

Subject:	Wish Ward - Resident Parking Scheme Consultation		
Date of Meeting:	4th March 2013		
Report of:	Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: Ext: 3329
	Email:	Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Wish		

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address responses to an initial consultation in the Wish Ward. The consultation asked residents, business and services whether they would like to be consulted on a full detailed design for a resident parking scheme. Permission to proceed with the initial consultation was agreed at the Transport Committee meeting on 15th January 2013 as part of the Citywide Parking Review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee approves:

(a) That a new proposal for a resident parking scheme be consulted upon in the Wish Park / Aldrington Recreation Ground area under one of the following options;

- i) Consult residents in the agreed streets for a stand alone full scheme (9am-8pm Mon to Sun) or an extension to the Zone W light touch scheme (10am-11am & 7pm-8pm Mon to Sun).

or;

- ii) Consult residents in the agreed streets on an extension to the Zone W light touch scheme (11am-Noon & 7pm-8pm Mon to Sun)

or;

- iii) Consult residents in the agreed streets on a stand alone full scheme (9am-8pm Mon to Sun).

(b) To take forward Bolsover Road as an extension to Area R (Westbourne West) as part of the next stage of consultation and to take forward an option to create parking lay-bys on the west side to maximise parking.

(c) That a further consultation for a resident parking scheme in any other roads within Wish Ward is not taken forward at this stage.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 As part of the Citywide Parking Review report presented to the Transport Committee Meeting on 15th January 2013 it was agreed to consult residents in the Wish Ward not currently within a resident parking scheme (excluding Boundary Road) to determine whether they would like to be consulted on a full detailed design for a resident parking scheme.
- 3.2 This was further confirmed in a report to the Transport Committee on 30th April 2013 which approved an initial consultation giving authority to proceed to detailed design consultation on any proposed scheme. The full background regarding the citywide parking review is outlined in this report.
- 3.3 In November 2013 a leaflet, map and questionnaire was sent to all property addresses in the Wish Ward area, excluding residents currently in a resident parking scheme, and excluding all property addresses in Boundary Road (Appendix A).
- 3.4 As outlined in the report to the Committee meeting on 30th April 2013 there were community meetings in the West Hove and South Portslade areas during the city wide parking review in 2012 where several business owners in Boundary Road attended. They said that the current arrangements of one hour free bays and single yellow lines worked well for them and they did not favour any changes.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 3027 property addresses in the Wish Ward area of Hove. An information leaflet, detailed map, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. Residents were given further information on how similar schemes currently operate as these are the types of schemes that would likely be considered.
- 4.2 1217 responses were received giving a high response rate of 40.2% which included 14 people who did not answer the question. A further 15 responses were not included where no street name was given (4) and where duplicates were sent (11).
- 4.3 Overall, 39.1% of respondents required a residents parking scheme and to see a detailed design while 60.1% of respondents did not want a parking scheme in their area. The full results analysis of the consultation is outlined in Appendix B.
- 4.4 Analysis took place of all the responses received from residents in the Wish Ward area and it was clear that there were two proposals that could be considered to take forward to the next stage of consultation (Appendix C).

Wish Park area

- 4.5 Within an area around Wish Park / Aldrington Recreation Ground there was a section of roads that were 57.8% in favour of a consultation of a detailed design (Appendix D). This included four roads in favour (New Church Road between Wish Road and Saxon Road, Glendor Road, Marine Avenue and Saxon Road), three roads slightly against a resident parking scheme (Kingsway between Wish Road and Saxon Road, Norman Road and Tandridge Road) and one road that was 50/50 (Tennis Road). This section would also

include Wharf Road entered from the Kingsway where there are no immediate properties (Appendix E).

4.6 The initial letter sent out to residents outlined that we would not be proposing any further light touch schemes due to the conclusions of the Citywide Parking Review presented to the Transport Committee on 15th January 2013.

4.7 However, this was on the basis that a large area of the Wish Ward was being consulted and a new scheme would have to be a full scheme between 9am-8pm. However, due to the following reasons it is proposed that an extension to the Area W resident parking scheme could also be considered;

- The conclusion of the Citywide Parking Review stated that there should be no further light touch schemes. However, this would be a small extension to an existing light touch scheme.
- Although it was stated a full scheme only (9am-8pm) would be considered in the leaflet that was on the basis of the whole larger area being consulted. The result shows a small possible area to take forward in Wish Park adjacent to an existing light touch scheme.
- There could be pay & display bays (up to four hours in this case) in Saxon Road for users to the park. This would solve any issues for park users and indeed visitors for other services not being able to park in the restricted hours. It is also proposed to consider pay & display bays (up to four hours) in Wish Road adjacent to the park although this would be considered separately as part of the next available amendment Traffic Order for changes within resident parking schemes. This would review the current utilisation of parking spaces in Wish Road.

