

A recent history of Round Hill's planning concerns 2007-2011

	CONTENTS	Page
12 Feb 2007	Newhaven incinerator to come before ESCC planning committee	2
4 Apr 2007	Round Hill residents consulted RE BHCC's Urban Characterisation Study	2
3 May 2007	35 units proposed on former Esso garage site in Hollingdean Road	3
27 May 2007	Update on proposal for a 7-storey building on the former Esso site in Hollingdean Road	4
15 Jun 2007	Proposed overdevelopment on former Esso Garage Site refused	5
5 Jul 2007	Carelet appeal against refusal of their 9 three-storey house proposal	6
12 Jul 2007	Carelet's appeal against refusal of their 9-house proposal withdrawn	6
10 Aug 2007	Southern Primary Housing appeal against refusal of 7-storey block of 35 units on former Esso Garage site	8
8 Mar 2009	rBHCC admits that removal of Victorian street light columns in Round Hill was work done in error	9
25 Oct 2009	Council officers recommend approval of Ashdown Road development	10
5 May 2011	Online petition in favour of Controlled Parking Zone in Round Hill	12
5 May 2011	Refuting the argument that it is the residents themselves who cause parking problems	12
7 May 2011	CPZs s divisive issue, but here's the case in favour of them.	14
9 May 2011	Legal/Safe On Street Parking Space is a finite resource.	15
9 May 2011	We need to vote for preferential treatment for our own residents	17
11 May 2011	Aren't you being xenophobic in your attitude to outsiders	18
16 Jun 2011	"There is still plenty of space to park without a CPZ if motorists would park sensibly (i.e. bumper to bumper)"	19
18 Jun 2011	"We would be better off if there were no CPZs at all! The Green Party is to blame!"	20
21 Jun 2011	"CPZs take away parking space as a result of all the yellow lining"	21
3 July 2011	"Traffic Regulations Orders (e.g. yellow lines) can be requested without resorting to a CPZ"	23
26 Nov 2011	Proposal to build "an earthship" on open space to west of Cat Creep	25
2 Dec 2012	Comment to protect the open space to the west of the Cat Creep	27

12 Feb 2007 - Newhaven incinerator to come before ESCC planning committee

Veolia's Newhaven incinerator proposal, with important implications for their works at Hollingdean Depot, is to come before East Sussex County Council's Planning Committee on WEDNESDAY 21st FEBRUARY 2007 at 10.00 AM.

If this proposal is REFUSED, this could delay continued construction works at Hollingdean Depot. If re-submitted applications for the incinerator at Newhaven are REFUSED, there may have to be a major rethink about Hollingdean Depot. Planning permission for the latter has already been granted, but on condition that construction is completed within a given time-frame.

See The Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> for info on how to contact East Sussex CC's Planning Committee Members who will decide on the Newhaven Incinerator.

MESSAGE FROM ALISON WALTERS (FRIENDS OF THE EARTH)

DOVE 'Defenders of the Ouse Valley and Estuary' are organising a demonstration for the morning from about 09.45 outside the council offices (East Sussex County Council, County Hall, St Anne's Crescent, Lewes, BN7 1SF. Tel: 01273 481000)

Please join them in support if you can make it. Bring groups, friends, families, placards, etc.

4 Apr 2007 Round Hill residents consulted RE BHCC's Urban Characterisation Study

21 round hill neighbourhood

context



topography & microclimate

As the name suggests, Round Hill neighbourhood lies on rising ground immediately north of the city centre. The neighbourhood provides views over the city, including to St. Peter's Church, the sea and the Downs. Although mostly on raised ground, the streets feel sheltered from the prevailing winds. The abundance of street trees help to reduce wind speeds and provide shade in the summer.

ke

Rou
cent
cour

Befo
pop,
the
went
Som
of B
sub
Lew

The
Apl
spat
with
Park

tyj

Rou
pre-
arch
Man
envi
park

Ref
on la

The Council would welcome residents' feedback (during April 2007) on this first draft about Round Hill people's habits and the most valued features of our area.

See https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/sites/default/files/migrated/article/inline/downloads/conservation/UrbanStdy_Round_Hill_final.pdf

Have they got us right? Note that the Urban Characterisation Study is not the same as the Conservation Area Definition Statement.

The definition of Round Hill in this recent study, which claims to be guided by a concept of "neighbourhood", extends beyond the boundaries of the conservation area to London Road and Lewes Road.

Draft descriptions have recently been prepared in-house (i.e. by planning officers at Brighton and Hove City Council) characterising over 30 neighbourhoods in our city and they are posted on the Council's web site at <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk>

To see an index of all the studies, use the menu on the LHS of the Council's web site to navigate to PLANNING and then to CONSERVATION. Then select URBAN CHARACTERISATION STUDY from the menu on the RHS.

Although residents' input is being invited during April 2007, no formal consultation is envisaged at this stage in relation to these documents.

These 'background study' descriptions will not carry the weight of SPDs (Special Planning Documents) in influencing planning decisions, but will inform policies. Content from them might find its way into later SPDs, so I would emphasise the importance of letting the Council know about any inaccuracies or imbalance.

For example, if you are concerned about protecting Round Hill's green ribbons (i.e. open spaces on private land) in the absence of public open spaces, you might wish to challenge the statement that The Level and Preston Park are within 10 minutes walk for most residents.

