

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 108

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Hanover & Elm Grove Resident Parking Review Community Consultation		
Date of Meeting:	25 March 2010		
Report of:	Director of Environment		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Owen McElroy	Tel: 29-3329
	E-mail:	owen.mcelroy@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	No		
Wards Affected:	East Brighton; Hanover & Elm Grove; Queen's Park		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the community consultation regarding the review of residents parking in the currently unrestricted Hanover & Elm Grove area. This consultation has taken place following requests from both car owning and non car owning residents, and ward councillors
- 1.2 This report also describes the associated reviews of the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queen's Park) controlled parking schemes. Reviews of these areas have also followed requests from both car owning and non car owning residents, and ward councillors.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member agrees for the Hanover & Elm Grove Resident Parking Review to be progressed to the informal consultation stage consisting of a questionnaire and outline parking scheme map sent to all residents and businesses in the affected areas not currently subject to a controlled parking zone.
- 2.2 That a letter and questionnaire be sent to all residents and businesses in the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queens Park) schemes asking for their views on the current operation of those schemes including the times and days of operation.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 A timetable for consulting on Residents Parking Schemes across the City was agreed by Environment Committee in January 2008.

- 3.2 The Hanover & Elm Grove area was included due to representations received on a regular basis from ward councillors and residents regarding the need for parking controls. This area is bounded on three sides by existing parking schemes and is close to the City Centre and major employers. The housing is mainly of narrow terraced properties with no off street parking.
- 3.3 The City Council commissioned parking surveys in Hanover & Elm Grove and existing Area U in order to understanding parking characteristics and demand and to inform the development of parking solutions to meet local parking needs. These took place in June & July 2009.
- 3.4 For the purposes of the parking surveys the data was sub divided into three regions of demand (see Appendix B Brighton Residents Parking Zone Development Hanover & elm Grove Area Survey plan) ;

- north of Elm Grove Region 1
- south of Elm Grove and west of Queen's Park Road Region 2
- east of Queen's Park Road Region 3

reflecting the nature of the streets, residential demand and proximity to long term attractors. Region 2 is above capacity and the turnover data suggests that this is partly caused by visitors and commuters to the area. Region 3 experienced parking demand issues from visitors and commuters. Region 1 less so but displacement issues were identified, if a scheme was introduced into roads south of Elm Grove, overspill could affect streets to the north.

- 3.5 Elm Grove experiences high demand at all times and a significant proportion of illegal parking activity on footways and on double yellow lines creating difficulties for visibility at junctions and safety and obstruction issues for vehicles and pedestrians. Changes in the regulation of parking in Elm Grove could displace vehicles to nearby streets on the north side.
- 3.6 There is a high degree of short term turnover at the bottom of streets off Lewes Road suggesting a need for short term exclusive pay and display parking to assist the needs of businesses in this road.
- 3.7 In Area U St Luke' s a light touch scheme currently operates Monday to Saturday with parking restricted to permit holders only between 10 am & 11am and 2 pm & 3pm. Streets in area U have significant under-capacity with demand falling as low as 16% during the day. The data suggests that the scheme is managing visitor and commuter demand but that it is displacing residential demand to neighbouring streets such as Freshfield Street, Queen's Park Rise and Hendon Street which are over capacity e.g. Queens park Rise between 103% & 106%. The scheme excludes short term pay and display parking and this has caused problems for local businesses and amenities such as the swimming baths as drivers without permits cannot park anywhere close within restricted hours. For the above reasons it is proposed to consult this area on proposed conversion to a full scheme with a mix of permit only, shared and exclusive pay and display spaces.

- 3.8 Area C Queen's Park scheme is a controlled zone which operates Monday to Saturday 9am to 8pm and has a mix of permit only, shared pay & display and exclusive pay & display spaces. A number of requests have been received for minor changes in various streets that need to be looked at in the context of a holistic review. In addition representations have been received from residents, businesses and ward members that it is difficult to find a space on a Sunday. This zone faces visitor pressures due to its proximity to the sea, and the City Centre. The local hoteliers association have expressed particular concern over this. It is therefore proposed to consult over extending this scheme to Sunday operation as well.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 As this is a large and complex area with limited capacity and a whole range of parking and access issues a lengthy consultation and design process is required. The consultation has taken place following requests from residents sent to council officers and ward members for parking schemes to be introduced. These requests have come from both car owning and non car owning residents. Members for all the affected wards have been consulted and members from East Brighton and Hanover & Elm Grove wards attended the stakeholder workshops described below.
- 4.2 Part of the consultation process included holding two stakeholder workshops to which local community groups, transport providers, emergency services, business representatives and ward members were invited and attended. The purpose was to give local interest groups the opportunity to put across their points of view in order to inform the Council of the key issues and shape any parking proposals for the area should a decision be made to proceed to the feasibility stage. The results of the on street parking surveys were fed into the workshop process. The workshops were a first for the council and were well attended with a high quality of debate and a good degree of consensus. This is a proactive form of community engagement and could be considered for further parking reviews.
- 4.3 Workshop one focused on identifying the existing parking issues. The main issues identified were, lack of parking spaces for residents, commuter and visitor parking pressures, illegal and obstructive parking leading to obstructed footways and problems for emergency access, need for additional cycle parking and car club spaces, need for loading and parking facilities for businesses. There was some conflict between those who favoured on street cycle parking bays in most streets and those who felt this would reduce the number of resident spaces. There were some concerns expressed about displacement of vehicles into adjacent areas should some areas vote for a scheme and others not. A broad consensus was that there was a need for a parking scheme in the area and that the worst parking problems were experienced in the Hanover and Baker's Bottom areas.
- 4.4 Workshop two looked at a proposed scheme boundary and types of parking i.e. whether permit only, pay and display or shared use? Where other types of parking such as loading bays and cycle bays might be located? Due to the residential character of the area most streets would have a mixture of permit only and shared short term bays with loading bays and exclusive pay & display bays

