

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 40

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Resident Parking Schemes Consultation		
Date of Meeting:	24 September 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: ENV10358	
Wards Affected:	East Brighton and Rottingdean Coastal		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome of the public consultation undertaken regarding a proposed extension to the Area H Residents Parking Scheme, which lies in an area to the east of the current Area H scheme surrounding the Royal Sussex County Hospital in Kemptown (shown in Appendix A).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member approves:
- (a) That the Area H Extension Residents Parking Scheme be progressed to final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised, subject to the amendments outlined in this committee report.
 - (b) That Cowfold Road and Manor Road 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.
 - (c) 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 The Area H extension area was agreed to be included in the resident parking scheme priority timetable as an area to consider for a resident parking scheme in the report to the Environment Committee on 24 January 2008. Following detailed parking surveys which took place in December 2008 and meetings with the Ward Councillors, it was agreed a public consultation would take place for the proposed extension to the Area H Residents Parking Scheme, and subsequently to consult residents on the detailed design for this scheme.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 In May 2009, an information leaflet, map and questionnaire were sent to 1766 households in an area to the east of the current Area H scheme surrounding the Royal Sussex County Hospital in Kemptown, which covers 35 roads. Questionnaire returns totalled 708, giving a response rate of 40%.
- 4.2 Prior to completing the questionnaire, residents were asked to visit a public exhibition to learn about the proposals in more detail. An unstaffed public exhibition was held at Hove Town Hall from 14 May to 5 June 2009 between 9am and 5pm and a staffed public exhibition was held at the Manor Sports and Activity Centre in Manor Road on Monday 11 May 2009 from 12pm until 4pm and again on Tuesday 12 May 2009, from 5pm to 8pm.
- 4.3 Following the public exhibitions, detailed analysis of the questionnaires was undertaken. Summary results are presented below and the full consultation report is given in Appendix B.

Area H Extension Residents Parking Scheme

- 4.4 Overall, 45.2% of respondents support the proposed extension of the Area H scheme and 50.4% are not in favour. A further 31 people (4.4%) expressed no opinion either way. The street by street analysis indicated that 12 streets within the original proposed extension area (Appendix A) were in favour of the scheme overall, with a further three streets remaining neutral. The original proposed extension area included a number of roads that have requested a consultation on a resident parking scheme. In line with our Council policy to consult wider areas and being mindful of possible displacement effects, the consultation was extended to include a number of other roads that had not originally expressed a wish to be included in any scheme consultation.
- 4.5 An open text box was 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 Where people used the text box, the most frequently mentioned comments were however generally negative:
- 25% stated that they did not want to pay for parking;
 - 12% stated that the scheme is purely a money making exercise by the council;
 - 9% had concerns over hospital displacement parking; and
 - 8% stated that there is no need for a parking scheme.
- 4.7 Respondents were also asked a further seven direct questions. Firstly they were asked if they are a resident, manage a business in the area, are a visitor to the area or work in the area. Responses are given in the table below.

	No.	%
Resident	703	93.0
Own or manage a business in the area	21	2.8
Visitor to the area	1	0.1
Work in the area	31	4.1
Total	756	100

- 4.8 Those who own or manage a business in the area were asked about the type of business that they own / manage; results are given in the table below. It is important to note that residents also responded to this question if they managed a business from home.

	No. of Responses
Retail outlet	6
Office based	11
Other business	25
Total	42

- 4.9 The 21 people who stated that they own or manage a business in the area were asked how many vehicles are directly associated with their business; the results are given in the table below. Five people did not state the number of vehicles associated with their business.

No. of Vehicles	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1	7	41
2	2	12
3	2	12
4 or more	6	35
Total	16	100

- 4.10 The same group of 21 people were asked if the proposed parking scheme would affect the performance of their business. 16 of the 21 respondents answered the question; 2 stated that the scheme would either be helpful or very helpful to their business, 3 had no opinion either way, 2 stated that it would restrict their business and 9 stated that it would be very restrictive to their business.

