

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 19

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	VARIOUS CHANGES TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS		
Date of Meeting:	2nd October 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	Forward Plan No. N/A	
Wards Affected:	Central Hove, East Brighton, Goldsmid, Hangleton & Knoll, Hanover & Elm Grove, Hollingdean & Stanmer, Hove Park, Moulsecoomb & Bevendean, North Portslade, Patcham, Preston Park, Queens Park, Regency, Rottingdean Coastal, St Peter's & North Laine, South Portslade, Westbourne, Wish, Withdean, Woodingdean.		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Parking Infrastructure Team receives a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions. 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. 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 improved accessibility for disabled people by providing disabled parking bays.
- 1.2 This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals and amendments for over 100 roads.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove Seafront (Various Restrictions) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment No.* 201* with the following amendments:

- a) The proposed removal of disabled parking bays in Henfield Way, Hollingbury Park Avenue, Norman Road and Sandgate Road, are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are still required by local residents.
- b) The proposed change to time restrictions of shared parking from 4hrs no return within 4hrs to 2hrs no return within 4hrs in Lorna Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.4
- c) The proposed removal of the disabled parking bay in Titian Road is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.6
- d) The proposed Loading Ban in (north/south section) in Queens Place is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.7

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 This combined Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 100 roads. A number of objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders. The comments, support and objections are summarised and explained in detail in Appendix A and plans showing the proposals which have received comments/objections are shown in Appendix B. Although proposals with no objections do not need to be agreed at the meeting a summary of overall proposals are detailed in Appendix C so the Committee is aware of what is being taken forward.

3.2 In particular objections were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Lorna Road (Goldsmid – Controlled Parking Zones O) – proposed change to time restrictions of shared parking from 4hrs no return within 4hrs to 2hrs no return within 4hrs.
- b) The Upper Drive (Hove Park – Controlled Parking Zone O) – proposed motorcycle bay.
- c) Titian Road (Wish – Controlled Parking Zone W) – proposed removal of disabled parking bay outside No.17.
- d) Queens Place (St Peter’s & North Laine – Controlled Parking Zone Y) – proposed No Loading Monday to Sunday 7am - 10am and 4pm - 7pm.
- e) The Highway (Moulsecoomb & Bevendean) – proposed removal of a taxi rank.

3.3 Letters of support were received in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Shaftesbury Place (Preston Park – Controlled Parking Zone J) – proposed removal of permit parking bays.
- b) The Drive (Goldsmid – Controlled Parking Zone N) – proposed loading ban outside Philip Court.
- c) Wilbury Road (Goldsmid – Controlled Parking Zone N) – proposed extension to motorcycle bays.
- d) Queens Place (north/south section and east/west section) (St Peter's & North Laine – Controlled Parking Zone Y) – proposed No Loading Monday to Sunday 7am - 10am and 4pm - 7pm.
- e) Sillwood Street/Sillwood Road (Regency – Controlled Parking Zone Z) – proposed relocation of a motorcycle bay.
- f) King's Road (Regency – Seafront) – proposed loading bay next to Bandstand.

Summary of Objections

- 3.4 **Lorna Road** - there have been 9 objections to the proposed change of the time restriction of the shared parking from 4 hrs no return within 4 hrs to 2 hrs no return within 4 hrs. This was requested by residents via a petition, which was presented at an Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Members Meeting on 29th November 2011. The petition recommended restricting visitors parking to 2hrs allowing the residents more opportunity to park in the shared bays. However, following consultation some residents felt that the parking time restrictions should remain as they are and one of the Ward Councillors also opposed the proposal. Therefore, due to the objections we are recommending not to proceed with this proposal.
- 3.5 **The Upper Drive** – the Council received a petition with 4 signatures objecting to the proposed motorcycle bay location and offering a more suitable location within the section of shared parking. This was originally requested by a resident as there were no motorcycle bays in that vicinity. However, the location proposed in the petition would also be a suitable location for the motorcycle bay and would not affect any other residents. Therefore, it is felt that we should proceed with the motorcycle bay but at the other end of the shared bay section as requested by residents in the petition.
- 3.6 **Titian Road** – there has been one objection to the proposed removal of the disabled parking bay outside No.17. According to Council records the original applicant contacted the Council to say that they no longer had a vehicle. The original applicant and a resident in the vicinity have been sent application forms and at this present time these have not been returned.

However, we will delay proceeding with the proposal to remove the disabled parking bay within this traffic order. If these application forms are not received by September 2012 the proposal will be re-advertised on our next Traffic Order due to be advertised in November 2012.

3.7 **Queens Place (north/south section & east/west section)** – there have been 3 objections and 2 items of support to the proposed no loading Monday to Sunday 7am to 10 am and 4pm to 7pm. This was requested by residents to prevent large vehicles from loading/unloading and prevent obstruction to all road users on this narrow road. However, following the consultation there are concerns that these proposals will seriously affect some businesses in this area.. Therefore, we are recommending to proceed with the east/west section of Queens Place where the main problem is obstruction by small vehicles parked for long periods. However, it is proposed to withdraw the north/south section loading ban (but proceed with the single yellow line changes) for further investigation as currently there is no viable nearby alternative for businesses to load / unload without causing an obstruction particularly at peak times.

3.8 **The Highway** - there has been 1 objection to the proposed removal of a Taxi Rank. This was requested by residents via a petition, which was presented at an Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Members Meeting on 4th October 2011. The Taxi Rank has been monitored for several months and it was noted that it has rarely been used. We do appreciate the need for taxi companies to have dedicated spaces; however this area has huge demand for parking particularly for residents and the Council needs to ensure the parking spaces are utilised. Therefore, we propose to proceed with the removal of the Taxi Rank.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 16th June 2012 and 7th July 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 also put on street on the 16th June 2012; 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 16th June 2012. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library, the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

4.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

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: 12/09/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The Traffic Orders have been advertised according to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the relevant procedure regulations. 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: Carl Hearsom

Date: 31/08/12

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

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

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.6 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
3. Appendix C – Summary of proposal put forward

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None