

Agenda Item 21 Appendix 4

**DRAFT EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF ENVIRONMENT CMM HELD ON
16 SEPTEMBER 2010**

ENVIRONMENT CMM

4.00PM 16 SEPTEMBER 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Councillors G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

Also in attendance: Councillors Mitchell (Opposition Spokesperson – Labour) and Randall (Opposition Spokesperson) – Green)

Other Members present: Councillors Fryer and West.

45 HANOVER & ELM GROVE RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME REVIEW COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

45.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning outcome of the public consultation undertaken regarding a proposed Residents Parking Scheme in the currently unrestricted Hanover & Elm Grove area and associated reviews of the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queen's Park) controlled parking schemes.

45.2 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Ms Gail Findlay concerning the element of the consultation which considered a residents' parking scheme for Canning Street. Ms Findlay explained that Canning Street was currently a dangerous place to live. She mentioned that an ambulance had recently been stuck between two parked cars in Canning Street on the way to treat her daughter who had been seriously injured. The access was narrow in the road and 50% of cars parked on the pavement. There was a problem of displacement from other roads. Ms Findlay considered that the simple solution would be to extend Zone H to include Canning Street. As the majority of residents in Canning Street had expressed the wish to restrict parking to one side only, the inclusion of Canning Street in the parking scheme would be democratic.

45.3 The Cabinet Member explained that whilst residents from Canning Street and several other streets in the consultation did vote in favour of a parking

scheme, nearly 75% of the total respondents across the area as a whole voted against.

- 45.4 The Council did receive a number of concerns from residents about displacement into other roads in Baker's Bottom who would find themselves surrounded by parking schemes, so it was proposed not to include Canning Street within the Zone H area.
- 45.5 On balance Canning Street could not be considered in isolation from other roads in the Baker's Bottom area and the Cabinet Member had to keep in mind that overall this area voted against the introduction of a resident parking scheme. The Cabinet Member informed Ms Findlay that he would arrange for traffic officers to meet with her to see if anything could be done to improve safety in Canning Street.
- 45.6 The Cabinet Member also considered a deputation from Ms Sarah Griffin concerning the part of the consultation which considered introducing a residents' parking scheme in Queen's Park Rise. Ms Griffin explained that Queen's Park Rise was a small residential street and the bottom half of the road had been included in the scheme. The residents of the top half of the road could not understand why their response had been linked to Freshfield Street rather than the lower end of Queen's Park Rise. She stressed that the street should be treated as a whole and responses treated on a road by road basis.
- 45.7 Ms Griffin explained the difficulties residents were experiencing. There were five disabled bays in the road and several elderly people who did not qualify for disabled bays could not park near to their houses.
- 45.8 The Cabinet Member thanked Ms Griffin for her response. He explained that he was aware that Queens Park Rise respondents voted in favour of a resident parking scheme. However, nearly 75% of residents across the entire consultation area voted against the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.
- 45.9 There are further concerns that this proposal would increase displacement to surrounding roads and would also leave Freshfield Street in isolation surrounded by controlled parking.
- 45.10 It was felt that Queens Park Rise could not be considered in isolation from Freshfield Street, who also voted against the proposal.
- 45.11 Overall, the respondents from Queens Park Rise and Freshfield Street combined were against the proposals. Therefore, it is proposed not to proceed with this request.
- 45.12 The Cabinet Member considered that the results of the consultation as set out in the report clearly showed that there was no mandate to progress a parking scheme in the majority of the Hanover & Elm Grove area.

- 45.13 However, there was clear support from residents in the existing Queen's Park Controlled Parking Zone to extend their scheme to Sundays and this was also supported by the local Ward Councillors, and the Hoteliers and Guest House Association.
- 45.14 There was also an overwhelming mandate to retain the current scheme in the St. Luke's area.
- 45.15 Councillor Mitchell was pleased to see that Craven Vale had voted no and was not included in the scheme. She considered that there was an urgent need to evaluate how residents' parking schemes were implemented. Councillor Mitchell queried what would happen if emergency vehicles could not gain access and asked who would be responsible in such a scenario. The extension of parking schemes had raised a number of issues such as the affordability of permits and a lack of ability to understand the scheme. Elderly people were being fined as a result. Councillor Mitchell expressed concern for people who needed care along with family carers, who did not qualify for a permit.
- 45.16 Councillor Fryer spoke in her capacity as a Ward Councillor for Queens' Park. She stressed the need for better public transport, but accepted that it would be a long time before that aim was achieved. In the meanwhile, the problems residents were experiencing with regard to displacement and lack of access, should not be ignored. Councillor Fryer believed that there should be one vote per person not per household. In spite of more and more consultation, peoples' wishes were being ignored. Councillor Fryer said she would like to see residents parking zones in the upper part of Queens' Park Rise and Canning Street, or alternative policies stated. Residents should be re-consulted within a year. Councillor Fryer wished to see a workable solution.
- 45.17 Councillor Randall mentioned that the Hanover and Elm Grove Local Action Team had met on 15 September, and had agreed to set up a sub-group to look at residents' parking.
- 45.18 The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport, responded to Councillor Mitchell's points. He reported that there was no legal obligation to bring forward residents' parking schemes on road safety grounds. Road safety solutions were needed for specific accident related issues not parking controls. He acknowledged there was an issue concerning affordability which needed to be investigated. With regard to Councillor Fryer's points, he acknowledged there were problems with boundary issues, and there was potential for displacement into other streets. However, officers had undertaken a substantial consultation and come up with the right solutions. Officers were always interested to hear the views of the Local Action Teams. It was difficult to balance every view but officers had listened and taken forward the view of the majority of residents in Hanover and Elm Grove.

45.19 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:

- (1) That no changes be made to the St Luke's (Area U) Controlled Parking Zone.
- (2) That the Queen's Park (Area C) Controlled Parking Zone operational times be extended from Monday to Saturday 9am to 8pm to Monday to Sunday 9am to 8pm and a Traffic Regulation Order be advertised.
- (3) That no changes be made in the area covered by the Hanover & Elm Grove residents parking scheme review.

Note: This item was taken immediately following Item 39.