I would hazard a guess that the majority of family outings to Preston Park by Round Hill residents are made by car.

The Council also states in the study that The Level is under-used.

In the light of recent concerns about Upper Lewes Road, could the under-use of the Level be partly because access and safety considerations affect our perceptions of 'neighbourhood' i.e. the distances over which Round Hill parents will happily allow their children to roam unattended?

The traffic lights at the junction of Upper Lewes Road and Ditchling Road do not provide any safe crossing time at all for pedestrians (young or elderly).

Nothing has been done about this, in spite of many representations to The Council by Peter Meakins, a former member of The Round Hill Committee.

3 May 2007 35 units proposed on former Esso garage site in Hollingdean Road

A planning application (by Southern Primary Housing, Hole Farmhouse, Woodmancote, Henfield BN5 9SU) to develop the site of the former Esso Garage Hollingdean Road Brighton, is now under consideration by the Council.

The developer proposes 35 residential units arranged over 3-7 storeys, providing a mix of 1, 2 & 3 bed affordable units. Parking would be for 3 motor vehicles and 42 bicycles.



The proposed roofing would be of single ply membrane, the external walls of brick / timber cladding / timber louvres and the doors & windows of metal.

It is my belief that the proposed development would obliterate the pleasant view (out of the Round Hill Conservation Area) from the bend at the intersection of Richmond Road and D'Aubigny Road.

Please visit The Round Hill Society's web site at: <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> to see pictures of the current view and for details of the full horror of the proposed overdevelopment to residents in Hollingdean Road. There is a link to the Council's online submission form to use if you agree that this monstrosity must be opposed.

Ted Power

27 May 2007 Update on proposal for a 7-storey building on the former Esso site in Hollingdean Road

A 3-page report, prepared on behalf of the developer, minimising the effects of the proposed tall building on Richmond Rd, D'Aubigny Rd and Princes Rd, has now been submitted to the Council's Development Control Department.

It is admitted in this document that the current public viewpoint from the junction of Richmond Road and D'Aubigny Road, comprising tiers of low density dwellings, allotments and trees on the horizon, would be affected. We would be left with views either

side of the proposed tall building. It is argued that this public viewpoint is NOT identified in our Conservation Area Character Statement as being "an important viewpoint out of Round Hill across the City".

It is further claimed that since this viewpoint would be broadly in line with the fourth storey of the proposed building, then a person at the junction of D'Aubigny Road and Richmond Road would be viewing "the equivalent of a 2 or 3 storey building at a distance of 40 to 50 metres, with views either side of the building". This comparison hardly holds since viewing from a hillside would mean that the extra 3 storeys block the tree-line on the horizon.

The opinion given on behalf of the developer is that "such a relationship is acceptable in an urban area."

So much for the setting of the conservation area. If the Richmond Rd/D'Aubigny Rd viewpoint is plugged, other developers (using the 7-storey building as a precedent) would soon attempt to plug other viewpoints on bends and between ends of terraces in Round Hill. Much of the character of our neighbourhood would then disappear.

Still time to object to the proposal since it is NOT on the Agenda for the planning committee meeting on 6th June.

See the Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> for pictures and further information.

Ted Power

15 Jun 2007 Proposed overdevelopment on former Esso garage site refused.

I'm glad to report that the proposed overdevelopment on the former Esso Garage site in Hollingdean Rd, which would have wrecked the public viewpoint out of the Round Hill Conservation Area from the junction of Richmond Rd and D'Aubigny Rd and would also have been seen from parts of Princes Rd, has now been REFUSED on seven counts by Brighton and Hove City Council. Full reasons for refusal are posted at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk>

I understand that several Round Hill residents submitted letters of comment. It would appear that The Council has taken note of our objections. The effect of the proposed overdevelopment on the Round Hill Conservation Area is mentioned in Reason 1. The inadequate provision for social infrastructure within & around the proposed development site is also mentioned. Pleasingly too, the Council recognised that the proposal did not constitute genuine car-free development.

Ted Power

5 July 2007 Carelet appeal against refusal of their 9 three-storey house proposal

As if the noise, upheaval and upsetting visual impact of Veolia's Hollingdean Depot installations were not already enough, we could have more noise and loss of amenity in Round Hill with heavy traffic and works within our conservation area lasting up to one year.

The developer, Carelet, has just appealed against Council's refusal of their application to build 9 three-storey houses (none of which are offered as affordable accommodation). Their proposed development involves the Greenfield site running behind the gardens of 69 81 Princes Rd and part of the gardens (separate freeholds) belonging to 67 & 81, properties also bought up by the developer.

Please go to The Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> for info on how to comment to The Government's Planning Inspectorate, which will decide the outcome of this Appeal.

Unless the Appeal is dismissed, we would look forward to loss of an important open space (never previously developed) which screens and separates the built-area of Round Hill from two industrial estates i.e. Veolia's installations at Hollingdean Depot and The Centenary Industrial Estate.

If Carelet is successful in overturning Council's reasons for refusal, look out for disappearing parking space. Their crammed proposal offers no infrastructure of its own. Reason 4 (of Brighton and Hove Council's reasons for REFUSAL) is that: "The proposed car free development fails to provide for the resulting travel demand and would be likely to exacerbate the existing on-street parking stress and result in the displacement of existing resident parking, contrary to Brighton and Hove Local Plan policies TR1, TR19, QD27 and HO7".

