

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Resident Parking Schemes - Formal Consultation</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>30 April 2013</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director Environment, Development &amp; Housing</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Charles Field</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3329</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<b>Yes</b>		
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>Hollingdean &amp; Stanmer, Preston Park, St Peters &amp; North Laine</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE****1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation orders. The traffic orders outline the inclusion of proposed extensions to the Area J Residents Parking Scheme (London Road Station area) The first was undertaken in the London Road Station North area (Appendix A) while the second was in the Round Hill area (Appendix B). Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following order;
- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\* 20\*\* (Area J extensions) TRO-6-2013
- 2.2 That any necessary minor amendments and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

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

- 3.1 In 2009 a leaflet and questionnaire, asking about support for a residents parking scheme was sent to all properties in a large area to the north of Brighton covering Round hill and roads to the south of the Fiveways junction bordered by Preston Road, Stanford Avenue and Ditchling Road. At this time, respondents for the whole area were not in favour but a section to the south of the proposed area bordered by Viaduct Road, Preston Road, Ditchling Rise and Ditchling Road were heavily in favour and so Area J was extended to cover this area.
- 3.2 Since then, the area to the North of London Road station and the Round Hill area have experienced parking pressures and the council has received requests to look at these locations again to see whether support for a residents parking scheme has changed.

- 3.3 At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011 it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join neighbouring residents parking schemes.
- 3.4 In September 2012 an information leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for a resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the area to the North of London Road Station (1784 property addresses) and the Round Hill area (1260 property addresses)..
- 3.5 Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at: Stanford Avenue Methodist Church on Thursday 25 October, 1.30 pm to 5.30 pm and on Friday 26 October 3.30 pm to 7.30 pm. There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Monday 1 October, 2012 to Wednesday 31 October, 2012, 9am to 5pm.
- 3.6 In the area North of London Road Station 715 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 40%. Overall, 394 (56%) respondents supported the proposed extension of the Area J scheme and 312 (44%) were not in favour. Responses from outside the area (17) or where no street name was given (1) were removed from the analysis. 9 responses where people did not state whether they are in favour of the proposed scheme were also removed from the analysis of this question. There are 16 streets in the proposed scheme area.
- 3.7 However, responses from Wellend Villas in Springfield Road were also separated from the final results. This is because at the time it was considered a car-free development and residents were ineligible for resident permits. Therefore, the final results outlined that overall 385 (58%) respondents supported the proposed extension of the Area J scheme and 280 (42%) were not in favour.
- 3.8 In the Round Hill area 433 valid responses were received giving a response rate of 34%. Overall, 239 (56%) respondents supported the proposed extension of the Area J scheme and 189 (44%) were not in favour. Responses from outside the area (7) or where no street name was given (6) were removed from the analysis. 5 responses where people did not reply whether they are in favour of the proposed scheme were also removed from the analysis of this question. There are 18 streets in the proposed scheme area.
- 3.9 Therefore, the recommendation on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 in the report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting was that both these residents parking scheme extensions should be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic regulation order.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013 with the closing date for comments and objections on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013.
- 4.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 4.3 Notices were put on street for 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013 which outlined the proposal and after a week any missing notices on-street were replaced. The notice was also

published in The Argus newspaper on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013. Detailed plans and the Traffic Regulation Order were available to view at Hove Library, Jubilee Library, the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. A plan detailing the proposals is shown on Appendix A and B.

