

Subject:	Traffic Regulations Order objections- Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Vale		
Date of Meeting:	7 July 2015		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Matthew Thompson	Tel: 29-0235
	Email:	matthew.thompson@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Rottingdean Coastal		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider two objections received in relation to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertised to introduce waiting restrictions in Lustrell's Vale, north of School Lane (Saltdean) and to extend the existing double yellow lines on Saltdean Vale near the junction of Arundel Drive East.
- 1.2 The measures outlined in the TRO form part of the wider Saltdean Primary expansion measures as part of the of the 2015-16 Safer Routes to School Scheme, which also includes the new Bilingual school near Hove Park and the expansion of St Andrew's Church of England Primary in Central Hove.
- 1.3 The Road Traffic Act 1988 places a statutory duty on local highway authorities to promote road safety. This duty involves studying the occurrence and causes of collisions and taking appropriate preventative action in the form of physical (engineering) and educational measures to reduce the risk of casualties on local roads. Unitary local authorities in England also have a Public Health duty to take such steps as they consider appropriate for improving the health of the people in their areas.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the amendment of the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.** 20** (TRO-11-2015) to enable the introduction of one hour maximum waiting restrictions on Lustrell's Vale north of School Lane outside numbers 59-87 either side of the bus stop and to extend the existing double yellow lines on Saltdean Vale to a point north of the Arundel Drive East junction.
- 2.2 That the Committee also approves the extension of existing waiting restrictions to a point outside numbers 114-132 Lustrell's Vale, either side of the existing bus stop to prevent long stay parking at these locations blocking deliveries and preventing a regular turnover of customer parking.

- 2.3 That the Committee authorises officers to consult with residents and businesses over the introduction of a 'Pay by Phone' four hour maximum waiting restriction to the off-street car park on the corner of Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Drive, in order to prevent long stay parking for the same reasons given at 2.2 above and to finance enforcement and upkeep.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 Safer Routes to School is an initiative that aims to improve routes to school making it safer for children and their parents and carers to walk, cycle or use public transport, thus providing increased travel choice for the journey to and from school. The initiative forms a key component of Brighton & Hove City Council's Local Transport Plan 2015/16 – 2018/19 and the Safer Roads Road Safety Strategy 2014-2020. .
- 3.2 Saltdean Primary School is expanding from two forms entry (420 pupils) to three form entry (630 pupils). This will require an additional 16 staff bringing the total number of employees on site to 80.
- 3.3 Saltdean residents did not support an area wide 20mph speed limit for the area in the phase 3 public consultation carried out in autumn 2014, but were in favour of 20mph limits around the school. The introduction of lower limits in this area will be supported by these measures.
- 3.4 Approval for the expansion was granted by the Planning Committee on 11 March 2015 with the following transport mitigation measures:
- One hour parking restrictions outside the Co-op on Lustrell's Vale.
 - Improved signage on the corner of School lane and Lustrell's Vale.
 - Dropped kerbs and tactile paving on: Chichester Drive West junction with Saltdean Vale; Glyndebourne Ave junction & Chichester Drive West; Glyndebourne Ave junction with Lustrell's Vale; Saltdean Vale junction with Lustrell's Vale; Saltdean Vale nr junction with Arundel Drive East.
 - A central pedestrian refuge on Saltdean Vale near Arundel Drive East (necessitating an extension of double yellow lines to protect pedestrian sightlines).
 - A central pedestrian refuge on Saltdean Park Rd between car park and Lido/ Library.
 - A raised table across the junction of Chiltington Way and Saltdean Vale.
 - A raised table across the junction of Chiltington Way and Lustrell's Vale.
 - Extending the footways to narrow the junction of Saltdean Park Rd and Arundel Drive West and adding a central pedestrian refuge on Arundel Drive West.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

The TRO was advertised for public comment between 11 May and 5 June 2015.

- 4.1 The three ward Councillors for Rottingdean & Coastal were contacted prior to the restrictions during the run up to the Local and General elections, with one requesting a site visit with Council officers. This took place on the 24 March 2015

and covered the wider scheme including the proposed TRO amendments. Since the election, the newly elected ward councillors have been offered a second site visit on 12 June and all have been shown the detailed plans.