Letters of comment must reach The Government's Planning Inspectorate by 23rd July 2007 to be taken into account.

See The Round Hill Society's web site at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> for further info, pictures of the proposed development site, details of reference numbers and for the address of The Government's Planning Inspectorate.

Ted Power

12 July 2007 Carelet's appeal against refusal of their 9-house proposal withdrawn.

A Round Hill resident received notification today from The Government's Planning Inspectorate that Carelet's Appeal against Refusal of their third proposal HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN.

Go to:
<http://www.roundhill.org.uk>
for further details.

The Round Hill Society has been able to hold back 300 leaflets, which were ready for distribution. So far, there has been no notification of the withdrawal on Brighton and Hove City Council's website, though I expect this will be updated soon.

The good news (worth a glass of champagne!) is that Round 3 has now been won outright. The open space, which constitutes Carelet's main freehold, is more important than ever now. With intensification of industrial zones encroaching on us, we need a (previously undeveloped) greenfield site to screen and separate the built-area of Round Hill from the Waste Transfer Station at Hollingdean Depot and The Centenary Industrial Estate.

Recent pictures of this site appear at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk>



We may have to suffer two more rounds of these threats to our amenity and infrastructure, but indications are that local residents feel strongly enough about loss of open space and overdevelopment to go the distance. I would not be surprised if we see a fourth proposal from this developer quite soon.

Thank you if you took prompt action to oppose the Appeal which has just been withdrawn.

Ted Power

10 Aug 2007 Southern Primary Housing appeal against refusal of 7-storey block of 35 units on former Esso Garage site

Southern Primary Housing has appealed to the Secretary of State for Transport Local Government and the Regions against Council's decision on 11th June 2007 against refusal of their proposal to build a 7-storey block of 35 units on the former Esso Garage site in Hollingdean Road.

The deadline for submissions to The Planning Inspectorate is 6th September 2007. If the developer wins the appeal, then expect more development in the area. Residents do not have the right of appeal.

Further information and details of how to comment at: <http://www.roundhill.org.uk>

Ted



P.S. If you commented to The Council during the consultation period of the original proposal, note that your submission will be forwarded to The Planning Inspectorate, and thanks!.

8 Mar 2009 BHCC admits that removal of Victorian street light columns in Round Hill was work done in error



The columns of Round Hill's traditional street lights were cast in the 1880s for gas lamps by J. Every, the large traditional iron and steel foundry based in Lewes, East Sussex.

The street lights were later powered by BLEECO, the Brighton, Lancing and Eastbourne Electricity Company. See: <http://www.eastbournes-street-lighting.co.uk/1880to20.htm>

The current swan necks, also cast by J. Every of Lewes, were added in the 1930s.

Colas was out on Sunday 1st March 2009, fitting swan-necks to their new galvanised steel posts. This work had already been cancelled. The Council had already acknowledged that the fitting of the new columns was work done in error, but the message did not seem to have got through. The men working for Colas were still under the mistaken assumption that the cast iron columns were to be removed shortly.

The advice given to me by The Regency Society's representative on The Council's Conservation Area Advisory Group (on which I am Round Hill's representative) is that these columns are like gold-dust and that we should see that they are repaired and put back rather than removed and broken up for scrap.

In recent months, a number of Round Hill residents have reported what has been happening to our street lights. Their vigilance has probably saved three of these distinctive columns.

The reason given for moving lamp posts back from the kerbs, is to prevent vehicle damage. However, while the new galvanised steel post erected in Princes Crescent has been set back from the kerb, the new ones erected at the NE end of Princes Road and the SE end of Princes Crescent are hardly set back further than the traditional columns.

When the original cast iron posts were erected on the kerb, they were provided with a single ladder bar on the right hand side. The door would usually be on the pavement side so as the lamp fitter climbed the ladder on the pavement side, he would hold the post with his left hand, leaving his right hand free to do any work.

Interesting comparisons have been drawn between the columns of Round Hill's traditional street lights and the columns used in the bandstand on Brighton Sea Front. The latter are thought to be cast in 1884 by J. Every in the very Lewes foundry where Round Hill's columns were cast at about the same time.

Set up in 1832, the foundry which came to be known as the Phoenix Ironworks was located at the bottom of North Street in Lewes adjacent to the river Ouse. This site proved useful for delivery to the ironworks, for example nine cargoes of iron and steel (1,584 tons) were transported by river to J. Every at the Phoenix Works in 1936. The Phoenix Ironworks closed its doors for the last time in the late 1970s. In 2000, the area was subject to extensive flooding.

For further information:

Tryt the Round Hill Society's Lamp Post Quiz at <https://roundhill.org.uk/rhlamps.htm>

25 Oct 2009 Council officers recommend approval of Ashdown Road development

The planning officers are recommending that the application to build two new houses on land to the rear of Ashdown Road, also converting the existing house into three units of accommodation, should be granted.

The Planning Committee at their meeting (25th November) voted in favour of a site visit, deferring the outcome of this application to their meeting at Hove Town Hall on Wednesday 16th December 2009 (starts 2pm).

The Planning Committee are aware of local residents' concerns about cramming and the effects that development (especially the construction of the large dormer window on the existing roof) will have on distant views (e.g. from Woodvale and above) of the historical layout of The Round Hill Conservation Area.