- 4.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

*London Road Station North area*

- 4.5 There were 296 items of correspondence received to the London Road Station North area proposal. All 296 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix C.
- 4.6 121 items of correspondence were support for the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. 166 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals. The remaining 8 items of correspondence were general comments and changes required to the scheme. The 166 items objecting included 125 from within the proposed area, 29 from outside the proposed area and 12 addresses were not disclosed.
- 4.7 The support and objections by road are outlined in Appendix D and they clearly indicate that the majority of objections have been received by the most Northerly roads. However, as shown by the informal consultation results outlined in Appendix D there are considerably less objections to the formal Traffic Order than objections by road to the previous consultation. To put the responses into some context the support / objections / comments from previous resident parking schemes since 2009 is outlined in Appendix G. Only twice in this period has there been more support than objections during the formal TRO stage (as opposed to support at the initial stage) and this was for single road extensions to schemes (Preston Park Avenue and Canning Street). The formal TRO stage is seen as a period to outline concerns rather than put forward support again as this would have been represented during the initial consultation period.
- 4.8 The 166 representations that objected contained 18 different types of reasons to object to the resident parking proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 4.9 77 of the representations were due to no parking problem being perceived in the area.
- 4.10 Several residents in this area have been requesting parking controls to the Council and that is the why the Council agreed to include this area in the resident parking scheme priority timetable. Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
- 4.11 From the original consultation in this area there are a few roads to the north against the proposals but there would be concern about vehicle displacement if these roads are not included. From previous experiences there have been a number of areas that rejected a resident parking scheme based on there being no problem at the time only to come back at a later date when part of a scheme has been introduced complaining

about vehicle displacement. Officers have then been accused of having no “foresight” and eventually a re-consultation occurred and a resident parking scheme was introduced. Examples of this include Tivoli Crescent and Poets Corner.

- 4.12 72 of the representations were that this is a revenue gaining exercise for the Council and / or they do not want to pay to park.
- 4.13 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. The Council do have to charge residents for permits for the schemes as the schemes have ongoing costs i.e. Civil enforcement officers, maintenance of signage and lining etc. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport and environmental improvements throughout the City.
- 4.14 48 of the representations were concerned that the proposals would affect businesses, services, schools and churches.
- 4.15 Officers have met with representatives from the school and church to discuss parking needs and comments on the design have been considered. In some cases alterations have been made to bays in the area such as more pay & display bays for visitors. There were also a number of parking policy issues raised which does not come under the remit of this consultation, however, comments have been passed onto the relevant department to take into consideration. As with all the parking schemes introduced into Brighton and Hove the objective is to find the right balance of residents, business and daily parking for a local area. The introduction of a scheme will require that all day parkers and visitors using parking places will pay for their use. The consultation on the parking scheme is reflecting the fact that too many vehicles are trying to use this area or may park in certain roads if a scheme is introduced in other roads and a system for managing this situation has been requested by local residents. In terms of parking for the Church and / or Nurseries if a scheme is taken forward then extra exclusive pay & display bays (which finish at 6pm) will be considered in suitable roads in the vicinity.
- 4.16 36 of the representations were concerned that displacement would occur. The majority of these respondents were from residents just north of the proposed boundary in Stanford Avenue.
- 4.17 The council is aware that the introduction of a parking scheme may cause some displacement into adjacent areas, although to what level is very hard to predict. This is because driver behaviour changes and where vehicles may go cannot be known in advance of a scheme introduction (e.g. some commuters using the local area may choose alternative means of travel or pay to park within the scheme). However, previous experience has shown that there can be a degree of displacement to neighbouring areas. Equally officers feel that not to proceed with a scheme in the proposed area would not be fair on residents suffering parking pressures and safety issues.
- 4.18 34 of the representations were received to the reduction of parking spaces caused by waiting restrictions at junctions or across crossovers.
- 4.19 The design of the proposals was created using guidance from Department for Transport and officer expertise from experience of previous schemes as well as the

need for safety at junctions. In terms of crossovers the yellow lining is essential to make the scheme legal as there needs to be enforceable restrictions on every part of the public highway within a Controlled Parking Zone. The restrictions also need to be consistent with the rest of the scheme to ensure enforcement and deter any obstructional parking.