concentrated in retail and commercial areas and only a limited amount of long term shared pay and display on non residential frontages.

- 4.5 In Autumn 2009 the council wrote to over 9,000 addresses in the area to ask how residents perceived parking related issues in the area and understand more about their experience of the current situation. The questions asked related to the number of cars in the household, whether there is a parking problem in the street, whether pavement or double parking occurs and what kinds of parking i.e. visitor, commuter, shopper, long stay etc. Nearly 3,000 responses were received, a 33% response rate. A summary of the results is detailed below; the full report is attached as Appendix B.
- 4.6 Looking at the area as a whole around 70% of people reported parking problems in their street either regularly or sometimes and 30% said there are no problems with parking in their street.
- 4.7 62% of households have one car, 20% of households have no cars and 15.5% have two cars. This is broadly in line with the 2001 census results.
- 4.8 To get a clearer picture of the situation in particular neighbourhoods the 126 streets were sub divided into 6 distinct geographical areas. (Appendix A)
- Area A = streets north of Elm Grove,
 - Area B = streets south of Elm Grove and west of Queen's Park Road (including Queen's Park Road) i.e. Hanover
 - Area C = Freshfield Road and Queens Park Rise
 - Area D = Elm Grove
 - Area E streets east of Queens Park Road and south of Elm Grove
 - Area F Baker's Bottom i.e. Bute Street, Hendon Street, Rochester Street & Canning Street.
- 4.9 More than 50% of respondents in Areas B & F reported parking problems on a regular basis. More than 50% of respondents in all areas reported parking problems regularly or sometimes.
- 4.10 More than 50% of respondents in D & F reported pavement parking on a regular basis.
- 4.11 More than 50% of respondents in areas B & F reported commuter parking on a regular basis.
- 4.12 Where comments were supplied the following top four made by residents were:
1. No problem/against parking scheme 16%.
 2. Pavement parking is a problem 12.5%.
 3. Cannot park outside house 7%.

Conclusions & Timetable

- 4.13 The combined evidence from the parking surveys, community questionnaires (showing over 50% of people in all areas experienced parking problems) and workshops justify proceeding to a full consultation which should include all of the review area so that the council is not knowingly proposing a scheme that will cause vehicle displacement into adjacent areas.

- 4.14 It is proposed that the informal consultation stage for a possible new residents parking scheme and changes to existing Areas C & U take place Spring/Summer 2010 and that the results are considered by a further cabinet member meeting in Autumn/Winter 2010/11 which, if approved, would be followed by statutory advertisement of traffic orders proposals in early 2011. Representations to the traffic orders would be considered by CMM early in 2011 followed by, if approved, implementation in Summer 2011.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 Any revenue costs associated with the new schemes will be met from existing traffic revenue budgets. The financial impact of the revenue from the proposed new scheme will be included within the proposed budget for 2011-12 agreed at Budget Council in February 2011.
- 5.2 New parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £100,000 per scheme over 7 years

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw Date: 01/02/10

Legal Implications:

- 5.3 The council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to be properly exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway have to follow the rules on consultation promulgated by the government and the courts. These can be paraphrased as a need to ensure that the consultation process is carried out at a time when proposals are still at their formative stage, that sufficient reasons and adequate time must be given to allow intelligent consideration and responses and that results are conscientiously taken into account in finalising the proposals.
- 5.4 At this preliminary stage there are no identifiable human rights issues.

Lawyer Consulted: Stephen Dryden Date: 29/01/10

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.6 Proposed new motorcycle bays, car club and on street cycle parking provision will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.
- 5.7 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.8 The proposed residents parking scheme will not have any implication on the prevention of crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 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 The alternative option is not to proceed with consultation. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To seek approval to proceed to the next stage of consultation in respect of the Hanover and Elm Grove Residents parking Review. These proposals are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – Map of Hanover & Elm Grove Residents Parking Review community consultation area
2. Appendix B - Brighton Residents Parking Zone Development Hanover & Elm Grove Area Survey plan
3. Appendix C - Report on results of community consultation

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Brighton Parking Study: Elm Grove and Hanover Parking Survey Analysis produced by Mott McDonald for Brighton and Hove City Council

Background Documents

None