What I feel they need to learn about (perhaps they will witness it during their site visit) is the existing pressure on the street infrastructure of Ashdown Road, because creating 5 units of accommodation where there is currently only 1 unit will increase pavement parking, further worsening pedestrian and vehicle access, hampering collection of materials for recycling or the work of the emergency services. The Council's Highways Department has been extremely Laisser-Faire in recent recommendations and we are yet to suffer the consequences if/when Carelet and other approved developments are built.



The planning officers' tactic (both in THE PLANS LIST and probably on the site visit) will be to use demolition of the ugly garages as bait to persuade members of the Planning Committee to support overdevelopment. The existence of these unsuitably located garages, which are now being used as bargaining tokens both by the officers and the developer, owes itself to failure by previous officers to have them removed before they got "deemed consent". To use them as bargaining tokens is to encourage breaches of planning on other parts of Round Hill's 'green ribbons' in areas best suited for use as garden.

5 May 2011 Online petition in favour of controlled parking zone in Round Hill

Please note: The Round Hill Society committee was split 50:50 on the subject of CPZs so campaigning in favour of one (e.g. on the Round Hill Yahoo Group) was done outside of The Residents' Association.

The need was to gain 300 signatures in favour so that the Council would consider Round Hill for a second consultation on whether to become a CPZ. During the first consultation Round Hill voted against by about 60:40, but pressure on parking has become worse.

There is now a site at <http://www.roundhill.biz> with links to an online petition. These should be of interest to people who would like to see pleasanter streets and preferential treatment (through a CPZ) for Round Hill residents' parking needs.

The number of CPZs will continue to increase (as it has done during both Labour and Conservative control of The Council) regardless of who does well in the local elections. Our city's quota of CPZs has risen from 2 in 2001 to 14 in 2011. In the words of Cllr Geoffrey Theobald (currently Transport & Environment), "the only reason we put parking schemes in is in response to public demand".

Attempt to use the footways in suburbs near to Round Hill (e.g. streets like Elm Grove) and it becomes obvious why requests to have residents' parking re-considered will not go away. If Round Hill residents wish their area to be one of the city's "last bastions of free on-street parking for all vehicles whether they belong here or not", don't expect to park anywhere near your home as pressure from displacement increases.

When I was both younger and able-bodied, I could easily squeeze between parked cars as well as turn my head over my shoulder to park a car in a tight space.

"Free parking" is an attractive phrase. But it becomes a thoughtless soundbyte when it involves "a free-for-all favouring survival of the fittest".

I would like to feel that people with community values would see the need for planning and sharing a scarce resource among people who most need to use it. That way, a larger number of residents (including those without motor vehicles who are not so good at squeezing between obstacles) will be able to remain mobile.

Cleaner streets where junctions and pavements are free from parked vehicles are now on-show in the Viaduct Rise area, which I find much easier to navigate than Round Hill or the area to the north of London Road Station.

Ted Power

5 May 2011 Refuting the argument that it is the residents themselves who cause parking problems

Argument posted on 21 July 2009 on Preston Pages in opposition to the Viaduct Rise scheme:

"I must say that reading the discussion about problems in Viaduct Rise area, it seems some people have convinced themselves others are causing the parking problem, that outsiders/commuters are causing the problem, when it is the residents themselves."

The truth is that there has been displacement since the Viaduct Rise scheme came into operation.

The displacement has included a significant number of non-residents. Councillors were surprised by the level of displacement achieved when that scheme came into effect in September 2010. That CPZ does seem to deter people for dumping their vehicles for days on another community.

Also, how many displaced vehicles from other areas where parking is no longer free (forcing many of our own residents to park dangerously, thoughtlessly, and sometimes illegally) do we want? Do we want more pavement and double parking and road junctions which pedestrians struggle to cross? How far does it have to go?

With more vehicles competing for our on-street parking, we will surely get more yellow-lining and traffic regulation orders, regardless of whether we vote to remain outside a CPZ. There will be more safety and access reasons to justify these measures.



If as a result of the public consultation a residents parking scheme is not progressed, the council may consider introducing double yellow lines in some roads to maintain emergency access and keep footways clear for pedestrians.

Ted

7 May 2011 CPZs s divisive issue, but here's the case in favour of them.

The case for giving preferential treatment to Round Hill residents wishing to park in their own area and maintaining vehicle & pedestrian access, can only get stronger over time.

Trying to find a space increasingly resembles a game of musical chairs during the day as well as at night; walkers are impeded at junctions and even by cars on pavements.



And as witnessed by a neighbour whose car was brought home by a pick-up truck a few nights ago, fire-engines could find their access blocked at some junctions in our area at night.

Yet people on this forum who want to discuss these issues without resorting to personal attack are described as "controlling" and characterised as a minority which needs to be "quelled".

I have friends in Round Hill (still!) who are vehemently opposed to CPZs. About the same number of my Round Hill friends are very much for them. Members of the RHS Committee are similarly split on the issue of residents' parking schemes. I have considerable respect for people in both camps. Some projects and campaigns (e.g. street parties; attempting to limit nuisance from the Waste Transfer Station) are less contentious.

The Reverend Philip Wells, who led the 7-year campaign to get the Viaduct Rise Area CPZ, comments that "one of the deep problems with parking is that it sets resident against resident".

Requests to ration on-street parking, giving preference to local residents, arise as a result of the sheer numbers of motor vehicles. If "controlling behaviour" means a desire for safety, access and quality of environment, then I am certainly no less controlling than somebody who wants to silence my thoughts for 7 years.

