

Subject:	Richmond Heights & Canning Street - Resident Parking Scheme Formal Consultation		
Date of Meeting:	10 July 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, Place		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	E-mail:	charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	No		
Wards Affected:	Queens Park		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation orders. The traffic orders outline the inclusion of Canning Street into the Area H resident parking scheme and the inclusion of the Richmond Heights area into the Area C resident parking scheme. The proposals include a number of one way streets alongside exemptions for cyclists to maximise parking.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Cabinet Member approves as advertised the following orders;
- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 20** (Areas C and H extensions) TRO-13a-2012
 - (b) Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 20** TRO-13b-2012
 - (c) Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (One-Way Traffic) Order No.2 20** TRO-13c-2012
- 2.2 That any subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 In September 2009 a letter plus short questionnaire about parking issues was sent to all property addresses in the Hanover and Elm Grove Area. In addition workshops had also been held in the local area with residents and stakeholders to establish whether there was sufficient demand to proceed to informal

consultation on the introduction of a residents parking scheme. Maps and plans for consultation on a proposed parking scheme for Hanover and Elm Grove area were designed, based on evidence gathered in these 3 exercises, and also from on-street parking surveys conducted by Mott MacDonald (traffic engineering and transport planning consultancy) and in consultation with ward councillors.

- 3.2 It was decided not to proceed with a scheme for the Hanover and Elm Grove area due to the level of residents' objections to a proposed scheme for the overall area.
- 3.3 However, respondents from a segment of the wider area in the Richmond Heights area and in Canning Street were broadly in favour of a scheme.
- 3.4 At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9th November 2011 it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.
- 3.5 In January 2012 an information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address within the Richmond Heights area (1086 property addresses). 67 property addresses were also consulted in Canning Street.
- 3.6 Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at: St Mary's Church Hall, 61 St James' Street, Brighton on Tuesday 10 January, 2012, 1.30pm to 5.30pm and Thursday 12 January, 2012, 3.30pm to 7pm. There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Tuesday 3 January, 2012 to Tuesday 31 January, 2012, 9am to 5pm.
- 3.7 In the Richmond Heights area 253 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 23%. Overall, 148 (61%) respondents supported the proposed extension of the Area C scheme and 96 (39%) were not in favour. Responses from outside the area (x1) or where no street name was given (x8) were removed from the analysis
- 3.8 In Canning Street 34 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 51%. Overall, 30 (88%) respondents supported the proposed extension of the Area H scheme and 4 (12%) were not in favour.
- 3.9 Therefore, the recommendation on 27th March 2012 in the report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting was that both these residents parking scheme extensions should be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 27th April 2012 with the closing date for comments and objections on 19th May 2012.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.

- 4.3 Notices were put on street for 27th April 2012 which outlined the proposal and after a week any missing notices on-street were replaced. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on 27th April 2012. Detailed plans and the Traffic Regulation Order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library, the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. A plan detailing the proposals is shown on Appendix A and B.
- 4.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

Richmond Heights

- 4.5 There were 19 items of correspondence received in relation to the Richmond Heights proposal (hard copies are available to view in the Members Room). All 19 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix C.
- 4.6 8 items of correspondence were support for the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. The remaining 11 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals.
- 4.7 The 11 representations that objected contained 20 different objections to the resident parking proposals.
- 4.8 5 objections were received to the loss of parking spaces caused by parking only being proposed on one side of the road.
- 4.9 The design of the proposals was created using guidance from Department for Transport and officer expertise from experience of previous schemes. In a number of roads there is no opportunity to allow parking on both sides as the road is too narrow to meet the guidelines and the Council does not condone pavement parking within resident parking schemes. The proposals were clearly outlined in the informal consultation documents and the majority of respondents were in favour of the proposals.
- 4.10 4 objections were that that this is a revenue gaining exercise for the Council and / or they do not want to pay to park.
- 4.11 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport and environmental improvements throughout the City.
- 4.12 2 objections were general objections to the resident parking scheme proposals.
- 4.13 Overall during the informal consultation the majority of respondents who responded were in favour of proceeding with these proposals.
- 4.14 2 objections were due to the fact there is no guarantee of more than one resident permit for each household.

- 4.15 Each household in the proposed scheme will be able to apply for one permit if they do not have off street parking for that vehicle. Any household requiring more than one permit can call the Parking Information Centre to request a second permit application form. Assuming that permits are available following the initial allocation, (as has been the case with previous schemes) these will be issued to other members of the household who have applied for a second permit for that household before the scheme begins operation. The number of permits issued in Area C is based on a 1:1 ratio of spaces available in resident permit only and shared resident permit/ pay & display spaces available and a waiting list will be created at that cut off point. Currently there is no resident permit waiting list in Area C.
- 4.16 2 objections were to the one way streets meaning increased speeds of traffic.
- 4.17 The design of this proposal involved liaising with the road safety team and the outcome was that staggered parking was introduced to reduce speeds of traffic.
- 4.18 2 objections were to the consultation process with concerns that the whole Hanover area voted no to the proposals and this was "Gerrymandering".
- 4.19 The consultation process is clearly outlined in the background section above. Respondents from a segment of the wider area in the Richmond Heights area and in Canning Street were broadly in favour of a scheme as part of the Hanover parking review. At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9th November 2011 it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.
- 4.20 1 objection was that there is no consideration for the low paid Commuters.
- 4.21 As part of the consultation undertaken regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the scheme but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the area and existing parking provisions in the area.
- 4.22 1 objection was there is no consideration for the elderly that do not qualify for a blue badge who would be affected by this proposal as they would have to pay for a permit.
- 4.23 The Council do have to charge residents for permits for the schemes as the schemes have ongoing costs i.e. Civil enforcement officers, maintenance of signage and lining etc. The consultation literature makes this perfectly clear and residents had a choice of whether to vote for a scheme or not. Overall during the informal consultation the majority of respondents who responded were in favour of proceeding with these proposals.
- 4.24 The final objection was a failure of the Council to outline the AMEX development proposals during the consultation which include off-street parking for staff.