- 4.20 34 of the representations were to the consultation process and / or that the process has been undemocratic.
- 4.21 The consultation process has been extensive and is clearly outlined in the background papers outlined below. Overall during the previous consultation the majority of respondents in the whole area who responded were in favour of proceeding with these proposals.
- 4.22 33 of the representations were received requesting that a Light touch parking scheme should be considered.
- 4.23 The reason the scheme is being consulted on in this area at this point is because it is based on previous designs for an extension to a full scheme (Area J). The Committee agreed in November 2011 to take forward consultations up to 2014 for full scheme extensions where in particular residents had campaigned to be re-consulted and designs were in place. Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2015 approved a recommendation in a report detailing the outcome of the Citywide Parking Review that no further light touch schemes are proposed. This is due to a number of issues outlined in that report including increased displacement and lack of flexibility for visitors.
- 4.24 31 of the representations were that the scheme should only be in the Southern Roads of the proposal.
- 4.25 As outlined in the report to the Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 there was a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the London Road Station north area with sufficient public support for the proposed Area J extension, based on the scheme boundary. Therefore, the recommendation was that the revised Area J Residents Parking Scheme extension into the London Road Station North area be progressed to final design and advertised through a traffic order. In this area there were roads to the north against the proposals but there is concern about vehicle displacement if these roads are not included and the area as a whole did vote in favour of a scheme.
- 4.26 30 of the representations were due to the fact there is no guarantee of more than one resident permit for each household or other permit issues such as for visitors or wanting a permit despite being outside the proposed area.
- 4.27 Each household in the proposed scheme will be able to apply for one permit if they do not have off street parking for that vehicle. Any household requiring more than one permit can call the Parking Information Centre to request a second permit application form. Assuming that permits are available following the initial allocation, (as has been the case with the majority of previous schemes) these will be issued to other members of the household who have applied for a second permit for that household before the scheme begins operation. The number of permits issued currently in Area J is based on a 1:1 ratio of spaces available in resident permit only and shared resident permit/

pay & display spaces available and a waiting list will be created at that cut off point. Currently there is no resident permit waiting list in Area J and the current take up of resident permits is 718 (1120 permit limit) so it is at 63% of permit capacity.

- 4.28 12 of the representations were that weekend / evening restrictions were not wanted.
- 4.29 As mentioned previously the reason the scheme is being consulted on in this area at this point is because it is based on previous designs for an extension to a full scheme (Area J). The 9am-8pm Monday to Sunday resident parking scheme proposal for the original Area J parking scheme was designed by officers as it was felt this would be the best scheme for the area taking into account previous experience of implementing resident parking schemes over the last few years. This seven day proposal takes into account possible displacement at weekends and evenings (if the roads were not restricted) into the area from other resident parking schemes and restricted areas (for example Area Y in the North Central Brighton area which is a 7 day parking scheme up to 8pm).
- 4.30 10 of the representations were concerned that the proposals will devalue property.
- 4.31 We have received no complaints or evidence from residents that property prices are reduced due the introduction of a resident parking scheme in their road.
- 4.32 9 of the representations were unhappy that the consultation excluded residents outside the proposed area.
- 4.33 This was considered as part of the Citywide Parking report presented to Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The area north of Stanford Avenue is due to be investigated from the end of the year with consultation with directly affected residents in 2014.
- 4.34 9 of the representations did not want unsightly pay & display machines or signage in their area.
- 4.35 The Council has considered the issue of additional street furniture causing street clutter and difficulties on narrow pavements. Therefore, the Council will be putting down the minimal signing / machines possible to allow enforcement and will take into consideration pavement widths.
- 4.36 8 of the representations were concerned that there may be safety issues or perceived that there were no current safety issues to warrant the proposals.
- 4.37 The design of this proposal involved liaising with the road safety team and the proposals should improve road safety by reducing parking on junctions.
- 4.38 5 of the representations wanted free parking for the schools.
- 4.39 This is a parking policy issue which does not come under the remit of this consultation, however, comments have been passed onto the relevant department to take into consideration.
- 4.40 2 representations would like the parking scheme extended further.

- 4.41 This was considered as part of the Citywide Parking report presented to Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January. The area north of Stanford Avenue is due to be investigated from the end of the year with consultation with residents in 2014.
- 4.42 2 representations were concerned that no resident permits would be available to Wellend Villas in Springfield Road.
- 4.43 It has been agreed that at Planning Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013 to allow the completion of a variation to the s106 planning agreement dated 27 September 2002 relating to Wellend Villas, Springfield Road, Brighton to allow residents of the development to apply for residents' parking permits.
- 4.44 2 representations were concerned about taxi issues and specifically asked that taxi ranks be increased.
- 4.45 The Council have taken into account all the taxi issues and also consulted taxi representatives as part of the traffic order process. No taxi ranks are being removed or reduced as part of these proposals. Any requests for additional or increased taxi ranks can be considered as part of the six monthly Controlled Parking Zone Traffic Regulation orders.

