

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Notification of two Deputations has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**(v) Deputation concerning 20mph Speed Limit for Surrenden Road****Spokesperson: Esther Gill**

“We are three local residents with children at Dorothy Stringer and Varndean School who would like to ask you to rethink your decision to keep Surrenden Road at 30 mph. We thank a number of you who have come and seen for yourselves just how dangerous this road is, particularly at school opening and closing times. Hundreds of children (many as young as 11) cross this dual carriageway daily on their way to and from school and college. The Council’s own research show that cars regularly drive in excess of 30 mph; there is at least one dangerous blind corner on the road and not a single controlled crossing along the whole road where children can control the traffic. You would not want your children or grandchildren crossing this road at 8.30am on a school day. As one of our daughters said, “Sometimes, you just have to go for it”.

We have been told by Council Officers that they recognise that there is a road safety issue on Surrenden Road which is why they have recommended a 20mph speed limit, as well as a number of planned traffic calming measures for installation this year. However, we are very concerned that this opportunity will be wasted as the proposed new measures do not include any controlled crossing that would allow children to stop the traffic. The road already has dropped curbs and they don’t help the children who still have to take a chance and run across the road as quickly as possible to avoid the vehicles, many of them travelling in excess of 30 mph.

Those Councillors who took up the invitation to meet us, saw for themselves just how dangerous this road is and how cars have to suddenly break as teenagers dash out in front of them having just got off a bus. To successfully deal with this safety issue, it is critical we first deal with the speed of traffic on the road and then introduce measures to allow children to stop the traffic.

**This is not a ward issue as children from across Brighton and Hove go to schools and colleges on this campus. Right next to the schools is a dual carriageway where cars regularly drive in excess of 30 mph. There is not one location on the entire road where children can stop the traffic. Every day we see children as young as 11 half running, half hesitating when they see a gap in the traffic. You can see in their faces they are unsure whether it is safe or not to cross. Often it is not.**

We ask you as community leaders to prioritise the safety of children and young people who are travelling to and from school and college. Listen to the local community who voted with a significant majority for the 20mph zone and reconsider your vote to allow the 20mph speed limit on Surrenden Road. Many thanks for listening to what we have to say.”

*Nicolette Fox, Esther Gill, Sandra Staufer*

## Supporting Information:

We are sure you know the facts, but they are so important that they are worth repeating:

- 1) Surrenden Road is a busy dual carriageway and sits alongside the largest campus of schools in Brighton. Over 5000 children and young people attend the schools and colleges on this campus (Varndean College, Downs View Link College, Dorothy Stringer School, Varndean School, Balfour Primary School) and a significant number of them will need to cross Surrenden Road on a daily basis, either because they live south or west of the road, or because they travel to school by bus, something that the Council actively encourages.
- 2) Well over half (57%) of Surrenden Road residents, who voted in the 2013 consultation, were in favour of the 20mph limit across the area. The Preston area as a whole voted 62.8% in favour of the 20 mph limit – the highest majority in favour of the 20mph in the consultation. There is significant support in the Preston area for a 20mph speed limit.
- 3) "Vehicle speeds predict both the frequency as well as the severity of pedestrian injuries. Five percent of pedestrians would die when struck by a vehicle travelling 20 mph, about 40 percent for vehicles travelling 30mph, about 80 percent for vehicles travelling 40mph." *National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1999. Literature Review on Vehicle Travel Speeds and Pedestrian Injuries.*  
<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/research/pub/HS809012.html>.
- 4) We also know that from the council's own figures from June 2013 that 85% of traffic driving north along Surrenden Road breaks the speed limit by travelling at 34mph. We often see vehicles driving considerably faster than this.
- 5) Martin Heath, Brighton and Hove Road Safety Manager, has confirmed to us that the proposed pedestrian works on Surrenden Road, that will begin shortly, do not include any controlled crossings that will allow children to stop the traffic.
- 6) The part of Surrenden Road that buses use is less than one mile long. At 30mph, a bus driving consistently at the speed limit and not stopping will take two minutes to do this journey. The same bus driving consistently at 20mph and not stopping will take three minutes to do this journey. It is very unlikely, due to parked cars, pedestrians and bus stops that buses currently travel at 30mph down this road.

**(vi) Deputation from ConsultUs (Community Parking Committee)**

James Thompson (Lead Spokesperson)  
Angela Moore  
Ruth Keynes  
Suzanne Jarrett  
Neil Waugh  
Nigel Goddard

ConsultUs (Community Parking Committee) was formed in response to local resident's concerns that a parking solution was being imposed on the area which did not address adequately the parking issues within our community.