I understand the attraction which people who struggle to run a motor vehicle experience when they are able to park for free. However, the problem of remaining outside a CPZ when they are springing up around you, is that your public open space becomes prey for non-residents looking to park for free. Some go away to other parts, leaving their vehicles to decorate your streets.

I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong, but all the evidence that has come to me suggests that disharmony in the Viaduct Rise area where resident was set against resident has evaporated in that community. They like their CPZ; some say it has changed their lives radically and for the better. As for the inconvenience caused to visitors, family friends of mine (an elderly couple living in Crawley) report that when they visit their son and daughter-in-law living in Shaftesbury Road Brighton to see their grand-children, they can now invariably park outside or near that family home. Before the CPZ, they found visits very difficult since they often had to park as far away as Preston Park and struggled to do the walking.

As for builders, I plan to have a lot of work done on my home in the future. With a CPZ, I accept that something would be added to the bill for parking, but let's get that cost in proportion. I've been a non-earner since an RTA forced me to give up my career 16 years ago, but the daily fee for parking would probably be no more than I spend in providing builders with coffee, tea & biscuits. However, I might stop making my builders pizzas and providing them with strawberries & cream.

I have now posted a FAQ page on the campaign site at <http://www.roundhill.biz> where I attempt to answer doubts on how paying the small weekly fee for a CPZ would benefit resident motorists returning from work after the cut-off time (which is currently 8pm for the neighbouring scheme).

Ted

9 May 2011 Legal/Safe On-Street Parking Space is a finite resource.

One of the first issues to consider when considering the case for or against a CPZ is how much "Legal / Safe on-street parking space" the area really has.

The June/July 2009 consultation documents sent to Round Hill residents did not contain a pledge that if residents voted "No" to a CPZ the matter would not be reviewed again until 7 years later!

Nobody could have the authority to make such pledge when we elect New Councils every 3 years and parking pressure in our area is affected all the time by new CPZs springing up

around us: 2 in 2001, 14 in 2011, could this double in three further years, let alone seven?!

What the 2009 consultation documents did say, was:

"If as a result of the consultation a residents' parking scheme is not progressed, the Council may consider introducing double-yellow lines in some roads to maintain emergency access and keep footways clear for pedestrians."

To neglect safety and access would lay Councils open to legal challenge, which any concerned resident would be entitled to initiate. Councils cannot ignore the needs of groups such as the visually impaired who are more at risk than many of us. The RNIB runs a strong campaign against pavement parking, which is already banned in London.

Any resident who is worried about parking on pavements, visibility/safety at junctions and emergency vehicles getting through to them in the event of a household fire or somebody in their family having a stroke, can make yellow-line requests to <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/index.cfm?request=c1218256>

Sylvan Hall residents' association have already had such a request granted in relation to the lower part of Wakefield Road where parked vehicles were blocking a pedestrian entrance from their estate. If enough residents (they wouldn't need to live in Round Hill) made a fuss about illegal parking (i.e. blocking pavement access on Wakefield Road) the Council would have little option but to extend yellow lining up one side of Wakefield Road.

Some Councils tolerate parking on junctions in residential streets, but no Highways Department is going to bring that space into their definition of "legal / safe parking". Our Highways Department's instruction that space around junctions was not to be defined as safe parking, helped local residents to stop a new residential development which would have created a demand for 9 extra on-street parking spaces. The developer was arguing that there was surplus "safe/legal on-street parking in Round Hill", but spaces their transport consultant was defining as "safe" and "rarely occupied" turned out to be "dangerous". The Appeal Inspector was not impressed!

Junctions within the SE of Round Hill have already been yellow lined. If safety and access are being compromised at junctions further up in Round Hill (i.e. Richmond / Mayo | Mayo / Princes | both ends of Crescent Rd), our Highways Department will think twice before risking an unnecessary fatality, especially if the dangers are reported to them.

Brighton and Hove City Council has already assumed powers to penalise double parking.

Yellow lining without a CPZ, will not solve the problems we have in Round Hill, because the total supply of "legal / safe on-street parking spaces" available to us is smaller than many residents may think. Also without adequate enforcement, vehicles from all areas, attracted by free parking (a rapidly diminishing resource in our city), will compete for this finite space. They will also flout traffic restrictions, making our area more dangerous. There are lots of yellow lines in Elm Grove, but also lots of vehicles (from all over the place) taking no notice of them whatsoever. With no CPZ there, inadequate attention is given to enforcement. When Elm Grove residents (& neighbourhoods to the N & S of them) end this chaos by voting for a CPZ, the domino effect will send further

displacement to Round Hill. House prices respond to the quality of the urban environment a factor which might outweigh the cost of visitors' permits.

To stop further parking stress, we need to vote for "preferential treatment for our own residents' parking" which is actually enforced, as in The Viaduct Rise area where residents are now very much happier.

9 May 2011 We need to vote for preferential treatment for our own residents

The main purpose of a CPZ is to give residents who live in an area preferential treatment over outsiders looking for on-street parking space.

When the Viaduct Rise area scheme started to the west of Round Hill last September, householders in that area were astonished at how much displacement occurred.

They were equally surprised at how few of the vehicles they had been accustomed to seeing must have belonged to their own residents.

I need to confirm this with Cllr Pete West, but I recall him telling me that two permits per household are now on offer in that area. However, this isn't by any means the take-up rate since some households do not run motor vehicles at all.

