

Subject:	Double Yellow Lines Traffic Order		
Date of Meeting:	1st July 2014		
Report of:	Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Charles Field	Tel: 29-3329
	Email:	Charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Hanover & Elm Grove and Hollingdean & Stanmer.		

GENERAL RELEASE

Note: The special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 7, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act as amended (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the Consultation period for the proposal ended only recently (Friday 20th June and allowing any late submissions over the weekend) and the information needed to be compiled into the report.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

- 1.1 The Parking Infrastructure Team has received a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions due to displacement from resident parking schemes. These requests have been from residents and Ward Councillors. This report considers the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contains proposals and amendments for a few roads in two wards.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Approve the Brighton & Hove Outer areas (Waiting, Loading, and Parking) and Cycle Lanes consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. *201* (TRO-16-2014) Traffic Regulation Order.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 This Traffic Order includes proposed double yellow line restrictions for a number of roads in the Hanover & Elm Grove and Hollingdean & Stanmer wards. This is in response to concerns about dangerous parking and obstruction following displacement from resident parking schemes.
- 3.2 This traffic order is funded through the capital code for implementing resident parking schemes because the impact of parking displacement is directly connected to the schemes. We are unable to carry out changes to parking restrictions outside of resident parking schemes from the revenue budget, with

the exception of disabled bay requests, as the revenue budget is now prioritised for essential signing and lining maintenance.

- 3.3 A number of support and objections were received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders. The comments, support and objections are summarised in Appendix A. Plans showing the proposals which have received comments / objections are shown in Appendix B.
- 3.4 Overall the Council has received 5 items of supporting correspondence for the double yellow lines with 3 containing general support for the restrictions in Hanover & Elm Grove and 2 items supporting the restrictions in the Hollingdean & Stanmer ward.
- 3.5 The Council has also received 9 items of objection from local residents.

Summary of Objections

- 3.6 **Double Yellow lines in Hollingbury & Stanmer** – There have been 4 objections to the proposed double yellow lines. The main concern is to the proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Hollingbury Park Avenue and Hollingbury Rise West as it would mean a loss of parking and cause increased speeds as visibility would be improved. It was felt by one objector that there isn't a current problem and that this would cause vehicle displacement.
- 3.7 **Double Yellow Lines in Hanover & Elm Grove** - There have been 5 objections to the proposed double yellow lines in this ward. The first is because there is a concern this is a precursor for a resident parking scheme and the other two are because they do not believe there is a problem. The third objection included comments: that they are a waste of money to mark & maintain, more enforcement will cause bad feeling, the visual impact of the lining, there is no evidence of a problem and no costings were given. A fourth objection was received as it was felt the proposals were not comprehensive enough and more lining was required. The final objection is regarding the yellow lines on the corner of Bentham Road and Islingword Place because it would mean a loss of parking spaces. It was also stated that there were insufficient notices displayed and they didn't show the closing date for responses.
- 3.8 These proposals have been taken forward due to concerns from local residents and Ward Councillors. Vehicles parked on corners cause obstruction to other road users and in some cases pedestrians if they park partly on the pavement. They also cause visibility issues for both other road users and pedestrians. Costings have not been provided yet but the estimate would be £1,400 for the traffic order and £500 for the road markings. Notices were put up in all the locations and they did indicate the closing date of 20th June as outlined below.

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 For the majority of the proposals the only alternative option 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 within the report.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between the 30th May 2014 and 20th June 2014.
- 5.2 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services.
- 5.3 Notices were also put on street on the 29th May 2014; these comprised of the notice as well as a plan showing the proposal and the reasons for it. The notice was also published in The Argus newspaper on the 30th May 2014. Detailed plans and the order were available to view at the Customer Service Centres at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall.
- 5.4 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the Council website.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 It is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The cost of this traffic order is funded from existing capital budgets

Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates

Date: 24/06/2014

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 The Traffic Orders have been advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the relevant procedure regulations.
- 7.3 As there are unresolved objections and representations they are now referred to this meeting for resolution.
- 7.4 There are no human rights implications to draw to Members' attention

Lawyer Consulted:

Katie Matthews

Date: 24/06/2014

Equalities Implications:

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

Sustainability Implications:

- 9.1 None identified

Any Other Significant Implications:

10.1 None identified

Crime & Disorder Implications:

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

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

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

Public Health Implications:

13.1 None identified

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

14.1 None identified

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1. Appendix A – summary of representations received
2. Appendix B - Plans showing the proposals

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None