- 4.2 TRO notices were posted on 11 May 2015. Letters were delivered to all businesses on Lustrell's Vale and officers spoke to business owners/managers where possible.

Objections to the Traffic Regulation Order amendment

- 4.3 Saltdean Vale
No objections have been received to the proposed changes to double yellow lines on Saltdean Vale.

- 4.4 Lustrell's Vale: Objection 1.
This objection was received by email. The objector noted that restrictions will be in place from Monday to Saturday, although school hours are Monday to Friday. The objector did not believe there was a need to restrict the parking on a Saturday, when the schools will not be open but people will be looking to use the local shops.

The objector also noted that the proposed restrictions will be 8 AM to 8 PM and wondered how this would assist traffic around the school drop-off and collection times, suggesting it would be more appropriate to impose these restrictions from 8 AM to 10 AM and then again from 3 pm to 5pm.

The objector pointed out that one of the attractions of small businesses in Lustrell's Vale is the ability to find easy parking and felt that Brighton and Hove Council did not appear to be concerned regarding this.

As a longstanding business owner on this parade the objector is concerned that this restriction in parking would have an impact on his business and suggested the Council should also be considering ensuring that traffic wardens patrol this area during school drop-off and collection times as the parking by parents is more of a major concern than whether cars are parking for longer than two hours in a designated parking space.

- 4.5 Officer's response:
The statement of reasons for the Traffic Regulation Order (see Appendix 1) gives two reasons for the changes; to prevent long term parking by parents, and to give local shops a turnover of customers.

As customers need to access these businesses throughout the day we have applied the 8am to 8pm restriction. Other retailers spoken to by officers were in favour of such a restriction in order to encourage greater customer turnover.

In addition, the proposed timing will ensure that school staff do not use these parking spaces. Parking on the school site will be very limited following the expansion and these restrictions will avoid parking being displaced onto Lustrell's Vale.

While there are other shorter 'light touch' parking restrictions in force in other parts of the city, these are currently only applied in conjunction with a controlled parking scheme. Officers do not believe this would be supported by Saltdean residents and it does not form part of this scheme.

While school lessons do not run on Saturdays, the school premises will be used from time to time on a Saturday by community and other groups and for this reason Saturdays are included in the proposal.

Civil enforcement officers will make regular patrols to the area and extra enforcement can be requested by the school when necessary to ensure that restrictions are enforced.

4.6 Lustrell's Vale: Objection 2

A retailer on Lustrell's Vale emailed and subsequently phoned the project manager to make it clear that he does not want any change to current parking arrangements. When previously visited by officers he expressed concerns about delivery lorries stopping for longer than an hour at the very end of the day outside the adjacent store on Tuesday and Friday evenings blocking his frontage from view, which he believes impacts negatively on his business. In the email he repeats his opposition but adds that if the changes went ahead, he would like to see a loading ban on Lustrell's Vale after 4pm.

4.7 Officer's Response

The restriction as proposed would not prevent deliveries but would prevent lorries remaining parked, blocking the shops adjacent.

An officer spoke to the manager of the store where the deliveries take place, who accepted that lorries often stay longer than they should for logistical reasons. She did not, however, object to the one hour restriction and agreed that this was long enough to accommodate deliveries. A waiting and loading ban would prevent all parking outside the shops in question, including both deliveries and customers, and would clearly not satisfy the retailer who has objected.

Officers are confident the changes will be an improvement on the current situation. The objection cannot be responded to by engineering solutions and is therefore not resolved.

Alternative proposals

- 4.8 The TRO proposed waiting restrictions outside 59-87 Lustrell's Vale only. Retailers on the opposite side of the road (114-132) told officers that they were concerned that waiting restrictions at 59-87 and increased traffic associated with the school would also increase long stay parking to their side of the road, obstructing deliveries and preventing customer turnover. Officers agree that this is likely, and are therefore proposing this TRO be amended to include this area either side of the bus stop.

