

# ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

## Agenda Item 112

Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Resident Parking Schemes Consultation</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>19 February 2009</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Director of Environment</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel:</b> <b>29-3329</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Forward Plan No. <i>ENV7177</i>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	Preston Park; Stanford; Withdean		

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the second stage of public consultation for the Stanford, Preston Park Avenue, The Martlet and Preston Park Station areas (in the area shown in Appendix D).

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 (1) That the Cabinet Member for Environment approves:
- (a) That no restrictions will be proposed in this report for the Stanford Area due to opposition amongst residents and businesses in the area.
  - (b) That the whole of The Martlet area and Preston Park Avenue area be progressed to final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised, subject to the amendments outlined in this committee report.
  - (c) That Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent residents be contacted again by letter drop to ensure that they are aware a scheme will be progressed around them and to give them a further opportunity to decide whether to be in or outside of this scheme.
  - (d) That the Preston Park Station area be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised, subject to the amendments outlined in this committee report. This design may or may not include Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent depending on the results of the letter drop.
  - (e) That an order should be placed for all required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the proposed parking schemes are undertaken as programmed.

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

- 3.1 Following detailed parking surveys which took place in April 2008 and meetings with the Ward Councillors it was agreed a letter drop would take place in a number of areas to see if residents would like to be consulted on the detailed design for a resident parking scheme in their area.
- 3.2 Following the results of the initial letter drop (shown in Appendix A) it was agreed that a second stage consultation incorporating detailed design would take place in the four areas shown in Appendix B in November / December 2008. Residents & Businesses had until 12 December 2008 to respond and a staffed Public exhibition was arranged at the Church of Good Shepherd on Dyke Road between Wednesday 12 November 2008 until Thursday 13 November 2008 and the Bowling Pavilion in Preston Park on Friday 14 November 2008. The exhibition was then available for the public to view at Hove Town Hall until Monday 15 December 2008.

### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 Approximately 1925 leaflets were delivered to residents, businesses and services in the Stanford, Preston Park Avenue, The Martlet and Preston Park Station areas. Questionnaire returns totalled 851 giving a response rate of around 44%.
- 4.2 Detailed analysis of the questionnaires was undertaken and the results split into the four areas to enable further analysis. This is shown in more detail within the consultation reports (Appendix C).

#### **Preston Park Station area parking scheme**

- 4.3 An explanatory leaflet and questionnaire was mailed to 914 addresses within the Preston Park Station area covering 11 roads. 357 questionnaires were completed giving a 39% response rate. The details of the scheme were laid out in the accompanying leaflet, including a map of the area. Residents, businesses & services were asked to comment on whether they would like to be included in a resident parking scheme.
- 4.4 Overall 49.6% of respondents support the introduction of the scheme, whereas 49.6% are opposed. 0.8% had no opinion or did not answer. A street by street analysis indicates that only 4 streets within the scheme boundary were opposed to the scheme overall (The Drove, Compton Road, Innwood Crescent and Millers Road).
- 4.5 An open text box was also provided for respondents to give their views on the resident parking scheme proposals. It should be noted that these weren't always mutually exclusive – respondents sometimes expressed both positive & negative comments about the scheme.
- 4.6 The most frequently mentioned comments were:

- 31.5% said they were in favour because of parking difficulties
- 29.5% said there is no need for a scheme

- 26% don't want to pay for parking
- 21% said this proposal would reduce long term parkers in the area

4.7 Residents were also asked a further five direct questions. Firstly on whether they were a resident, business, both or neither as shown in the table below.

<b>Which applies to you?</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Resident	329	92.5
Both resident and business	4	1
Business	17	5
No Reply	5	1.5

4.8 Secondly the businesses were asked if the parking proposals would affect the performance of their business. 24 businesses within the area responded to the consultation representing approximately 6% of the overall response rate. 3 of the businesses thought the scheme would be helpful to their business, 4 of the businesses thought the proposals would not restrict business, 5 businesses said it would affect business and 12 thought that their businesses would experience restrictions due to the new parking regulations.

4.9 Thirdly people were asked what type of permits they would apply for. Out of 357 respondents, 352 people said they would apply for permits (some more than one type); the general distribution is as below:

<b>Types of permits</b>	<b>No.</b>
Residents	267
Residents Visitor	191
Business	8
Carer	7

4.10 Fourthly people were asked how many cars were in their household. The table below shows that 314 respondents own at least 416 cars = 1.32 cars per household.

<b>Amount of Cars per Household</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>0</b>	38	10.5
<b>1</b>	224	63
<b>2</b>	77	22
<b>3</b>	7	2
<b>4 or more</b>	5	1.5

4.11 Finally people were asked if they would consider having parking signs on their wall/frontage in order to minimise the visual impact on the road. 13% said yes and 88% said no.

