Goldstone Crescent. It is also felt that the proposal will mean increased danger for pedestrians and all road users due to the increased speed of vehicles.
- 3.4 Therefore, due to the amount of objections it is proposed that the double yellow lines on Woodland Avenue will not proceed at present but we will continue to monitor this stretch of road.
- 3.5 There have been 6 objections to the proposed no waiting at any time in Court Farm Road and a petition to change the proposal to single yellow lines has also recently been handed into the Council after the consultation period. Again the majority of the objections are from residents who feel that the proposed double yellow lines should be a single yellow line (Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm) as the problems in Court Farm Road are at school drop off and collection times.
- 3.6 The Bus Company supports the proposal as the parking currently allowed does cause bottlenecks and delays to buses, especially but not exclusively as school times.
- 3.7 Officers have considered the issues and are recommending that the double yellow lines from the shops up to the double yellow lines by the traffic lights in Court Farm Road change to a single yellow line Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm as the problems are due to the issues during the school drop off and collection times. However the proposed double yellow lines around the triangular area in Court Farm Road / Nevill Road will remain due to safety reasons.
- 3.8 There have been two objections to the proposed removal of limited waiting bays in Old London Road (Patcham). The objections are from residents concerning the loss of short use parking for the shops. The garage owner who made the original request now also has concerns about the removal of parking.
- 3.9 Therefore, due to the objections it is proposed that the removal of the limited waiting bays in Old London Road (Patcham) will not proceed at present but this can be re-considered if we receive further correspondence regarding this issue.
- 3.10 There have been three objections to the proposed loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R). The objections are from residents and from the two Ward Councillors who are concerned about the loss of parking and enforcement issues regarding this proposal.
- 3.11 Therefore, due to the objections received to the perceived need for a loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R) it is proposed this is deferred to a future meeting. This meeting would consider the objections received and the results of the discussions with Ward Councillors and local residents to consider the best way forward.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 5 December 2009 and 31 December 2009.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 4.3 Notices were also put on street for the 5 December 2009, 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 Argus newspaper on the 5 December 2009. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library and at the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

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

##### Financial implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the order and having the lining and signing amended will be covered from the existing traffic revenue budget.

*Finance officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw Date: 05/02/10*

##### Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The traffic orders have been advertised according to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. As there are unresolved objections and representations they are now referred to this meeting for resolution. There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention.

*Lawyer consulted: Stephen Dryden Date: 05/02/10*

##### Equalities Implications:

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

##### Sustainability Implications:

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

##### Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 The proposed amendments to restrictions will not have any implication on the prevention of crime and disorder.

##### Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 Any risks will be monitored as part of the overall project management, but none have been identified.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 The legal disabled bays will provide parking for the holders of blue badges wanting to use the local facilities.

**6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 6.1 For the majority of the proposals the only alternative option is doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined in Appendix A and within the report.
- 6.2 For the proposals outlined as being removed from the order in the recommendations the only alternative option is taking these forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are not taken forward for the reasons outlined in the recommendations.

**7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 To seek approval of the Traffic Order with amendments after taking into consideration of the duly made representations and objections.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

- 1. Appendix A – summary of representations received
- 2. Appendix B - Plans showing the proposals

**Documents in Members' Rooms**

None

**Background Documents**

None