Now it could be that there are still residents from the Viaduct Rise area, perhaps people who resent paying for CPZs, who are still taking up our very limited "safe on-street parking space" in Round Hill. Some may even be parking thoughtless or unsafely in our area, in space which would be yellow-lined under a CPZ.

Outside a CPZ, we get the worst of all worlds. Vehicles owners from any part of the city or any area in the UK can park in Round Hill for free. Nothing to stop any person leaving perhaps their second vehicle here (stationing it as close as they can get to the city centre without paying), going off somewhere else and forgetting about it for months.

Within the Area J Extension CPZ, which we decided not to join in 2009, our permits would entitle us to park in the both Round Hill and the streets in the Viaduct Rise area at all times.

This could facilitate car-sharing between parents in both areas whose children attend the Downs Schools, though junctions would also be clearer for people to walk to & from school.

In all, this reciprocity would probably benefit Round Hill residents more than Viaduct Rise ones, since we could park at all times nearer The Duke of York's, Preston Park, London Road shopping centre and London Road station. There are probably fewer reasons for Viaduct Rise area residents to be drawn to Round Hill.

Without the preferential treatment which a CPZ confers, yellow lines and other restrictions will arrive anyway (as hinted at in the 2009 consultation documents) for safety & access reasons. Many residents would welcome them.

The unwanted arrival, from which we now need protection, is more and more outsiders looking for free parking space in neighbourhoods where traffic regulations are inadequately enforced.

Ted

11 May 2011 Aren't you being xenophobic in your attitude to outsiders?

cannot see what is xenophobic or distasteful about a scheme for giving preferential treatment to the parking needs of residents who actually live in a community.

Under a CPZ, there will be some "pay & display" for people from outside: our urban environment ("streets" account for nearly all Round Hill's public open-space) will be given a value.

Also all our own residents will be rationed in relation to the number of vehicles (2 in the neighbouring CPZ) each household can use to colonise this limited public space.

Motor vehicles are clearly useful and important, but I am tired of the assumption that they are all that is useful and important. "Outsiders" include pedestrians as well as motorists. To some outsiders, our values are very strange. I'm not saying that this is the equitable system I would like to see in Round Hill: but, in Tokyo, on-street parking is not permitted at all; it's ironic that in a country which exports so many cars, motor vehicle ownership requires proof that you own somewhere off-street where you can park.

Living in Round Hill, I am an "outsider" to the Viaduct Rise area, but as a resident of Brighton (and indeed a citizen of the world with pedestrian rights!) I take absolute delight in walking along streets which are planned for more than one type of user. Our public open space will remain open to both residents and outsiders in relation to uses, such as appreciation of the architectural beauty of our surroundings, which do not set neighbour against neighbour or visitor.

As well as working in Brighton, part of my career involved working in countries where Council planning (i.e. the public purse) was far more limited than in our city. In one neighbourhood where I lived, there was no refuse collection. Residents either tipped their rubbish out of their apartment windows, some to be eaten by stray donkeys/goats/dogs/cats. Alternatively, we went out into the public open space between our apartments to dig a trench to bury our rubbish, preferably near a home where the owner didn't carry firearms! I find it somewhat more relaxing now living in a city where there is a reasonably sized "public purse" to plan transport & environment as well as a system of refuse collection which doesn't cause a civil war.

Seeing how regulations are ignored (e.g. vehicles blocking public access on pavements; yellow lines treated as invisible), some would argue that there is inadequate enforcement in many parts of our city and "the public purse" should be just a little bit (£2 per week) larger. It is good when we can actually put money together to target a recognised problem.

There are two scapegoats, commonly used in attempts to stall the inevitable arrival of CPZs in areas like our own for as long as possible:

- 1) Councils
- 2) Students

Most attacks on Councils do not recognise that they are essentially democratic institutions serving residents' requests and needs with money we give them to use.

The attacks sometimes take on a "Tabloid Press" style in implying that Councils are evil and our money is used for corrupt and wasteful purposes.

If there is evidence that the money raised from CPZs is being siphoned off by corrupt officials and diverted away from Transport & Environment requests and needs, then the residents who make these attacks on Brighton and Hove City Council ought to give it rather than just implying it.

We have just elected a new Council where the successful candidates have come under public scrutiny. Part of caring about your own local community is to vote out people whose performance or behaviour is "not up to scratch" and to vote in ward Councillors who convince you that they will do well.

There are also many ways that local residents can contact planning officers in Council departments. I am rarely impressed when I hear attacks on "The Council as a general body" by residents who have never had any discussion with people in Transport & Environment. In some instances, those who make derogatory comments do not know who departmental officials are, and have even less idea of what they do.

Another "general body", subject to uninformed attack, is students. Students living in Round Hill have as many rights and responsibilities as anybody else. They are also residents.

Some combine both work and study, some have families, some have pressing needs for travel (e.g. doctors / nurses / social workers in training). It is easy to make reference to a popular scapegoat or to discriminate against a "general body" when you do not know who you are actually talking about.

My partner was a Sussex Uni student (Social Work) in her 50s. I combined a full-time job in Brighton & Hove with University study at Birkbeck College in my mid-30s. I didn't use a car for that, but I might have needed one if geographical locations or my responsibilities had been different (e.g. a trainee with a need to visit clients).