*Round Hill area*

- 4.46 There were 12 items of correspondence received to the Round Hill area proposal. All 12 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix E.
- 4.47 1 item of correspondence were support for the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. The remaining 11 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals. The support and objections by road are outlined in Appendix F
- 4.48 The 11 representations that objected contained 9 different types of reasons to object to the resident parking proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 4.49 6 of the representations were due to no parking problem being perceived in the area.
- 4.50 Several residents in this area have been requesting parking controls to the Council and that is the why the Council agreed to include this area in the resident parking scheme priority timetable. Permission to proceed with the consultation was agreed at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
- 4.51 6 of the representations were received to the reduction of parking spaces caused by waiting restrictions at junctions or across crossovers.
- 4.52 The design of the proposals was created using guidance from Department for Transport and officer expertise from experience of previous schemes as well as the need for safety at junctions. In terms of crossovers the yellow lining is essential to make the scheme legal as there needs to be enforceable restrictions on every part of the public highway within a Controlled Parking Zone. The restrictions also need to be

consistent with the rest of the scheme to ensure enforcement and deter any obstructive parking.

- 4.53 5 of the representations were that that this is a revenue gaining exercise for the Council and / or they do not want to pay to park.
- 4.54 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. The Council do have to charge residents for permits for the schemes as the schemes have ongoing costs i.e. Civil enforcement officers, maintenance of signage and lining etc. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport and environmental improvements throughout the City.
- 4.55 2 of the representations were concerned that displacement would occur.
- 4.56 The council is aware that the introduction of a parking scheme may cause some displacement into adjacent areas, although to what level is very hard to predict. This is because driver behaviour change and where vehicles may go cannot be known in advance of a scheme introduction (e.g. some commuters using the local area may choose alternative means of travel or pay to park within the scheme). However, previous experience has shown that there can be a degree of displacement to neighbouring areas. Equally officers feel that not to proceed with a scheme in the proposed area would not be fair on residents suffering parking pressures and safety issues.
- 4.57 2 of the representations were due to the fact there is no guarantee of more than one resident permit for each household or other permit issues such as for visitors or wanting a permit despite being outside the proposed area.
- 4.58 Each household in the proposed scheme will be able to apply for one permit if they do not have off street parking for that vehicle. Any household requiring more than one permit can call the Parking Information Centre to request a second permit application form. Assuming that permits are available following the initial allocation, (as has been the case with the majority of previous schemes) these will be issued to other members of the household who have applied for a second permit for that household before the scheme begins operation. The number of permits issued currently in Area J is based on a 1:1 ratio of spaces available in resident permit only and shared resident permit/ pay & display spaces available and a waiting list will be created at that cut off point. Currently there is no resident permit waiting list in Area J and the current take up of resident permits is 718 (1120 permit limit) so it is at 63% of permit capacity.
- 4.59 2 representations were concerned about taxi issues and specifically asked that taxi ranks be increased.
- 4.60 The Council have taken into account all the taxi issues and also consulted taxi representatives as part of the traffic order process. No taxi ranks are being removed or reduced as part of these proposals. Any requests for additional or increased taxi ranks can be considered as part of the six monthly Controlled Parking Zone Traffic Regulation orders.



- 4.61 1 representation would like overnight restrictions.
- 4.62 As mentioned previously the reason the scheme is being consulted on in this area at this point is because it is based on previous designs for an extension to a full scheme (Area J). The 9am-8pm Monday to Sunday resident parking scheme proposal for the original Area J parking scheme was designed by officers as it was felt this would be the best scheme for the area taking into account previous experience of implementing resident parking schemes over the last few years. This seven day proposal takes into account possible displacement at weekends and evenings (if the roads were not restricted) into the area from other resident parking schemes and restricted areas (for example Area Y in the North Central Brighton area which is a 7 day parking scheme up to 8pm).
- 4.63 1 representation was to the consultation process and / or that the process has been undemocratic.
- 4.64 The consultation process has been extensive and is clearly outlined in the background papers outlined below. Overall during the previous consultation the majority of respondents in the whole area who responded were in favour of proceeding with these proposals.
- 4.65 1 representation received requesting that a Light touch parking scheme should be considered.
- 4.66 The reason the scheme is being consulted on in this area at this point is because it is based on previous designs for an extension to a full scheme (Area J). The Committee agreed in November 2011 to take forward consultations up to 2014 for full scheme extensions where in particular residents had campaigned to be re-consulted and designs were in place. In a separate Citywide Parking Review report that was presented to Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 it was approved that no further light touch schemes are proposed. This is due to a number of issues outlined in the report including increased displacement and lack of flexibility for visitors.