4.12 A Petition was also received from residents (285 Signatures) in the boundary of Dyke Road / Millers Road & The Drove who are against the introduction of a resident parking scheme.

- 4.13 In view of the overall support for a parking scheme in the Preston Park area officers and ward councillors it is recommended that a scheme should go ahead to the final design. Geographically, it is possible to go ahead with the exclusion of 3 of the roads who voted against a scheme.
- 4.14 If Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road were removed from the proposals then this would allow a new boundary to be drawn (Appendix D). Within the new boundary not including the above roads 62% of respondents support the introduction of the scheme, whereas 37% are opposed. 0.5% had no opinion or did not answer. Although within this new boundary, the Drove and Kingsley Road were against, it is not possible geographically to exclude these two roads from the scheme. The overall vote within this new boundary was in favour of a scheme.
- 4.15 Therefore the recommendation is to proceed with the final design for Preston Park Station. As this proposal is different from the detailed design proposal, the recommendation is to letter drop Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road, in order to inform residents that a scheme will go ahead in adjacent roads, and to give them an opportunity to consider the effect this may have. Residents in these 3 roads can then make an informed decision about whether to be included or excluded from the scheme.
- 4.16 This would mean that the Preston Park Station area be progressed and that Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road be included or excluded depending on the response to the letter drop.

#### **Preston Park Avenue area**

- 4.17 An explanatory leaflet and questionnaire was mailed to 432 addresses within the Preston Park Avenue area covering 3 roads. 169 questionnaires were completed giving a 39% response rate. The details of the scheme were laid out in the accompanying leaflet, including a map of the area. Residents, businesses & services were asked to comment on whether they would like to be included in a resident parking scheme.
- 4.18 Overall 70% of respondents support the introduction of the scheme whereas 29% are opposed. 0.5% had no opinion or did not answer. A street by street analysis indicates that none of the roads were against the proposals.
- 4.19 An open text box was also provided for respondents to give their views on the resident parking scheme proposals. It should be noted that these weren't always mutually exclusive – respondents sometimes expressed both positive & negative comments about the scheme.
- 4.20 The most frequently mentioned comments were:
- 43% said this would stop van dwellers from parking in the road
  - 12% said there is no need for a scheme
  - 9% said they were in favour because of parking difficulties
  - 9% said this will reduce long term parkers in the area.

4.21 Residents were also asked a further five direct questions. Firstly on whether they were a resident, business, both or neither as shown in the table below.

<b>Which applies to you?</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Resident	156	91
Both resident and business	10	6
Business	2	1
No Reply	3	2

4.22 Secondly the businesses were asked if the parking proposals would affect the performance of their business. 8 businesses within the area responded to the consultation representing approximately 5% of the overall response rate. 3 of the businesses said it would be helpful to their business, 2 of the businesses thought the proposals would not restrict business, 2 businesses said it would affect business and 1 thought that their businesses would experience restrictions due to the new parking regulations.

4.23 Thirdly people were asked what type of permits they would apply for. Out of 170 respondents, 128 people said they would apply for permits (some more than one type); the general distribution is as below:

<b>Types of permits</b>	<b>No.</b>
Residents	78
Residents Visitor	91
Business	1
Carer	7

4.24 Fourthly people were asked how many cars were in their household. The table below shows that 170 respondents own at least 190 cars = 1.1 cars per household.

<b>Amount of Cars per Household</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>0</b>	32	20
<b>1</b>	90	53
<b>2</b>	41	24
<b>3</b>	2	1
<b>4 or more</b>	3	2

4.25 Finally people were asked if they would consider having parking signs on their wall/frontage in order to minimise the visual impact on the road. 30% said yes and 70% said no.

4.26 A petition was also received from residents in Preston Mansions (30 signatures) who are opposed to the resident parking scheme proposal because they are not eligible for resident permits as this was designated a car free development within the planning application. They are also opposed to the removal of the double yellow lines outside Preston Mansions which are proposed to be replaced with resident permit parking bays.

- 4.27 At present in Preston Park Avenue on the south eastern end a stretch of double yellow lines exist from Stanford Avenue extending northwards to just beyond Preston Mansions. Within the redesign and for the informal consultation a distance of 15 metres has been allowed from the top of the island for vehicles to “back up” when entering Stanford Avenue.
- 4.28 To address the residents’ issues the length has been increased from 15 metres to 20 metres allowing 5 or more cars to queue at this location, which Officers believe to be more than adequate. The proposed narrowing of the carriageway will have an impact on the way drivers use this road, and it is also proposed that a “SLOW” road marking should be placed in the carriageway when entering Preston Park Avenue from Stanford Avenue. If this proposal is agreed discussions will take place with the Road Safety team to ensure the layout is safe for road users and pedestrians alike.
- 4.29 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the proposed area. Therefore the recommendation is that the Preston Park Avenue resident parking scheme area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.

