# ENVIRONMENT TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

# Agenda Item 22

**Brighton & Hove City Council** 

Subject: Surrenden Road Traffic Management/Road Safety

Scheme

Date of Meeting: 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014

Report of: Strategic Director of Environment, Development and

Housing

Contact Officer: Name: Len Holloway Tel: 29-2184

Email: Len.holloway@brighton-hove.gcsx.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: Westdene

#### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to address two objections received in relation to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order that contains proposals for waiting restrictions to support a local road safety and traffic management scheme in Surrenden Road, Brighton. The aim of the scheme is to improve pedestrian crossing facilities at various locations along the road.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee, having taken into account all duly made objections received, approves the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.
- 2.2 Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. \* 201\* (TRO-)

#### 3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Council receive many requests each year for controlled pedestrian crossing facilities in various roads throughout the city. These roads are assessed using nationally recognised and adopted criteria and then ranked for consideration of appropriate measures. Not all requests meet the required criteria and many do not justify expenditure. However, where there are exceptional circumstances (for example on routes to schools) alternative measures may be explored that could assist pedestrians with crossing these roads.
- 3.2 Surrenden Road was assessed for a controlled crossing in 2012 but did not meet the criteria. It was, however, considered to be one of the roads that should be explored for further measures, for reasons including; the number of school journeys in the area that traverse Surrenden Road and, in conjunction with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. A scheme comprising localised measures to slow traffic, increase visibility and reduce crossing distance aims to improve crossing opportunity over the length of Surrenden Road south of Loder Road has been developed.

- 3.3 The design also creates chicanes by re-organising on-street parking into a staggered formation within the northbound carriageway of Surrenden Road and by providing build outs and waiting restrictions, within the southbound carriageway, to create the objectives above.
- 3.4 Two objections to the advertised waiting restrictions were received from residents of streets adjacent to Surrenden Road and hard copies of these are available to view in the Members room. No objections were received from residents of Surrenden Road itself. The objections are summarised thus;
- 3.5 One objection in relation to the provision of parking bays adjacent to the central reserve was received stating that this will obscure the vision of oncoming vehicles and that occupants will have to cross the road after alighting from vehicles.
- 3.6 In response to this objection, visibility towards the south end of Surrenden Road is has been reviewed and is adequate for the new speed limit, and assisted the layout of the road which bends away from the junction. This significantly increases the distance over which oncoming vehicles can be seen. In addition parking on the southbound carriageway currently takes place on the offside of the road, so users are already accustomed to this layout.
- 3.7 The second objection related to the adjustment of double yellow lines opposite Herbert Road on the north bound carriageway. The objector stated that pedestrians will be unable to see approaching traffic and access to vehicles will be via a grassed area. The objection states that as child seats are predominantly positioned on the near side of vehicles this proposed scheme will cause a hazard when children are being loaded in to vehicles.
- 3.8 In response to this objection the detailed drawings for the proposals show that the scheme includes the construction of a footway alongside the road. Safe access to vehicles will be via this footway and not via the grass verge, allowing safer access for people with children.

#### 4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

4.1 Controlled crossings can be installed in locations that do not meet the national criteria but it is not considered good practice. If crossings are introduced in such locations but are underused on a regular basis, drivers can become accustomed to not having to stop with potentially disastrous consequences.

## 5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

Concern at the difficulty experienced by local residents crossing Surrenden Road at busy times has been raised by local ward Councillors and many individual residents. Officers have also met with local residents and Councillors on a number of occasions and have consulted on the scheme at these meetings and via e mail. The plans have been positively received by these groups.

5.1 The Traffic Regulation Order for the waiting restrictions was advertised on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2014 in The Argus newspaper and notices were also put up on the road

inviting any interested parties to view the plans at Brighton and Hove Libraries and City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.

#### 6. CONCLUSION

6.1 That the Committee (having taken into account the objections received) approve the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised for the reasons stated in this report.

#### 7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

#### Financial Implications:

7.1 The capital costs associated to the recommendations of this report will be funded from the Local Transport Plan capital programme. The total budget allocation for pedestrian crossings in 2014-15 is £80,000 as approved at Policy and Resources Committee.

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford Date: 16/06/14

## **Legal Implications:**

- 7.2 The Council regulates traffic by means of orders made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act"). Procedural requirements are contained in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and require public notice of orders to be given.
- 7.3 The Council is under a duty to exercise its powers under the Act to secure the safe and convenient movement of traffic.
- 7.4 Any person may object to the making of an order.
- 7.5 Where there are unresolved objections to the Order, then the matter is required to return to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision
- 7.6 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention at this stage.

Lawyer Consulted: Katie Matthews Date: 12/06/14

## **Equalities Implications:**

7.7 The scheme should improve conditions for vulnerable road users and has the potential to ease community severance by aiding the development of healthy and sustainable places and communities. In reducing the perception of road danger the scheme should enable children, young people and adults to make more and better use of their local streets.

#### Sustainability Implications:

7.8 The proposed scheme should assist the Council in encouraging more sustainable transport use such as walking and cycling by reducing vehicle speeds and improving safety and the perception that the streets are safer and more user friendly. Any modal shift to more sustainable transport achieved could also assist in improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions contributing to the Council's 'One Planet Living' programme

# **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

## **Appendices:**

1. Plan of the scheme

#### **Documents in Members' Rooms**

Copies of the objections received

# **Background Documents**

1. None

## Appendix 1.

## Crime & Disorder Implications:

1.1 There are no Crime and Disorder Implications of the report at this time.

#### Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

1.2 There is a risk that the scheme will not achieve its objectives, however, it will be subject to ongoing monitoring and evaluation. Should this show that the scheme aims are not being achieved remedial action may be taken in consultation with the local community.

## Public Health Implications:

1.3 It is likely that the scheme will support people to choose more physically active lifestyles by opting to make healthier active travel choices such as walking and cycling. Physically active adults have less risk of premature death and of chronic diseases with the direct cost of physical inactivity to the NHS across the UK is estimated to be £1.06 billion. For Brighton & Hove this cost is estimated to be £3.077,340

Promoting active travel can bring important health benefits but also contributes to objectives in relation to sustainability & congestion & air pollution, especially to reduction in particulate matter.

NICE guidance PH 8, PH 25 and PH 31 all recommend the prioritisation of pedestrian and cyclists as means to improve public health

## Corporate / Citywide Implications:

1.4 The proposed scheme will assist the Council to meet its strategic objectives and will contribute to the Council's and partners' wider objectives including those set out in the Corporate Plan and the Sustainable Community Strategy.