

# ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

## Agenda Item 24

Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Portland Road Loading Bay</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>26 July 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>Westbourne</b>		

### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The aim of the report is to agree a way forward following a request for a loading bay in Portland Road.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member, having taken into account all of the duly made representations and objections, approves the recommendations to create an additional amendment order to the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 with the following amendments:
- (a) Controlled Parking Zone R – proposed loading bay in Portland Road and an additional shared parking place in Portland Road.

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

- 3.1 This proposal was part of a City-wide Traffic Order which included proposed restrictions for over 150 roads that was presented to the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 25 March 2010.
- 3.2 There were three objections to the proposed loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R). The objections were from residents and from the Ward Councillors who are concerned about the loss of parking and enforcement issues.
- 3.3 Therefore, due to the objections received to the perceived need for a loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R) it was proposed this decision be deferred to a future Cabinet Member Meeting following a stakeholder meeting to discuss the proposal in more detail.
- 3.4 This meeting took place on 30 April 2010 with Sainsbury's representatives, Ward Councillors and local residents to consider the best way forward, where it was

agreed to reduce the length of the loading bay to 21 metres and restrict the times of loading to 6am to 9am and 7pm to 9pm and create an extra shared parking place.

#### **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 On-street notices were erected on the 5 December 2009, these comprised of the statutory legal notice, a plan illustrating the proposals and a justification statement. 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, City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

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

##### Financial implications:

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

*Finance officer consulted: Louise Hoten Date: 10/06/10*

##### 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: 10/06/10*

##### Equalities Implications:

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

##### Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The new loading bay will support the local economy and provide loading opportunities for deliveries.

##### 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 within the report.

**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 – Plan showing the proposals

**Documents in Members' Rooms**

None

**Background Documents**

None