#### **The Martlet area**

- 4.30 An explanatory leaflet and questionnaire was mailed to 138 addresses within the Martlet area covering 5 roads. 59 questionnaires were completed giving a 43% response rate. The details of the scheme were laid out in the accompanying leaflet, including a map of the area. Residents, businesses & services were asked to comment on whether they would like to be included in a resident parking scheme.
- 4.31 Overall 59% of respondents support the introduction of the scheme whereas 39% are opposed. 2% had no opinion or did not answer. A street by street analysis indicates that only Kestrel Close were against the proposals.
- 4.32 An open text box was also provided for respondents to give their views on the resident parking scheme proposals. It should be noted that these weren’t always mutually exclusive – respondents sometimes expressed both positive & negative comments about the scheme.
- 4.33 The most frequently mentioned comments were:
- 32% said this would reduce long term parkers in the area
  - 25% said they were in favour because of parking difficulties
  - 20% said there is no need for a scheme
  - 15% don’t want double yellow lines across driveways
  - 15% felt there was Insufficient parking in the scheme
  - 12% don’t want to pay for parking
  - 10% want single yellow lines like in Hove Park Road.
- 4.34 Residents were also asked a further five direct questions. Firstly on whether they were a resident, business, both or neither as shown in the table below. There were no responses from any businesses so one of the further questions had no response.

<b>Which applies to you?</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Resident	58	98
No Reply	1	2

- 4.35 Next people were asked what type of permits they would apply for. Out of 59 respondents, 43 people said they would apply for permits (some more than one type); the general distribution is as below:

<b>Types of permits</b>	<b>No.</b>
Residents	31
Residents Visitor	31
Carer	3

- 4.36 People were then asked how many cars were in their household. The table below shows that 170 respondents own at least 190 cars = 1.1 cars per household.

<b>Amount of Cars per Household</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>0</b>	3	5
<b>1</b>	42	71
<b>2</b>	12	20
<b>3</b>	1	2
<b>4 or more</b>	1	2

- 4.37 Finally people were asked if they would consider having parking signs on their wall/frontage in order to minimise the visual impact on the road. 17% said yes and 83% said no.
- 4.38 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the proposed area. Therefore the recommendation is that the Martlet resident parking scheme area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.
- 4.39 Due to a number of complaints from residents about insufficient resident parking bays being allocated within the proposals officers have revisited the area and have identified that more bays can be included in the final design.

### **The Stanford area**

- 4.40 An explanatory leaflet and questionnaire was mailed to 433 addresses within the Stanford area covering 13 roads. 261 questionnaires were completed giving a 60% response rate. The details of the scheme were laid out in the accompanying leaflet, including a map of the area. Residents, businesses & services were asked to comment on whether they would like to be included in a resident parking scheme.
- 4.41 Overall 39% of respondents support the introduction of the scheme whereas 59% are opposed. 2% had no opinion or did not answer. A street by street analysis indicates that only Hove Park Way, Stanford Close & The Paddock were in favour of the proposals.

4.42 An open text box was also provided for respondents to give their views on the resident parking scheme proposals. It should be noted that these weren't always mutually exclusive – respondents sometimes expressed both positive & negative comments about the scheme.

4.43 The most frequently mentioned comments were:

- 16% want single yellow lines like in Hove Park Road.
- 12% said there is no need for a scheme.
- 9% not happy about operation hours.
- 9% felt it was a revenue raising exercise.
- 8% don't want to pay for parking
- 8% said this would reduce long term parkers in the area
- 8% said problems were caused by workers at City Park (Legal & General)

4.44 Residents were also asked a further five direct questions. Firstly on whether they were a resident, business, both or neither as shown in the table below.

<b>Which applies to you?</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Resident	241	92
Both resident and business	3	1
Business	8	3
No Reply	11	4

4.45 Secondly the businesses were asked if the parking proposals would affect the performance of their business. 12 businesses within the area responded, 1 of the businesses thought the proposals would not restrict business, 5 businesses said it would affect business and 6 thought that their businesses would experience restrictions due to the new parking regulations.

4.46 Thirdly people were asked what type of permits they would apply for. Out of 261 respondents, 137 people said they would apply for permits (some more than one type); the general distribution is as below:

<b>Types of permits</b>	<b>No.</b>
Residents	69
Residents Visitor	70
Business	5
Carer	5

4.47 Fourthly people were asked how many cars were in their household. The table below shows that 259 respondents own at least 479 cars = 1.84 cars per household.