### **Conclusions**

- 4.67 The recommendation is that both scheme extensions be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background and consultation responses.
- 4.68 Ward Councillors in all three wards affected have been consulted about this proposal.
- 4.69 Preston Park and St Peters & North Laine Ward Councillors are in support of the proposals. Ward Councillors in Hollingdean & Stanmer have voiced their concerns about displacement into their Ward and also difficulties that may be presented to certain residents and services.
- 4.70 In terms of the London Road Station North area there are a number of reasons why it is being recommended to proceed with the whole area rather than the Southern part of the area.
- i. There is concern about vehicle displacement if the Northern roads are not included. A number of previous experiences have seen residents originally

against a parking scheme proposal come back to complain that the Council did not take this into consideration and that there was a lack of foresight by officers.

- ii. If a parking scheme is not taken forward in these roads it maybe a long while before the roads can be consulted again due to an agreed resident parking scheme priority timetable up to 2017. The timetable includes consulting residents north of Stanford Avenue in the Preston Park Triangle area next year which if taken forward would lead to the area left out being sandwiched between two parking scheme areas.
  - iii. Respondents to the initial consultation in the whole area voted in favour of a scheme (58%).
  - iv. The objections that have been received to the Traffic Regulation Orders are less by road than the objections received during the initial consultation when the scheme was originally agreed at Committee (Appendix D).
  - v. Preston Park Ward Councillors have been consulted and although they appreciate the concerns outlined agree with the principles and recommendations outlined.
- 4.71 Any necessary minor amendments or subsequent requests to the approved schemes deemed appropriate by officers will be introduced during the implementation stage and advertised through a traffic regulation amendment order.
- 4.72 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 set up costs of new parking schemes such as this are capital projects and are funded by unsupported borrowing. This is repaid from revenue over 7 years, using the income generated.
- 5.2 The financial impact of the income from the proposed new scheme, along with the associated ongoing revenue costs, has been included within the budget for 2013-14 which was approved by Budget Council in February 2013.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates*

*Date: 09/04/13*

### Legal Implications:

- 5.3 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.

The Council is under a duty to exercise its powers under the Act secure the safe and convenient movement of traffic and the provision of adequate on and offstreet parking facilities. It must also take into account any implications that orders would have for access to premises, local amenity, air quality, public transport provision and any other relevant matters.

Under section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended by the Traffic Management Act 2004, the Council must keep an account of all parking income and expenditure in designated (i.e. on-street) parking spaces which are in a Civil Enforcement Area, and of their income and expenditure related to their functions as an enforcement authority. Any surplus may be used for transport and highways related projects and expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares and Local transport Plan projects.

In carrying out consultation the Council is under a general duty to ensure that any consultation is fair. This means that it must be carried out when proposals are being formulated, that adequate time and information about proposals must be given to consultees to ensure that they can provide a proper response, and that any consultation responses must be properly considered in reaching the decision.

The Council is under a legal duty as a public authority to consider the human rights implications of its actions. Parking and traffic restrictions have the potential to affect 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 where this is necessary, proportionate and for a legitimate aim.

*Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsom*

*Date: 10/04/13*

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.5 The new motorcycle bays will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.
- 5.6 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.9 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 The only alternative option for the proposals is doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward or only taking forward part of the scheme. 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 schemes to the implementation stage 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 - London Road Station North area Plan
2. Appendix B - Round Hill area Plan.
3. Appendix C - Items of correspondence – London Road Station North
4. Appendix D - London Road Station North area – Road by road analysis
5. Appendix E - Items of correspondence – Round Hill
6. Appendix F – Round Hill area – Road by road analysis
7. Appendix G - Support / Objections to TRO – Recent Parking scheme proposals

### **Background Documents**

1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011
2. Item 49 – Transport Committee Meeting Report – 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013