Extension to the Area W Light touch scheme ((10am-11am & 7pm-8pm Mon to Sun).

4.8 In terms of a Light Touch scheme in this area these are the pros and cons;

Pros

- Residents may prefer an extension to the Light touch scheme rather than a full scheme.
- Slightly reduced Resident Permit costs
- The feedback from the majority of residents in current light touch schemes is that they are happy with them.
- Free to park for the majority of the day.
- Less intrusive signage.

Cons

- There may be revenue implications of not having shared pay & display spaces and reduced resident permit costs.
- There may be issues for visitors to residents by not including shared pay & display spaces
- There may be issues with people parking to use the seafront and other facilities after 11am until 7pm particularly in the summer periods.

- This may increase vehicle displacement to adjacent roads as there will only be an opportunity for visitors to park near the park and not on any other roads included within a light touch parking scheme.

A new stand alone full scheme (9am-8pm Mon to Sun)

4.9 In terms of a new stand alone full scheme in this area these are the pros and cons;

Pros

- Residents were originally consulted on this sole option and agreed to be consulted on these proposals.
- The restrictions are more flexible to allow visitors to park in the area and for longer periods.
- Restrictive parking throughout the day from 9am to 8pm may help residents and visitors to park.
- The resident permit is valid during the whole period from 9am-8pm.
- Although displacement may occur it is likely to be reduced slightly by introducing shared pay & display for longer periods.

Cons

- A new stand alone full scheme proposal (9am-8pm) would mean the existing light touch scheme (Area W – Westbourne West) would be sandwiched within two full schemes.
- More / larger signage required compared to light touch schemes
- Resident permit costs are slightly higher.
- Residents may prefer more resident permit parking rather than some shared pay & display parking.

4.10 Residents, businesses and services in this proposed area would have the opportunity to vote for or against a resident parking scheme based on the consultation proposal agreed in the recommendations as part of the next stage of consultation on the full detailed design.

4.11 If a light touch scheme is taken forward then this would be the last extension to the Area W light touch resident parking scheme. This is because if the scheme became any larger than the current scheme and the possible extension area this could cause internal commuting e.g. residents using their permits / visitor permits to use in other roads. The conclusion of the Citywide Parking Review reported to Transport Committee on 15th January 2013 stated that there should be no further light touch schemes although this would be a small extension to an existing scheme.

Bolsover Road

4.12 Respondents from Bolsover Road were strongly in favour of a consultation on a full detailed design (89.1%) so it proposed that they are consulted on an extension to the Area R (Westbourne) resident parking scheme (Mon to Sun, 9am-8pm) as they are immediately adjacent to this zone (Appendix E)

4.13 Officers have met with representatives of the local resident association and it was made clear that residents want to be consulted on a detailed design as long as it created parking on both sides of the road. During previous consultations when parking was proposed on

one side only there was strong opposition to the proposals as this would severely restrict the parking available to residents. It was made clear at the time that the Council could not condone pavement parking and this could not be considered as part of any proposals. Therefore, it was recommended not to proceed with any resident parking scheme in this road.

- 4.14 As Bolsover Road is a very unique road with wide pavements a number of investigations have been undertaken for various options to maximise parking. The only option that was viable both practically and financially was to cut a number of parking spaces 1.1 metres into the west side of the pavement where the existing street furniture allows and make the road one way northwards. It was calculated this may create up to 44 parking spaces on this side of the road in addition to the 46 spaces on the other side (total of 90 spaces).
- 4.15 The estimated cost of this work would be just over £30,000. Residents are unlikely to want a resident parking scheme unless additional parking is provided so in effect the above fee would be paid under capital expenditure through the parking scheme costs. This would be on the basis that the Council would get an annual fee from approx up to 90 permits (current cost is £120 each) of £10,800. So in effect this carriageway work would pay itself back in three years. Due to the costs involved and the unpredictability of resident permit take up the Council would also need to consider a section of shared pay & display / resident permit spaces on the west side of the road.
- 4.16 This proposal would not set a pavement parking precedent as the Council would widen the carriageway to create lay-bys between the street furniture. It also would not set a precedent for other parking schemes because there are very few streets in the city where the pavements are wide enough to be able to do this and where the road layout makes this an appropriate option. The current pavement on the west side is three metres wide and would be reduced to 1.9 metres under the proposal which would still leave a significant amount of width for the remaining pavement.
- 4.17 However, although initial checks have been made and it looks unlikely that services will be found when moving the carriageway, if the costs increase due to issues such as underground cables / drainage issues then this proposal would have to be reviewed.

