

Subject:	Madeira Drive - Alterations to the parking arrangements and tariffs.		
Date of Meeting:	7th July 2015		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-33299
	Email:	Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	East Brighton		

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

- 1.1 The report outlines a number of proposed changes to the parking arrangements and tariff costs following the safety requirement for a 4 metre perimeter fence to allow works on the Terraces on Madeira Drive.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Committee agrees to remove the perpendicular parking on the north side of Madeira Drive east of the Concorde and replace this with parallel parking on both sides of the road. The parking on the north side will be further complemented with a 1.2 metre wide footway strip to provide safe means of access to and from vehicles. The parking on the southern side will also give some protection to the cycle lane and it will be further supported by extending the barriers further towards the Dukes Mound.
- 2.2 That Committee agrees to the installation of a section of white centre line markings at the eastern end of the road where road widths are narrower. Once finalised a Road Safety Audit would be undertaken.
- 2.3 That Committee approves that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is advertised so 20 parking spaces west of the Concorde are changed from high tariff to low tariff bays with the associated annual revenue loss of approximately £80,000 plus the TRO costs for the Parking & Network Operations service.
- 2.4 That Committee approves advertising a separate retrospective Traffic Regulation Order to incorporate any of the minor changes to bays again under the revenue budget for the Parking & Network Operations service.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 In April 2015 a number of discussions took place regarding the need for a 4 metre perimeter fence to support ongoing protection and maintenance operations for the arches along Madeira Drive.
- 3.2 After a number of site visits and discussions it was agreed to move the perpendicular parking on the North side 4 metres into the road. To meet the road

width requirements about 40 spaces on the South side of the road adjacent to the cycle lane also needed to be removed which meant a revenue loss of £130,000 to the Council.

- 3.3 The lining work was undertaken in early May at a cost of approximately £10,000, the expense was increased by the need for a hydro-blast process to remove the existing lining and prevent damage to the highway. There was subsequent work to allow for the required lining for the planters to improve traffic management and to allow placement after events.

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The main alternative option is doing nothing which would mean the changes would not be taken forward.
- 4.2 However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Following the changes on the ground a number of complaints have been received by the Council which are based on the impact of removing spaces and road safety concerns.
- 5.2 In terms of the removal of the 40 bays there are concerns that this has had an impact on businesses in the area such as Yellowwave. The removal of approximately 40 spaces coupled with half of those removed being low tariff bays has also led to affordability concerns for visitors. The remaining 30 low tariff bays are very well used which means many visitors usually only have the option of parking in high tariff bays during the summer period (May to October). Appendix A outlines the costs of the tariffs for reference.
- 5.3 In regard to the road safety issues there are concerns from users that the revised layout increases risk of incursion by passing traffic, since the parking bays next to it have been removed. It has also been suggested that the speed of traffic has increased between the base of Dukes Mound and the barriers which increases collision risk for people using the parking bays on the north side of Madeira Drive, including children crossing the road from the north side. It was also reported that coaches are parking in the bays and the disabled bay at the west end of the road restricts road width in its current position.

- 5.4 In response to these concerns officers met with representatives of Yellowwave and it was agreed to investigate the concerns.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 After investigating the options officers have agreed on the following recommendations to improve parking operations, maintain road safety and respond to visitor concerns.
- 6.2 The Council proposes to remove the perpendicular parking (30 spaces) on the north side of Madeira Drive and will replace this with parking parallel to the

kerblines on both sides of the road which should amount to no overall loss in parking capacity. The parallel parking on the north side will be further complemented by a 1.2 metres wide footway strip to provide safe means of pedestrian access to and from vehicles whilst the parallel parking on the southern side will also give some protection to the cycle lane and this will be further supported by extending the temporary barriers towards the Dukes Mound. As part of this work officers will look to see if any additional parking bays can be created to increase availability and also investigate regarding the location of the disabled bay concern.

- 6.3 Even with parking on both sides and narrow footway on the northern side there will be little change in the overall road width and with parallel parking the manoeuvring of vehicles will create less conflict and so maintain road safety.
- 6.4 Officers have also investigated the possibility of installing a section of white centre line marking at the eastern end where road widths are narrower to encourage lower traffic speeds and better lane discipline. Once the design is finalised a Road Safety Audit of parking and traffic management will be undertaken.
- 6.5 The overall costs for providing road safety measures comprising planters, barriers and associated road markings will be about £5,000 over the course of this year and roughly £1500 annually to maintain thereafter. It is expected that there will be a requirement to frequently maintain the temporary blocks / planters and there is likely to be a need for the replacement of some blocks, the longer they are in place.
- 6.6 The majority of these amendments are covered by the existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and can be undertaken quite quickly. However, a retrospective TRO will be advertised to cover some of the minor changes not currently contained within the existing order. All the additional lining work and TRO costs will be met from the Parking & Networks Operations revenue budget.
- 6.7 It is appreciated that it isn't cost effective to make continual changes to the lining, however, we are responding to a new situation and driver behaviour that wasn't anticipated following the re-location of the spaces in spite of the best endeavours of officers to re-design the road and parking layout in response to the urgent situation arising from the Madeira Terraces.
- 6.8 It is also proposed that to respond to visitor concerns a separate Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is advertised for a 21 day period so that 20 spaces west of the Concorde are changed from high tariff to low tariff bays with the associated revenue loss and TRO costs for the Parking & Network Operations section.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The costs and revenue loss associated to the recommendations will be reflected within the existing Parking Services revenue budget within the Transport service. It is anticipated that the costs of implementing the proposed changes to parking

arrangements, including associated Traffic Regulation Orders will be funded from existing revenue budgets.

- 7.2 The forecast revenue loss associated to the changes will result in an annual revenue loss of approximately £80,000 in addition to the initial £130,000 loss from the removal of 40 bays. This further projected loss in revenue has been incorporated into the councils budget monitoring forecasted reported to Policy and Resources Committee. The revenue impact will be monitored throughout the financial year as part of the budget monitoring process and mitigating underspends will sought to offset the revenue loss. The ongoing impact of these changes will be factored into budget setting for 2016/17.

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford

Date: 26/06/15

Legal Implications:

- 7.3 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. 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.
- 7.4 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.
- 7.5 After the proposals are 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 Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.
- 7.6 There are no human rights implications to bring to members' attention.

Lawyer Consulted: Katie Matthews

Date: 26 June 2015

Equalities Implications:

- 7.7 No Equalities implications identified.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.8 No Sustainability implications identified.

Any Other Significant Implications:

7.9 None

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – Seafront Tariffs

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Plans of the proposals

Background Documents

1. None

