

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Bakers Bottom &amp; Craven Vale resident parking scheme consultation</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> July 2014</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director Environment, Development &amp; Housing</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3329</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>East Brighton &amp; Queens Park</b>		

**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the recent public consultation undertaken for a proposed extension to the Area U Residents Parking Scheme (Bakers Bottom & Craven Vale area - Appendix A). Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Transport Committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Committee approves:

- (a) That an extension of the Area U resident parking scheme be considered within the Bakers Bottom area and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.
- (b) That no extension of a resident parking scheme takes place in the Craven Vale area.
- (c) That a prohibition of verge parking on the east side of Queensway is advertised alongside any double yellow lines in the Craven Vale area which would be considered in appropriate locations.

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

- 3.1 At the Transport Committee Meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 it was agreed to consult residents to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.
- 3.2 The Council had received a number of complaints and petitions from residents in the Bakers Bottom & Craven Vale area about general difficulties in parking and the belief that this was at least partly caused by displacement from other schemes introduced in the last few years. Therefore it was agreed that consultation on a resident parking scheme should take place as soon as possible within the timeframe set out in the committee report.
- 3.3 In March / April 2014 a leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for an extension to the Area U resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the two areas outlined.

## 4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 576 property addresses in the Bakers Bottom & Craven Vale Area of the city. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal should they wish to: 9 respondents (4.9%) chose this method.
- 4.2 Plans could also be viewed at staffed exhibitions held at The Vale Community Centre (1pm – 5pm Wednesday, 2 April 2014 and 4pm – 8pm Thursday, 3 April 2014) and an unstaffed exhibition held at Hove Town Hall parking Shop from 24 March 2014 to 2 May 2014, 9am to 5pm.
- 4.3 182 responses were received giving a response rate of 31.6%. The following responses were not included - 3 from outside the area and 2 where no street name was given.
- 4.4 54.8% of respondents were in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 45.2% of respondents were against the extension of the scheme. The full results and analysis of the consultation is outlined in Appendix B.
- 4.5 The results have been broken down further into the two distinct areas (Appendix C) and it is clear that residents in the Bakers Bottom area are in favour of a scheme with 77.8% of respondents in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 22.2% of respondents against the extension of the scheme.
- 4.6 Within the Craven Vale area there is a distinct difference with only 31% of respondents in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 69% of respondents against the extension of the scheme.
- 4.7 The Council also received a petition signed by 52 people from residents of Monument View and The Causeway in the Craven Vale area who objected to the proposed resident parking scheme.
- 4.8 Therefore, it has been recommended to take into account these results and propose an extension of the Area U resident parking scheme into the Bakers Bottom area but not to include the Craven Vale area.
- 4.9 In terms of the comments received as outlined in the Consultation report (full details in Appendix B), the highest amount in the whole area was 34 who were in favour of the scheme followed by 27 comments from respondents not in favour of a scheme. A further 21 comments were that there were not enough parking spaces and / or more than one permit is needed while ten comments were made that this is a money making scheme.
- 4.10 Officers have discussed the results with all the Ward Councillors who have either voiced their support for this way forward or responded with no concerns with the recommendations being taken forward. East Brighton Ward Councillors did have concerns about possible displacement into the Craven Vale area if the Bakers Bottom scheme proceeds. Therefore, if approved as part of the proposals the Council could consider advertising no verge parking on east side of Queensway where verges are being damaged

and buses have difficulty getting through. Double yellow lines will also be considered throughout the area in appropriate locations.

- 4.11 It is recommended by officers this proposal is advertised as a traffic order allowing further comments to be made from residents both within and outside the new proposal. All comments will be reported back to a further Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting.

## **Conclusions**

- 4.12 Based on the consultation results officers recommend that we proceed with an extension to the Area U resident parking scheme in the Bakers Bottom Area. There are concerns about possible displacement into the Craven Vale area; however, due to the results it would be very difficult to justify a case for including the Craven Vale area. These two areas are also very distinct.
- 4.13 As part of the consultation undertaken in the schemes, 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 area and existing parking provisions in the area.

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

### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The revenue costs associated with the recommendations in the report will be met from existing Transport revenue budgets. The capital costs of creating and extending parking schemes are funded by unsupported borrowing, with appropriate repayments made over a seven year period funded from the revenue income generated.
- 5.2 Revenue income generated from on-street parking schemes is first defrayed against the costs of the scheme itself with any surplus used for transport and highways related projects and expenditure. This would include items such as supported bus services, concessionary fares and Local Transport Plan projects.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates*

*Date: 21/05/2014*

### Legal Implications:

- 5.3 The Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act") must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic including cyclists and pedestrians. As far as is practicable, the Council should have regard to any implications in relation to:- access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public services vehicles; securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 5.4 The Council has to follow the rules on consultation set out by the government and the courts. The Council must 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 properly taken into account in finalising the proposals.

After the proposals are formally advertised, the Council can, in the light of objections / representations received, decide to re-consult either widely or specifically when it believes that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of any associated orders. Where there are unresolved objections to the traffic orders, then the matter is required to return to Transport Committee for a decision.

Under the Act the Council may acquire, whether by purchase or by hiring, such parking meters and other apparatus as appear to it to be required or likely to be required for the purposes of its functions in relation to designated parking places.

*Lawyer Consulted: Katie Matthews*

*Date: 23 May 2014*

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.7 The new motorcycle bays and the on-street pedal cycle bays will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.
- 5.8 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Public Health Implications:

- 5.11 There are no direct public health implications in this report although the introduction of the pedal cycle bays and controls over vehicle parking may encourage more healthy forms of transport.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.12 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 options are going ahead with both areas as an extension to the existing zone or doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward.

However, it is the recommendation of officers that proposals put forward are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

## **7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 To seek approval to advertise the Traffic Order after taking into consideration the consultation report. These proposals are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

#### **Appendices:**

Appendix A – Map of proposal consulted on.

Appendix B – The consultation report

Appendix C – Results broken down into two areas

#### **Documents In Members' Rooms**

None

#### **Background Documents**

1. Item 53 – Transport Committee Meeting Report – 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013