Other Roads

- 4.18 The respondents of the vast majority of the other roads consulted were either 50/50 or against any resident parking scheme in their road. The exception to this was the following five roads;
- Worcester Villas (79.5% - 35 votes to 9)
 - Chelston Avenue (53.5% - 8 votes to 7)
 - Portland Villas (65% - 26 votes to 14)
 - Mornington Crescent (66.7% - 2 votes to 1)
 - Portland Lane (100% - 1 vote to 0)
- 4.19 However, there is no viable scheme or geographical boundary that would allow these roads to be consulted as an area for a resident parking scheme. Therefore, it is proposed not to take forward a further consultation in any of the other roads within Wish Ward.
- 4.20 As concerns have been outlined about dangerous and obstructive parking the Council are recommending proposing double yellow lines in Chelston Avenue (junction with Portland

Road) and Olive Road (East side) as part of the scheme costs to counter any possible increased vehicle displacement. This would be part of the traffic order advertised for the schemes only if any scheme is taken forward.

- 4.21 Officers have met with both the Wish Ward Councillors who have voiced their support for all these ways forward.

Conclusions

- 4.22 It has been recommended to take into account the responses received and a consultation on a detailed design take place in the Wish Park / Aldrington Recreation Ground area based on the consultation proposal agreed in the recommendations.
- 4.23 Also recommended is to take forward Bolsover Road as an extension to Area R (Westbourne West) as part of further consultation and to take forward an option to create parking lay-bys on the west side of parking to maximise parking.
- 4.24 It is also been recommended at a later date to advertise double yellow lines on the East side of the road in Olive Road and on the junction of Portland Road / Chelston Avenue if any schemes are taken forward. This will be included in the recommendations for any further committee report if appropriate.
- 4.25 Therefore, it is recommended not to take forward a further consultation for a resident parking scheme in any of the other roads within Wish Ward at this stage.
- 4.26 All residents in the Wish Ward who have been consulted will be sent a newsletter following any Committee decision to inform them of the way forward.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 Capital: New parking schemes are capital projects which are funded by unsupported borrowings, and repaid from revenue over 7 years, using the income generated.

Revenue: income generated from on-street parking schemes is first defrayed against relevant expenditure with any surplus used for transport and highways related projects and expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares and Local Transport Plan projects.

Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates

Date: 04/02/2014

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 The Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act") must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic including cyclists and pedestrians. As far as is practicable, the Council should have regard to any implications in relation to:- access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public

services vehicles; securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.

5.3 The Council has to follow the rules on consultation set out by the government and the courts. The Council must ensure that the consultation process is carried out at a time when proposals are still at their formative stage, that sufficient reasons and adequate time must be given to allow intelligent consideration and responses and that results are properly taken into account in finalising the proposals.

5.4 After the proposals are advertised, the Council can, in the light of objections / representations received, decide to re-consult either widely or specifically when it believes that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of any associated orders. Where there are unresolved objections to the traffic orders, then the matter is required to return to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.

5.5 Under the Act the Council may acquire, whether by purchase or by hiring, such parking meters and other apparatus as appear to it to be required or likely to be required for the purposes of its functions in relation to designated parking places.

Lawyer Consulted : Hilary Woodward

Date:10 February 2014

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

5.7 Any new motorcycle bays and any on-street pedal cycle 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 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.

Public Health Implications:

5.11 There are no direct public health implications in this report.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.12 Any 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 alternative options are going ahead with a full scheme in the Wish Park area or doing nothing at all which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that proposals put forward are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To seek approval to proceed to the next stage of consultation after taking into consideration the consultation report. These proposals are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Appendix A – Map of area consulted.
2. Appendix B – The consultation report
3. Appendix C – Plan showing roads in favour / against
4. Appendix D – Analysis / results of Wish park area.
5. Appendix E – Map of proposal areas to take forward

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Item 43 - Environment Cabinet Member Meeting Report – 9th November 2011
2. Item 49 – Transport Committee Meeting Report – 15th January 2013
3. Item 80 – Transport Committee Meeting Report – 30th April 2013