One cannot base a reasoned argument against CPZs on scapegoats and rumours.

A CPZ will put a restriction on some Round Hill householders as well as some outsiders who are depriving residents in neighbourhoods which are not their own.

The rules for students (as a general body) need to be exactly the same as the general rules for everybody else.

Ted

16 June 2011 "There is still plenty of space to park in Round Hill without a CPZ, especially if motorists would park sensibly (bumper to bumper)"

There were just two CPZs (Central Brighton and Hove) in 2001.

Now there are fourteen of them: A - Preston Park station; C - Kemptown; H - Hospital; J - Preston Circus; M - Brunswick and Adelaide; N - Central Hove; O - Martlets area; Q - Prestonville area; R - Church Road, Portland Road and Poets corner area; T - Hove station; U - St Lukes area; W - Wish Road area; Y - North central Brighton; Z - South Central Brighton.

There is understandable anxiety among residents living in hilly areas such as Hanover, Elm Grove and Round Hill, about the consequences of a new scheme. However, by voting for our area to remain one of "the last bastions of free parking", available too to any vehicle which used to enjoy the same in zones A to J, Round Hill residents would not free

themselves of any parking stress and would be ignoring the domino effect of CPZs which is rooted in surplus demand for finite space.

A cut-off point of 8pm would help to clear Round Hill streets of vehicles which would otherwise be taking up space when non-resident owners park them and disappear for days or weeks. Also the restrictions imposed through the system of "resident permits" is a method of sharing a finite resource. It prevents single households monopolising limited on-street space with multiple vehicle ownership, making it much more likely that there is parking space for those returning in one vehicle from work.

Before claiming that there is still plenty of space to park in areas such as Round Hill, Hanover and Elm Grove, it is worth reflecting that these are all very densely populated areas.

"Plenty of space" at the expense of the pedestrian environment. My own street is still used by pedestrians in their 90s as well as children and parents pushing buggies. I imagine that a visually-impaired person would have a nightmare in streets such as Elm Grove, Wakefield Road and Ashdown Road. It is not out of bloody-mindedness towards motorists that the RNIB campaigns so actively against pavement parking and parking around junctions.

Considering all on-street space (as well as some pavement space!) as space where motorised vehicle parking should be maximised, is not a very thoughtful premise on which to base a claim that there is still "plenty of room to park".

Logically, Elm Grove and Hanover should be the next areas where a CPZ is inevitable. Visit them and look at the parking situation and the obstacles for pedestrians! It might take displacement from that scheme to persuade Round Hill residents to embrace preferential treatment for their own parking. Three years?

Ted

18th June 2011 "We would be better off if there were no CPZs at all! The Green Party is to blame!"

Stuart - which CPZs do you suggest we do away with?

How would residents in Central Brighton & Hove or the Sea Front areas stand a chance of parking near their homes if they had to compete with day-trippers and longer-stay visitors for free on-street parking?

How about the North Laine area around Brighton Station? Was there not a valid case there for giving residents preferential treatment, which is what a CPZ does over and above parking restrictions? Had narrow streets like Trafalgar Street remained outside a CPZ, yellow lines would still have been necessary to maintain pedestrian & vehicle access.

It is not difficult to understand why the "more Central" areas of our city were already within CPZs by late 2004 and why now in 2011 the domino effect of CPZs has spread northwards to hilly areas e.g. the streets just to the south of London Road station and just

to the west of Round Hill. Princes Road and Princes Crescent are experiencing the displacement. When Elm Grove and Hanover follow the trend (these hilly areas represent a very small pocket of "relatively Central" neighbourhoods which have so far resisted!) displacement from many other CPZs will certainly be felt in The Triangle Community and streets to the SE of Round Hill.

There can be no going back, especially in the context of new development:

To the north of Trafalgar Street is the New England Quarter, which has been fairly densely developed in recent years. High buildings put extra pressure on public open space within the vicinity, which is why in cities like Tokyo there is no on-street parking at all. The space is needed for vehicle & pedestrian access.

I don't think it helps any resident who can no longer park on a regular basis near their home to politicise the arguments for or against CPZs.

Although I have never voted for his party, I believe that Councillor Geoffery Theobald (Transport and Environment) was being entirely honest when he told The Argus (Wed, Aug 4, 2010):

"The only reason we put parking schemes in is in response to public demand."

Whichever political party controls Brighton and Hove City Council there are statutory duties imposed on them in relation to street / pedestrian access and public safety. In the context of the ever increasing volume of vehicles on residential streets, they have to listen to residents who can no longer park near their homes, especially in a city where there are a lot of tourists.

The number of CPZs in Brighton & Hove rose from 2 to 8 (see The Argus 2 Dec 2004) during years (2001-4) when Labour was the dominant party on The Council. Later, the timetable for satisfying residents' requests for CPZs was handed over to a Tory-controlled Council which brought the number of CPZs up to 14. Now in 2011, it is the turn of the Greens to sort out conflicting demands for open space. CPZs do not ban on-street parking, as happens when pressures are much more severe, but they are needed in hilly areas like our own to ensure that residents who need to access their homes (sometimes with heavy shopping, small children &/or elderly relatives) can be more certain of a suitable place to park. I hope too that our new Council will want to pursue policies which improve air quality in our city and make it easier for those who have to get around on foot.

21 Jun 2011 "CPZs take away parking space as a result of all the yellow lining"

Jan I have the 2009 CPZ consultation document, which covers a wider area than just Round Hill, open in front of me.