4.9 Public Car Park on Lustrell's Vale

The Saltdean Residents' Association and other retailers have suggested that the car park on the corner of Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Ave (currently free to use with no restrictions) is frequently used for all day parking by residents who live up the hill, leaving cars near the bus stop in order to catch the bus into town. They believe this parking may be preventing some customers accessing Lustrell's Vale businesses and have therefore requested that waiting restrictions be added to the car park. The land is owned by the council but is not part of the public highway, but would have to be the subject of a separate TRO.

4.10 Paid parking

Officers were asked to investigate the possibility of introducing pay and display parking to help pay for car park maintenance costs and as a way of making regular extra enforcement in the area cost neutral. The concern was that this outlying area may not have frequent enforcement visits. Officers involved in parking have informed the Road Safety Team that the Council spent £9,100 on resurfacing the car park in 2011 but does not have a maintenance budget for this car park.

4.11 Parking Enforcement team response

Setting up 'pay & display' facilities is the most costly option, at over £3,500 per machine plus ongoing cash collection costs whereas 'Pay by Phone' parking would be much cheaper to set up. Drivers could still opt to pay in cash at the nearby Co-operative store. This would be much easier to enforce as Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) would be able to consult an online live database to identify whether a driver has paid, rather than having to return in one hour to see if the vehicle has overstayed the time limit. However, officers note that parking on surrounding streets will remain unrestricted and suggest that imposing a cost on the car park could displace some parking to residential streets, which could be unpopular with some residents.

4.12 Staff Costs

The new parking restrictions would pay for regular enforcement in the area by CEO's as well as upkeep costs for the site, which are currently unbudgeted for.

CONCLUSION

5.1 The majority of local retailers support the proposed restrictions on Lustrell's Vale and believe they will assist with customer turnover as intended. Retailers on the other side of the road want the same restrictions to be applied outside their premises for the same reasons stated in the TRO.

5.2 Officers believe that the car park on the corner of Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Avenue would benefit from a 4 hours maximum stay restriction. Pay by phone charges would have the added benefit of financing regular enforcement visits to the area and general upkeep of the car park, which currently does not have an allocated budget. However, aside from the Residents' Association, other Saltdean residents have not had a chance to comment on this aspect, and officers would recommend that this is undertaken before a final decision is made.

5.3 There are no objections to the Saltdean Vale double yellow line extension proposal and this can now proceed.

6. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 Financial Implications:

The costs associated to implementing the recommended amendments and extension of existing waiting restrictions are expected to be approximately £72,795. This is due to be funded from developer contributions from the Saltdean Primary School extension. Additional costs of consultation, design costs and

officer time have been met from the approved Local Transport Plan capital budget and the road Safety revenue budget.

The costs associated to the proposed consultation of introducing pay by phone parking will be funded from existing Parking Infrastructure revenue budgets, and the financial implications of the will be considered before potential implementation.

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford

Date: 11/06/15

6.2 Legal Implications:

6.3 The Council regulates traffic by means of orders made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Procedural regulations require public notice of orders to be given and any person may object to the making of an order. Any unresolved objections to an order must be considered by the Transport Committee before it can be made.

6.4 The Traffic Order has been advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the relevant procedure regulations.

6.5 As there are unresolved objections and representations they are now referred to this meeting for resolution.

6.6 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention

Lawyer Consulted: Katie Matthews

Date: 10/06/2015

Equalities Implications:

6.7 No Equalities Impact assessment has been carried out, but the amendments to the parking restrictions will not prevent blue badge holders from parking.

Sustainability Implications:

6.8 The expanded school will continue to have a relatively contained catchment area. The proposed measures will encourage walking and cycling to school, and the School travel team are working with the School to update the School travel plan to encourage safe and sustainable travel to and from school.

Public Health Implications:

6.9 The measures will encourage active travel to school, supporting physical activity targets and contributing to tackling child obesity.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. TRO statement of reasons

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Copies of the objections received

Background Documents

1. Local Transport Plan 2015/16 to 2019/2020
2. The Road Safety Strategy

