

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Area E Resident Parking Scheme - Traffic Regulation Order Consultation</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> March 2014</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director – Environment, Development or 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>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>Withdean</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 a proposed resident parking scheme (Area E Residents Parking Scheme – Preston Park Station North area). The proposed scheme is Monday to Friday 9am-8pm (Appendix A). Double Yellow Lines were also advertised for consultation through a Traffic Regulation Order in Withdean Avenue and Withdean Road in response to concerns from residents about displacement (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 orders;
- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order 2008 No.\* 201\*
  - (b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\*
- 2.2 That the Committee notes that any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers will be added to the proposed scheme during implementation subject to advertisement and approval as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

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

- 3.1 In 2007, the residents of the Preston Park Station North area voted to be excluded from the proposed Zone 'A' (Original Preston Park Station Area) resident parking scheme, and therefore, these roads were not included within the proposed scheme.
- 3.2 Since then and the further inclusion of Tivoli Crescent into a resident parking scheme in 2011, this area has 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 2013 a 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 Preston Park Station (318 property addresses).
- 3.5 Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at: Church of the Good Shepherd (Dyke Road), 1pm to 5pm, Tuesday 17 September and 4pm to 8pm, Wednesday 18 September. There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Monday 2 September, 2013 to Friday 11 October, 2013, 9am to 5pm.
- 3.6 182 responses were received giving a response rate of 57%. The following responses were not included within this figure: Responses from outside the area (9) or where no street name was given (1). Also not included were 10 duplicates (only one response was included from each household).
- 3.7 To clarify, a section of the east side of Dyke Road (280-346 – even numbers) is contained within the proposed traffic order as eligible for an Area E permit (schedule 18.1 within the traffic order). This section of Dyke Road is not part of the scheme itself physically on the ground; however, residents on this section of the east side of the road were included in the consultation as they would be able to apply for Area E permits as part of the residents eligible for permits within the scheme. This is because we are proposing double yellow lines right outside these properties without an opportunity to park safely nearby.
- 3.8 Overall, 50% of respondents were in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 50% of respondents were against an extension to the scheme.
- 3.9 Analysis took place of all the comments received from residents in the proposed area and it was clear that views were very mixed but the most frequently occurring comment by those both supporting and against the proposed scheme was that the current parking problems were caused by commuters particularly during the week and that there were no parking problems at weekends. Apart from general support, negative comments and views that a scheme wasn't needed, the next most frequently made comment related to concerns about visitor parking which were either the cost, the amount of permits allowed, how it would restrict visitors for elderly and general concerns about visitors at weekends.
- 3.10 It is clear from the comments received as part of the questionnaires that residents who both support and oppose the scheme have concerns about restrictions being applied at the weekend. Therefore, it was recommended to take into account these comments and a Monday to Friday only stand alone resident parking scheme was proposed for further traffic order consultation (this is based on the fact the consultation result was split 50/50 but a large amount of comments were received from both residents in support and opposed to the resident parking scheme who had concerns about weekend restrictions as they were seen to be either not required and / or would limit visitor parking).

- 3.11 Officers met with all the Ward Councillors who have voiced their support for this way forward. However, they have outlined their concerns about displacement which were also received from a number of residents adjacent to the proposed scheme.
- 3.12 The Council have responded to these concerns and are proposing double yellow lines on one side of the road in Withdean Road and Withdean Avenue as outlined in Appendix B.
- 3.13 In terms of Hazeldene Meads and The Beeches any potential parking in this area would cause obstruction issues rather than Road Safety issues. However, if a scheme is approved the Council will meet up with representatives from these roads within three months after any operational start to discuss the way forward and the options available if problems occur.
- 3.14 Therefore, the recommendation on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2013 in the report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee was that this Monday to Friday proposal is recommended to be advertised as a traffic order allowing further comments to be made from residents both within and outside the new proposal (Appendix A). Leaflets were also sent directly to residents making them aware of the traffic order and how to make their views known. All comments would be reported back to this Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting. This was approved at the meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> November.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014 with the closing date for comments and objections on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2014.
- 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 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014 which outlined the proposal. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014. Detailed plans and the Traffic Regulation Order were available to view at the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. A plan detailing the proposals is shown on Appendix A & B.
- 4.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

##### *Preston Park Station North area*

- 4.5 There were 203 items of correspondence received to the Preston Park Station North area proposal. All 203 items were received from individuals and included support, objections and general comments. The comments / objections are listed in Appendix C.
- 4.6 62 items of correspondence were support for the proposals due to the parking problems in the area. 141 items of correspondence were objections to the proposals. The 203 items objecting included 165 from within the proposed area, 38 from outside the proposed area and a further 11 were discounted as addresses were not disclosed.
- 4.7 The support and objections by road are outlined in Appendix D. To put the responses into some context the support / objections / comments from previous resident parking schemes

since 2009 is outlined in Appendix E. Only twice in this period has there been more support than objections during the formal TRO 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.

### *Support*

- 4.8 The 62 representations that supported the scheme contained 7 different types of reasons to support the resident parking proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection).
- 4.9 36 of the representations were outlining that the scheme is needed.
- 4.10 12 of the representations were support for the revised weekday change and / or that it was a sensible compromise.
- 4.11 12 of the representations were support for the resident parking scheme but would have preferred seven day restrictions.
- 4.12 12 of the representations were general support for the resident parking scheme.
- 4.13 9 of the representations were support for the double yellow lines on Dyke Road.
- 4.14 1 of the representations was support for the double yellow lines on Withdean Avenue / Road.
- 4.15 1 of the representations was support for the resident parking scheme but reluctant about costs.