	Number	Percentage
Very helpful to my business	1	6.2
Helpful to my business	1	6.2
No opinion either way	3	19
Restrict my business	2	12.4
Very restrictive to my business	9	56.2
Total responses	16	100

- 4.11 Respondents were also asked how many cars are in their household. 692 people answered this question and the results are given in the table below. The results show that 692 respondents own a total of at least 832 cars, which equates to 1.20 cars per household.

No. of Cars	No. of Respondents	Percentage
0	140	20
1	333	48
2	161	23.5
3	55	8
4 or more	3	0.5
Total Responses	692	100

- 4.12 The penultimate question asked if respondents have access to off-street car parking. Of the 668 people who answered the question, 65% said no and the remaining 35% said yes.
- 4.13 Finally, respondents were asked if they would consider having parking signage on their wall / frontage in order to minimise the visual impact on the road. A list of contact details who responded positively can be forwarded to the relevant traffic engineer but is not included here for the purposes of data protection.
- 4.14 In view of the overall majority of respondents not being in favour of the proposed extensions to Area H discussions took place with the East Brighton and Rottingdean Coastal Ward Councillors to examine the way forward. It was agreed that the boundary for the proposed scheme could be altered such that those roads with the highest overall proportion of respondents in favour of the proposals could be given an opportunity to progress to the final stage of consultation which is the formal Traffic Order. The roads with the lowest overall proportion of respondents in favour of the proposals have been taken out of the scheme, where possible.
- 4.15 The revised scheme boundary is shown in Appendix A and takes into account geographical viability, displacement issues, and that some roads were very strongly in favour due to severe parking problems with officers and councillors agreeing they would benefit from controlled parking.
- 4.16 The 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 also 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?)
 - (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?)
 - (c) What is the overall “area” result for any particular defined area compared to individual roads?
- 4.17 The original questionnaire results have been used to produce an analysis taking into account of the revised boundary; of the 22 roads that are included within the new scheme boundary, 13 are in favour of the scheme overall (59%) and a

further 3 (14%) are neutral. This is in comparison to 34% of streets being in favour overall and 9% remaining neutral with the initial scheme design.

- 4.18 In terms of the actual response overall in the new scheme boundary 52.3% of respondents are in favour a resident permit scheme (34.6 strongly in favour and 17.7% would support it to some extent), 4% had no opinion either way while 44.7% were against the scheme proposal (9.9% against to some extent and 34.8 strongly against). The revised list of roads included in the new scheme boundary and residents' responses to the consultation are shown in Appendix C.

Conclusions

- 4.19 There is a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the revised scheme area with sufficient public support for the proposed Area H extension, based on the new scheme boundary. Therefore the recommendation is that the revised Area H Residents Parking Scheme be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.
- 4.20 As this proposal is different from the detailed design proposal, the recommendation is to letter drop Cowfold Road and Manor Road residents, in order to inform residents that a scheme is progressing in adjacent roads and to give them an opportunity to consider the effect this may have. Residents in these roads can then make an informed decision about whether to be included or excluded from this scheme. The reason to consult these roads in particular is the nature of the roads which are very narrow and any displacement may have safety implications on these roads.
- 4.21 As part of the consultation undertaken in the scheme regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the schemes but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the areas and existing parking provisions in the areas.

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 scheme, along with associated ongoing maintenance costs, will be included within the proposed budget for 2010-11 which will be submitted to Budget Council in February 2010. New parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £130,000 per scheme over 7 years

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 13/08/09

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:

Stephen Dryden

Date: 11/08/09

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.

5.7 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

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 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 the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – Map of proposed Area H extension
2. Appendix B - Initial boundary consultation results
3. Appendix C – Revised scheme boundary consultation results

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Item 118 - Environment Committee Report - 24 January 2008.