<b>Amount of Cars per Household</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>0</b>	12	5
<b>1</b>	72	28
<b>2</b>	127	49
<b>3</b>	33	13
<b>4 or more</b>	13	5



- 4.48 Finally people were asked if they would consider having parking signs on their wall/frontage in order to minimise the visual impact on the road. 10% said yes and 90% said no.
- 4.49 A petition was received from residents in the Stanford Ward (425 signatures) who wanted parking restrictions such as single yellow lines rather than a resident parking scheme.
- 4.50 A petition was also received from residents (8 signatures) of the upper part of Tredcroft Road which is outside of the proposals. They are concerned about displacement and would prefer single yellow lines for one hour in the day similar to Hove Park Road.
- 4.51 The final petition came from residents of Shirley Drive (72 Signatures) urging the Council to reconsider a number of the proposals on Shirley Drive.
- 4.52 The Council is currently consulting on a resident parking scheme for the area rather than a “light touch” single yellow line approach. Recommendations which were agreed by members at a previous Environment Committee meeting is not to extend any single yellow lines as a form of blanket on-street parking restriction. This is because single yellow lines when used as extensive parking restrictions cause the following problems:
- They can stop residents parking on their own street. Single yellow lines can cause serious problems for residents who have no off-street parking and cannot always be available to move their car twice a day. For example, shift workers or those who do not use their car regularly every day for purposes such as driving to work.
  - They can cause serious displacement to other areas. Single yellow lines completely deter commuters from the area but because no alternative parking options (such as Pay & Display) are provided, the commuter vehicles are likely to move to an adjacent area, thus repeating the parking problems in the next neighbourhood.
  - As individual schemes, they are not financially viable. The council needs to enforce this nearly as often and with as much resources as a full scheme, but does not receive any income from residents or Pay & Display to support this.
  - They can be confusing to visitors and people new to the area, and confusing to enforce. Because the restrictions are confusing, non-residents tend to avoid these areas and park elsewhere, thus increasing displacement to neighbouring streets.
- 4.53 In light of the consultation results and petitions, where the majority of respondents were against a resident parking scheme it is recommended that no resident parking scheme is progressed for the Stanford area.

## **Conclusions**

### *The Preston Park Station area*

- 4.54 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the newly formed boundary (Appendix D). Therefore the recommendation is to re-consult Compton Road, Innwood Crescent and Millers Road. This would mean that the Preston Park Station area, with the possible exclusion of Millers Road, Compton Road & Innwood Crescent be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.

### *The Preston Park Avenue area*

- 4.55 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the proposed area. Therefore the recommendation is that the Preston Park Avenue resident parking scheme area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.

### *The Martlet Area*

- 4.56 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the proposed area. Therefore the recommendation is that the the Martlet resident parking scheme area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order. Because the scheme is an extension of Area O, the days of operation would be Monday to Saturday, not Monday to Sunday as proposed in the informal design consultation. Therefore residents in the Martlet area will receive a letter drop informing them of this and drawing their attention to the Traffic Regulation Order advert, which will give them an opportunity for final comment on the proposals.

### *The Stanford area*

- 4.57 In light of the consultation results, where the majority of respondents were against a scheme it is recommended that no resident parking scheme is progressed for the Stanford area.

### *General*

- 4.58 Residents in Dyke Road on both sides of the road next to the proposed parking schemes are generally in favour of double yellow lines so it is intended to proceed with this proposal. Double yellow lines on the Stanford (west) side will reach as far as Hove Park Road, and on the Withdean side (east) as far as Matlock Road. Residents in these parts of Dyke Road will be allowed to apply for a relevant resident permit for the scheme on their side of the road.
- 4.59 Any additional amendments to the schemes approved deemed necessary through the formal consultation will be introduced during the implementation stage and advertised through a traffic regulation amendment order.

## 5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the traffic regulation order and amending the lining and signing will be covered from existing traffic revenue budgets. The financial impact of the revenue from the proposed new schemes has been included within the proposed budget for 2009-10 which will be submitted to Budget Council in February.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw*

*Date: 16/01/2009*

### Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The consultation requirements for traffic regulation orders are set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. These require consultation to be carried out at an early stage, giving sufficient reasons for the consultation, allowing adequate time for the exercise and taking the product of the consultation into account when finalising the proposals.
- 5.3 The next stage, if the officer recommendations are approved, is for them to be publicised in the form of a draft Traffic Order and to bring forward a separate cabinet report with details of objections received and not resolved.
- 5.4 At this stage no human rights issues have been identified.

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Liz Culbert*

*Date: 15/01/09*

### Equalities Implications:

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

### Sustainability Implications:

- 5.6 The new motorcycle bays will encourage more sustainable methods of transport. Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

### Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

### Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

### Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.9 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.
- 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. These proposals and amendments are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within Appendix A and within the report.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

### **Appendices:**

1. Appendix A – Initial Letter drop results – October 2008
2. Appendix B - Map of 4 Areas
3. Appendix C – 4 Consultation reports
4. Appendix D – New Boundary for Preston Park Station area
5. Appendix E – Overall Key

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

None

### **Background Documents**

None