- 4.25 The planning proposals for the AMEX development have been outlined on the Council website. Therefore, there was the opportunity for respondents to take into consideration other proposals in their area when responding.

Canning Street

- 4.26 There were 8 items of correspondence received in relation to the Canning Street proposal (hard copies are available to view in the Members Room). All 8 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix D.
- 4.27 5 items of correspondence were support for the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. The remaining 3 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals.
- 4.28 The 3 representations that objected contained 10 different objections to the resident parking proposals.
- 4.29 2 objections were to the one way streets meaning increased speeds of traffic and the junctions being more dangerous.
- 4.30 The design of this proposal involved liaising with the road safety team and the outcome was that staggered parking was introduced to reduce speeds of traffic.
- 4.31 2 objections were received to the loss of parking spaces caused by parking only being proposed on one side of the road. It was added that would lead to residents having to travel further to walk to their front door.
- 4.32 The design of the proposals were created using guidance from Department for Transport and officer expertise from experience of previous schemes. In Canning Street there is no opportunity to allow parking on both sides as the road is too narrow to meet the guidelines and the Council does not condone pavement parking within resident parking schemes. The proposals were clearly outlined in the informal consultation documents and the majority of respondents were in favour of the proposals.
- 4.33 1 objection was that that this is a revenue gaining exercise for the Council and / or they do not want to pay to park.
- 4.34 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport and environmental improvements throughout the City.
- 4.35 1 objection was a general objection to the resident parking scheme proposal.
- 4.36 Overall during the informal consultation the majority of respondents who responded are in favour of proceeding with these proposals.
- 4.37 1 objection was due to the fact there is no guarantee of more than one resident permit for each household.

- 4.38 Each household in the proposed scheme will be able to apply for one permit if they do not have off street parking for that vehicle. Any household requiring more than one permit can call the Parking Information Centre to request a second permit application form. Assuming that permits are available following the initial allocation, (as has been the case with previous schemes) these will be issued to other members of the household who have applied for a second permit for that household before the scheme begins operation. The number of permits issued in Area H is based on a 1:1 ratio of spaces available in resident permit only and shared resident permit/ pay & display spaces available and a waiting list will be created at that cut off point. Currently there is no resident permit waiting list in Area H.
- 4.39 1 objection was to the consultation process with concerns that the proposals have changed since the informal consultation stage.
- 4.40 A number of alterations have been made since the informal consultation following comments from residents of Canning Street. These proposals were fully outlined in the advertised formal consultation allowing any member of the public the opportunity to comment on the proposals.
- 4.41 1 objection was that there is no consideration for Hospital staff who should be able to park for free in Canning Street.
- 4.42 As part of the consultation undertaken regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the scheme but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the area and existing parking provisions in the area.
- 4.43 1 objection was that this would cause the displacement of vehicles into the Bakers Bottom area.
- 4.44 In September 2009, the residents of the Bakers Bottom area and surrounding roads in the Hanover area voted to be excluded from any proposed resident parking scheme, and therefore all these roads were not included.
- 4.45 As outlined in the background above respondents from Canning Street, however, were broadly in favour of a scheme. At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9th November 2011 it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.

Conclusions

- 4.46 The recommendation is that both scheme extensions be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background and consultation responses.
- 4.47 Any additional amendments to the approved schemes deemed necessary through the formal consultation will be introduced during the implementation stage and advertised through a traffic regulation amendment order.

- 4.48 As part of the consultation undertaken in the scheme regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the schemes but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the areas and existing parking provisions in the areas.
- 4.49 Ward Councillors in Queens Park have been consulted about this proposal.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 Revenue: the costs of advertising the traffic regulation orders have been met from existing revenue budgets. The financial impact of the revenue from the new scheme, along with associated ongoing revenue costs, has been included as part of the budget for 2012-13.
- 5.2 Capital: new parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £100,000 per full scheme over 7 years.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 08/06/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The Council has power to make traffic orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The orders have been advertised in accordance with the relevant procedure regulations. As there are unresolved objections they are now referred to this meeting for consideration.

Relevant Human Rights to which the Council should have regard are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsom

Date: 11/06/12

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.
- 5.5 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 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 only alternative option for the proposals 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 schemes to the implementation stage after taking into consideration of the duly made representations and objections. These proposals and amendments are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A - Richmond Heights Plan
2. Appendix B - Canning Street Plan.
3. Appendix C - Richmond Heights - List of Objections / Comments
4. Appendix D - Canning Street - List of Objections / Comments

Documents In Members' Rooms

1. Objections / representations.

Background Documents

1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9th November 2011
2. Item 102 – Environment, Transport & Sustainability Report - 29 March 2012

