



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER  
MEETING  
ADDENDUM  
ITEM 146 – AMENDED REPORT**

**4.00PM, THURSDAY, 7 MAY 2009**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

| ITEM  | Page  |
|---|-------|
| 146. RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES RE-CONSULTATION | 1 - 6 |



# ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

## Agenda Item 146

Brighton & Hove City Council

|                         |   |                                    |                     |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Subject:</b>         | <b>Resident Parking Schemes re-consultation</b> |                                    |                     |
| <b>Date of Meeting:</b> | <b>7 May 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> 29-3329 |
|                         | <b>E-mail:</b>                                  | charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk |                     |
| <b>Key Decision:</b>    | <b>No</b>                                       |                                    |                     |
| <b>Wards Affected:</b>  | <b>Withdean</b>                                 |                                    |                     |

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the re-consultation for the Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent area (Appendix B).

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 (1) That the Cabinet Member for Environment approves:
- (a) That Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent be progressed as part of the Preston Park Station area to the final design and included in the draft Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised.
  - (b) That an order be placed for all additional pay and display equipment required for the proposed parking scheme.

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

- 3.1 Following the results of the second stage consultation (Appendix A) it was agreed at CMM on 19 February 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.
- 3.2 The letter / questionnaire (Appendix C) was sent out in early March 2009 and Residents & Businesses had until Friday 27 March to respond.

### 4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Approximately 393 leaflets were delivered to residents, businesses and services in the Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent area. The Questionnaire returns totalled 152 giving a response rate of 38.68%.

4.2 As shown by the table below overall 56.60% of respondents support the introduction of this area into the overall scheme, whereas 43.40% are opposed. A street by street analysis indicates that one street (Compton Road) within the re-consultation area is in favour of being included within the scheme overall. One street (Inwood Crescent) is opposed to the area being included while one street (Millers Road) had no consensus.

**Re-consultation Results:**

| Street Name            | Yes    |        | No     |        | Response Rate | No. of households mailed to |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|-----------------------------|
|                        | %      | Number | %      | Number |               |                             |
| <b>Compton Road</b>    | 66.20% | 49     | 33.80% | 25     | 42.5%         | 173                         |
| <b>Inwood Crescent</b> | 43.80% | 14     | 56.30% | 18     | 33.5%         | 95                          |
| <b>Millers Road</b>    | 50.00% | 23     | 50.00% | 23     | 37%           | 125                         |
|                        |        |        |        |        |               |                             |
| Total                  |        | 86     |        | 66     |               |                             |
| % within area          | 56.60% |        | 43.40% |        | 38.68%        | 393                         |

4.3 A signed petition was also received by the Council from residents (225 Signatures) in the 3 roads who are against the introduction of any resident parking scheme in the whole area. 49 signatures were received from Millers Road, 115 signatures from Compton Road and 61 signatures from Inwood Crescent. There were also 14 letters of complaint included within the petition. A further 41 signatures were received from residents in Reigate Road & The Drove against the whole proposal.

4.4 When analysing the figures it was discovered that 42 people in Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent who signed the petition against the scheme had voted in favour of the scheme in the re-consultation questionnaire posted out to local residents.

4.5 The Council also received correspondence from a further 19 local residents. 9 were in favour of the 3 roads being included as a resident parking scheme and 10 were against.

4.6 Following analysis of the results of the letter drop, officers have discussed these with Legal Services.

4.7 A large weighting was given to the tick-box responses, however, individual comments made by letter & e-mail were also taken into account.

4.8 The officer recommendation is based on a number of factors, as part of a matrix of decision making. Resident preference was an important factor, but there was also officer analysis of the overall impact on the scheme. Considerations included:

- a) What is geographically viable (i.e. how does a road link to other roads in/out of a scheme, is it a road right within the middle of other roads that want a scheme?)

Compton Road voted to be included in the scheme. Inwood Crescent voted to be excluded. However, Inwood Crescent is accessed via Compton Road and is therefore linked directly to a road within the scheme. If Millers Road and Inwood Crescent were excluded, these would be 2 isolated roads surrounded on all sides by parking schemes. It is felt that it is not geographical sensible to do this and would create a confusing boundary for the Preston Park station scheme.

- b) What is practicable (i.e. will it be confusing to commuters/visitors/residents to have certain roads in or out, will it increase zone entry/exit signage to an unacceptable degree? Will there be safety implications by leaving a road out and it being surrounded by a resident parking scheme?)

There are various considerations here. To leave Inwood Crescent out would result in increased zone signage and could cause confusion about whether it is part of the scheme. The road would undoubtedly suffer from displacement. With regard to Millers Road, which was 50/50 for/against, officer consideration is that displacement would affect this road to an unsafe degree, given that it would be sandwiched between the railway line and a parking scheme, and that it is used as a principle route for vehicles to and from London Road.

- c) What is the overall “area” result compared to individual roads?

The overall area result was in favour, by 56.60% compared to 43.40%.

4.9 It was stated in our original letter to all residents in October 2007 that “The boundary for any parking scheme will be established from the answers we receive. Ultimately the council has to have a boundary for parking schemes that is economically and geographically viable. This means a scheme has to be introduced for an area rather than for individual or isolated roads.”

4.10 There will be another opportunity for local residents to comment on the proposals for the parking scheme during the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order. The eventual decision on the currently proposed parking scheme within the Preston Park Station area will be a Cabinet Member decision, following the Traffic Regulation Order advertisement, if unresolved objections are received. The draft Traffic Regulation Order is the final stage in the consultation process, with the proposals available to view in the local newspaper or by request. Residents are informed of this by notices which are put up on street and are invited to comment during this stage.

4.11 The Council also intend to send out a postcard to inform residents and to make it clear that they have a final stage in which to make their views known.

## **Conclusion**

4.12 In view of the overall support for a parking scheme in the Preston Park area, officers and Ward Councillors' recommendation is that the Council should proceed with a resident parking scheme in this area including these three roads.

**5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial Implications:

5.1 The full cost of advertising the traffic regulation order and amending the lining and signing for the above scheme will be covered from existing traffic revenue budgets. The financial impact of the revenue from the proposed new schemes has been included within the budget for 2009-10 as submitted to Budget Council on 26th February.

Capital:

5.2 The capital cost of an average scheme funded by unsupported borrowing is in the region of £130,000 per annum over 7 years.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw*

*Date: 09/04/09*

Legal Implications:

5.3 Broadly, the Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must when promoting a traffic order be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway and any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.

5.4 As part of that process the council carried out a preliminary consultation exercise with various statutory bodies, businesses and residents. As a result of those initial objections /representations received the council decided to re-consult three roads identified in this report where it believed that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of the draft traffic order.

5.5 Relevant Human Rights Act rights to which the Council should have regard in exercising its traffic management powers are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and therefore there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Stephen Dryden*

*Date: 09/04/09*

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

5.7 The new motorcycle 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 amendments to 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.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.11 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.

**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 – Original Consultation report
2. Appendix B - Map of re-consultation area
3. Appendix C – Re-consultation letter / questionnaire sent out

**Documents In Members' Rooms**

None

**Background Documents**

1. Environment Cabinet Member report – 19 February Item 112