Peter Turner's letter of 6th January to residents advising the advertisement of formal Traffic Orders stated that this stage "is still part of the consultation procedure and members of the public are still able to comment, support or object to part or all of the proposals."

The Officers report to this committee released on 24 February (4.40pm) advised that out of 203 items of correspondence received in response to this stage of the consultation, 141 were objections to the proposals. So 69%, i.e. over 2/3rds of respondents are opposed to the proposed scheme. In the correspondence objecting to the implementation of these proposals many residents raised a number of salient points which officers have simply chosen to ignore. There is no mention in the appendices of these issues, it simply concludes "not needed in the area". This is a complete misrepresentation of resident's views and concerns and is evidence of some serious flaws in the report.

Previously at the Committee meeting on 26 November 2013, a petition was handed in containing 260 signatures opposed to scheme, yet this is not mentioned in the background to the report.

Dyke Road (East) has been included in the scheme but has a completely different set of requirements. The issue is double yellow lines NOT residents parking. Stripping away this confusion, shows that a majority of residents with real parking needs were against a scheme.

So why are the Officers recommending that the Committee approves this scheme?  
What clearer message is needed that there is not a majority in favour.

The Council has already flouted its own Policy HP4/15 which states "that a new area will be recommended for funding provided that a majority of resident are in favour of the scheme." The result of the original (and only) questionnaire was exactly 50% for/50% against.

So why is the Committee recommending spending tax payers money on an inappropriate parking scheme without a mandate to do so?

The Council claims it embarked on this consultation after representations from residents and Ward Councillors. But there are no published conclusions from a Traffic Survey (unlike the Preston Park Triangle consultation) which demonstrate a proven need for either a 7 day or 5 day scheme.

**In conclusion,**

- **a majority of residents are not in favour of this proposed scheme**

- **the evidence for a scheme has been weak and is not underpinned by firm evidence**
- **if the Committee approve this report the Members will be agreeing to unlawfully adopt a scheme in contravention of its own policies**
- **in view of the undisputed response from residents, we urge that Members act democratically and do NOT approve the Traffic Orders**

## Background Information

### Response to individual points made in the Report to Committee

3.7 "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 resident eligible for permits within the scheme. we are proposing double yellow lines right outside these properties [Dyke Road (East) 280-346 even numbers] without an opportunity to park safely nearby."

**This is untrue - ample opportunity exists on Dyke Road (West) and the roads on the Hove side of Dyke Road which is physically closer than proposed Area E.**

3.9 "there were no parking problems at weekends"

**This is untrue - there is no evidence from the statistics obtained from the Traffic Survey that was carried out on Tuesday 19 March 2013 and Saturday 23 March 2013, that there is a difference between weekday parking and weekend day parking.**

3.10 "It is clear...."

**This is untrue - how can it be clear what somebody who opposes a scheme wants from interpreting their comments? The word "interpretation" is key here. To truly understand what residents want would require another questionnaire including a yes/no preference question.**

4.7 (repeated at 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."

**This is untrue - Peter Turner's letter of 6th January to residents advising the advertisement of formal Traffic Orders stated that this stage "is still part of the consultation procedure and members of the public are still able to comment, support or object to part or all of the proposals." The officers have misled residents if the TRO stage is only to outline concerns, rather than to influence the scheme's destiny.**

4.26 "The council is aware that the introduction of a parking scheme may (emphasis added) cause some displacement into adjacent areas..."

**This is untrue - the introduction of a parking scheme will cause some displacement into adjacent areas. Why else are double yellow lines being introduced under a separate Traffic Order in Withdean Road and Withdean Avenue on the periphery of the area.**

4.48 "over 60 of the representations in objection were handed in together in the same envelope (emphasis added)..."

**This is untrue - a bundle of individual letters in individual envelopes were delivered to the council offices. The inference here is that coercion was used to obtain objections to the scheme. The council is welcome to check all respondents genuinely objected to the scheme (addresses are shown on all letters). Councillors must be aware that a petition can be an organised survey, but that makes it no less relevant in expressing the collective views of individuals.**

## Thought for the day

If commuters and displaced vehicles from Zone A, or elsewhere, are contributing to the perceived problem in Matlock Road, Maldon Road, Tivoli Road and Tivoli Crescent North, why are the empty spaces in adjoining Zone A not being utilised to avoid the need for a scheme in proposed Area E? Why is the council reluctant to address this question?

Note: The photographs below were all taken early on a Sunday morning when residents cars had not left Zone A and give an accurate representation of the amount of under occupancy that exists.



## Parking is a problem in the proposed Zone E?