### *Objections*

- 4.16 The 141 representations that objected contained 15 different types of reasons to object to the resident parking / double yellow line proposals (some residents / businesses outlined more than one type of reason for their objection). These objections are all responded to in the following paragraph in sequence.
- 4.17 104 of the representations were that the change was not supported by the majority.
- 4.18 Paragraphs 3.7 to 3.9 above outline the reasons why a Monday to Friday scheme is being proposed based on the responses from the previous consultation.
- 4.19 102 of the representations were due to no parking problem being perceived in the area and no scheme was needed.
- 4.20 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. There was also a previous resident / Ward Councillor survey in the area presented to the Environment Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011.

- 4.21 92 of the representations were regarding the consultation process and / or that the process has been undemocratic / inadequate.
- 4.22 The consultation process has been extensive and is clearly outlined in this report and the background papers outlined below. All households that would be eligible for resident permits / visitor permits were included in the result of the consultation.
- 4.23 9 of the representations were that this is a waste of money for the Council, they do not want to pay to park and this will impose several restrictions.
- 4.24 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.
- 4.25 8 of the representations were concerned that displacement would occur.
- 4.26 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. The Council have responded to specific concerns and are proposing double yellow lines on one side of the road in Withdean Road and Withdean Avenue as outlined in Appendix B. In terms of Hazeldene Meads and The Beeches any potential parking in this area would cause obstruction issues rather than Road Safety issues. However, if a scheme is approved the Council will meet up with representatives from these roads within three months after any operational start to discuss the way forward and the options available.
- 4.27 7 of the representations object to or have concerns about the double yellow lines on Withdean Road / Avenue.
- 4.28 The Council have responded to road safety concerns about vehicle displacement and are proposing double yellow lines on one side of the road in Withdean Road and Withdean Avenue as outlined in Appendix B.
- 4.29 6 of the representations were a general objection or that other solutions were required.
- 4.30 4 of the representations object to the double yellow lines on Dyke Road.
- 4.31 It is felt these double yellow lines are required to prevent parking on the advisory cycle lane which may become greater due to vehicle displacement if these lines were not proposed. There has been support for the double yellow lines during the previous consultation and the traffic consultation (see Paragraph 4.12 above).

- 4.32 4 of the representations received were unhappy about the hours of the scheme or requested that a light touch parking scheme should be considered.
- 4.33 In the Citywide Parking Review report that was presented to Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2015 it was approved that no new further stand alone 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. The hours proposed during the week are in line with the current Area A resident parking scheme to prevent displacement from that scheme particularly in the early evenings.
- 4.34 3 of the representations received were unhappy at the reduction of resident parking spaces available due to various reasons such as double yellow lines across driveways and at junctions.
- 4.35 Double yellow line restrictions will apply across all vehicle accesses. Whilst this means that residents or their guests will not be able to park across a garage or drive access, it will ensure that these remain unblocked and enforceable by the civil enforcement officers at all times. Double yellow lines are also placed on junctions for safety reasons.
- 4.36 1 of the representations was concerned that the proposals would affect local facilities due to the charges.
- 4.37 Officers have considered the 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 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.
- 4.38 1 of the representations did not want unsightly pay & display machines or signage in their area.
- 4.39 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.
- 4.40 1 of the representations was that this proposal won't solve the parking problems overnight.
- 4.41 The 9am-8pm resident parking scheme proposal was designed by officers as it was felt this would be the best scheme for the area taking into account comments received and previous experience of implementing resident parking schemes over the last few years.
- 4.42 1 of the representations outlines this will affect commuters.

- 4.43 As with all the parking schemes proposed in 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 commuters using parking places will pay for their use.
- 4.44 1 of the representations is concerned that this is a divisive scheme and a Citywide Parking Review is required.
- 4.45 A Citywide Parking Review was undertaken by the Council and the results of this were presented to the Transport Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

## **Conclusions**

- 4.46 The 203 Items of correspondence from residents within the proposed scheme is broken down by road in Appendix D with support and objection in comparison to the previous consultation results.
- 4.47 It is important that the Committee notes that as outlined in Appendix D from the original consultation area (where there was 91 for and 91 against in a private vote) there are 60 items of support and 105 objections to this more recent traffic order.
- 4.48 It is also important to consider that just over 60 of the representations in objection were handed in together in the same envelope with the same letter text and each signed individually. This indicates that possibly an organised door-to-door survey took place and letters may not have been signed privately as opposed to the previous consultation. A number of the submissions were also from the same household (in some cases three family / household members) as opposed to the original consultation which was one submission per household.
- 4.49 To put the responses into some context the support / objections / comments from previous resident parking schemes since 2009 is outlined in Appendix E. Only twice in this period has there been more support than objections during the formal TRO stage and this was for single road extensions to schemes (Preston Park Avenue and Canning Street).
- 4.50 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.
- 4.51 The Withdean Ward Councillors have been made aware of the consultation responses and the context outlined above and support the officer recommendations.
- 4.52 Therefore, the recommendation is that this parking scheme proposal and double yellow lines be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background and following the consideration of all the consultation responses.
- 4.53 Any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers will be added to the proposed scheme during implementation subject to advertisement and approval as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.
- 4.54 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





5.8 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. 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 – Preston Park Station North area Plan
2. Appendix B – Withdean Road / Avenue Plan.
3. Appendix C - Preston Park Station North area - List of Objections / Comments
4. Appendix D – Support / Objections – Road by Road Analysis
5. Appendix E – Recent consultation results.

### **Background Documents**

1. Item 90 – Environment Committee Meeting Report – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011
2. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011
3. Item 49 – Transport Committee Meeting Report – 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013
4. Item 51 – Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee Meeting Report – 26<sup>th</sup> November 2013.