

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 147

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Waiting & Loading Restrictions outside of Controlled Parking Zones		
Date of Meeting:	7 May 2009		
Report of:	Director of Environment		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	E-mail:	charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	Yes	Forward Plan No. ENV10092	
Wards Affected:	East Brighton; Hangleton & Knoll; Hanover & Elm Grove; Moulsecoomb & Bevendean; North Portslade; Patcham; Preston Park; Queens Park; Rottingdean Coastal; St Peter's & North Laine; South Portslade; Stanford; Stanmer & Hollingdean; Withdean and Woodingdean		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Parking Strategy Team receives requests for alterations to parking restrictions outside the Controlled Parking Zones. These requests are most often from residents, but can also be from businesses, local members, or other teams within the Council such as Road Safety. After investigation, if it is decided that the request is justified, then it is advertised on a Traffic Order. These amendments often help to improve sustainable transport, for example by providing additional motorcycle bays or can improve accessibility for disabled people by providing disabled parking bays.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1. (1) That the Cabinet Member for Environment is recommended to (having taken into account all the duly made representations and objections) approve the (waiting & loading/unloading restrictions and parking places) consolidation order 2008 amendment order no.* 200* with the following amendments:
- (a) Proposed double yellow lines in Downsview Road, Farm Close, Hawthorn Way, Worcester Villas, Old School Place, South Street, Goodwood Way, Lincoln Street, Grantham Road and Holmes Avenue are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the amount of objection from local residents;
 - (b) Proposed motorcycle in Roundhill Crescent to be removed from this order and to be considered when consulting on a London Road Station resident parking scheme later in the year.
 - (c) The proposed changes outlined in paragraphs 3.5 & 3.6 of the report.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 This Traffic Order includes proposed restrictions for over 150 roads outside the Controlled Parking areas of Brighton & Hove.
- 3.2 A number of comments & objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (which are explained in more detail in Appendix A), in particular to the following proposals:
- (a) Chailey Avenue/Steyning Road (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (b) The Green (Rottingdean Coastal) – proposed no loading/unloading
 - (c) Storingdean Close (Hangleton & Knoll) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (d) Brasslands Drive (North Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (e) Grantham Road (Preston Park) – new loading bay
 - (f) Rothbury Road (Wish) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (g) Whichelo Place/Bentham Road (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (h) Worcester Villas (Wish) – new car club bay
 - (i) Benfield Way (South Portslade) – proposed single yellow lines
 - (j) Benfield Way/Benfield Crescent (South Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (k) Sheepbell Close (South Portslade) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (l) Mayfield Crescent (Patcham) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (m) Jersey Street (Hanover & Elm Grove) – proposed time changes to single yellow lines
 - (n) Surrenden Road/Harrington Road (Withdean) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (o) Popes Folly (Hollingbury & Stanmer) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (p) Varndean Road (Withdean) – proposed double yellow lines
 - (q) Stanley Road (St Peters & North Laine) – proposed no loading/unloading
- 3.3 Letters of support were received to Chailey Avenue/Steyning Road (Rottingdean coastal – proposed double yellow lines), Manor Green (East Brighton – proposed double yellow lines), Maresfield Road/Cowfold Road (East Brighton – proposed double yellow lines), Stanley Road (South Portslade – proposed double yellow lines), Bennett Road/Bristol Gardens (East Brighton – proposed double yellow lines), Woodland Drive (Stanford – proposed double yellow lines), Bramble Way (Patcham – proposed double yellow lines), Gableson Avenue (Withdean – proposed double yellow lines), Brassland Drive (North Portslade – proposed double yellow lines), Whichelo Place/Bentham Road (Hanover & Elm Grove – proposed double yellow lines), Wilson Avenue/Henley Road (East Brighton – proposed double yellow lines), Mayfield Crescent (Patcham – proposed double yellow lines) and The Whole Traffic Order.
- 3.4 There have been objections to the proposed no waiting at any time at the junction of Harrington Road and Surrenden Road, Brighton. One of the objections is from a resident, who considers the restriction too long, that the time limit should be reduced and that speed across the junction will increase because

of the improved visibility. It is normal practice when considering restrictions applying to junctions that the restriction applies for 24 hours per day as there is the likelihood that vehicle and pedestrian conflict applies at all times of day and night. It has not been proven that vehicle speed will increase with such a limited amount of free road space and the length of the restriction is considered to be appropriate for the average speed of the road and taking into account the general layout of the junction.

- 3.5 Several other objections mention the increased volume of traffic using Surrenden Road as a result of works that were carried out in London Road and the lack of controlled crossing facilities around these junctions. However, this proposal is not intended to address these issues and is merely the first stage in a longer term plan to tackle the issues around travelling to school. This includes carrying out further assessments to see if a controlled crossing can be justified or placed in a safe position taking into account various other concerns such as visibility and loss of free parking.
- 3.6 Highbank - The double yellow lines were requested by Ward Councillors and residents in the area. This included double yellow lines on the entire length of Highbank on the south side to enable residents on the north side of the road to enter and exit their driveways without being obstructed by vehicles parked on the south side due to a new development of new houses and the road being very narrow.
- 3.7 However, there have been several objections from residents on the south side at the junction with Copse Hill whose properties are unable to have any form of off-street parking due to the steep incline of the grass verge. Due to these issues it is recommended that the double yellow lines now start from where the new properties are built and continue westwards to the junction with Mill Rise.
- 3.8 The Green, Rottingdean - The no loading/unloading restriction was requested due to the railings around the pond constantly being damaged and that quite often blue badge holders would park on the double yellow lines causing an obstruction to buses and lorries trying to pass this area.
- 3.9 Due to objections about the loss of parking for blue badge holders it has been recommended to reduce the length of no loading from 25 metres to 15 metres. This will allow some parking but would also reduce obstruction on this road.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 19 December 2008 and 26 January 2009.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services. Comments were received from Patcham Councillor and a Hangleton & Knoll Councillor objecting to proposed double yellow lines.
- 4.3 Notices were also put on street for 19 December 2008, these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reasons for it. The notice

was also published in The Argus newspaper on 19 December 2008. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library and at the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising the order and having the lining and signing amended will be covered from the existing traffic budget.

Finance officer consulted: Karen Brookshaw Date: 02/04/09

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The Council has specific powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make various types of order and the most relevant in relation to the proposals in this report are summarised below.
- 5.3 Section 1 of the 1984 Act enables the Council to make orders prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of roads. The various grounds for such action include safety, prevention of congestion and preservation of amenity and are not restricted to the roads mentioned in an order but can be for the benefit of other roads.
- 5.4 Under sections 32 and 35 of the 1984 Act, there is power to provide and regulate the use of parking places (without charges) on the highway, for the purpose of relieving or preventing congestion. The parking places powers must not be used in relation to any road so unreasonably as to prevent access to adjoining premises, or its use by anyone entitled to use it, or so as to be a nuisance.
- 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: 02/04/09

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.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 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 in Appendix A and 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.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A - Plans showing the proposals

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Summary of representations received

Background Documents

None