If you are focusing on the roadside space (colour-coded green) available for residents' parking, I understand your concerns. However, I understand from our local Councillors that CPZs are implemented somewhat differently now. All the roadside space, lined in the colour moave (designated in the 2009 proposal for "Shared Pay & Display 4hr") would also be available without time restrictions or further payment to holders of residents' permits.

Together the roadside space marked in green and mauve covers pretty well the whole of Round Hill apart from (1) the small number of junctions which haven't already been yellow lined and (2) the section on one side of Wakefield Road where yellow lining will probably be continued whether we have residents' parking or not to keep the footway accessible to pedestrians.

Yellow lines appear to get a bad press, but they cover a relatively small area of our total roadside space. The introduction of yellow lines is a road safety/ emergency vehicle issue, not strictly a CPZ residents parking issue. They are subject to individual approval and residents will have an opportunity to contest against/for each change to road markings one by one, whether the changes happen in the context of a CPZ or not.

Residents living around London Road Station who were first sceptical about yellow lining before the neighbouring CPZ was implemented have realised that they are now the context for regulating parking whether we are in a CPZ or not. See:

<http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/13323248/1716071691/name/11th+June+Open+House+letter.doc> (scroll down to page 8)

Regardless of the CPZ issue, a growing number of residents feel there is a case for freeing up some of the few Round Hill junctions which haven't already been yellow lined. I regularly see the recycling collection vehicle backing up Princes Road because its progress is blocked off at one or other of the Mayo Road junctions. I saw a variation of this last Thursday when the same vehicle backed from the summit of Princes Road down to the junction with Mayo Road. I understand that some residents in Richmond Road and Ashdown Road have missed out on collections due to problems of access. Recently a resident in Princes Road (The Copse) had a nightmare getting his broken down car returned to his home on a pick-up truck.

If the small number of Round Hill junctions, which haven't already been yellow lined are so precious, I do not understand why residents resist a scheme which will discourage non-residents looking for a base for surplus cars or cheap place to site "mobile sheds & homes" in the form of commercial vehicles, vans and campers. The kind of car-sales enterprise, which caused massive upheaval in Ashdown Road and took months to get to move on, would not return under a CPZ. Allowing an unfriendly contest between residents and non-residents to continue and intensify, is the "non-interventionist route" to getting traffic regulations extended. If emergency access and safety become issues, we will have few grounds on which to contest the length of yellow lines.

Residents living in the streets between Viaduct Road and Ditchling Rise, whose streets were marked up on the same "2009 consultation document" that you (Jan) and I have been looking at, were amazed at how much displacement was achieved: see the "Comments" page of <http://www.roundhill.biz>

The "Neighbouring Areas" page of the same campaign site has two columns of photographs showing how streets compare for on-street parking space to the south of London Road Station (within a CPZ with all junctions yellow lined) and to the north of the railway (outside a CPZ with the usual vans blocking access to other vehicles and pedestrians at junctions).

While Round Hill has only a handful of such junctions which are yet to be yellow lined, in 2010 the Viaduct Rise area had many. 18 are now yellow lined and a clear run now exists for walkers wanting to use the long stretches of pavements in Ditchling Rise and Clyde Road. The parking situation is much easier for residents wishing to park motor vehicles near their homes and for their visitors, even though the number of junctions (now yellow lined), small in terms of total on-street space, is far greater than we have in Round Hill, where there is more garden space between terraces:

1. Ditchling Road / Ditchling Rise
2. Ditchling Rise / Vere Road
3. Ditchling Rise / Warleigh Road
4. Ditchling Rise / Shaftesbury Place (leading to London Rd Station)
5. Ditchling Rise / Shaftesbury Road
6. Ditchling Rise / Yardley Street
7. Ditchling Rise / Gerard Street
8. Ditchling Rise / Winchester Street
9. Ditchling Rise / Beaconsfield Road
10. Clyde Road / Vere Road
11. Clyde Road / Warleigh Road
12. Clyde Road / Shaftesbury Road
13. Clyde Road / Lorne Road
14. Clyde Road / Stanley Road
15. Stanley Road / Lorne Road
16. Stanley Road / Shaftesbury Road
17. Ditchling Road / Vere Road
18. Ditchling Road / Vere Road

All this yellow lining has made this area far more pleasant to walk through and both residents' and visitors' parking in this neighbourhood has clearly benefited from the recently implemented scheme.

Ted

3rd July 2011 “Traffic Regulations Orders (e.g. yellow lines) can be requested without resorting to a CPZ”

Peter (and other contributors to this forum),

A walk or drive up Elm Grove, a street currently outside of a CPZ, illustrates the futility of yellow lines where they are not adequately enforced. You will find countless vehicles parked illegally at almost any time.

Motorists who park on the northern pavement in Wakefield Road usually make an effort to leave a gap so that pedestrians can squeeze through, but very often at least one vehicle is clearly parked illegally making this footway inaccessible to pedestrians.

The narrowness of this pavement does not even allow for the minimum of 1.7m clearance, which the Council's Principal Transport Planner advises; for pavement parking to be legal, there should be sufficient space remaining for two wheelchairs or buggies to

pass safely. It cannot be satisfying to park in a place where you know you are at risk of a fine and are probably making it at least inconvenient for some pedestrians, including neighbours. Freeing up our neighbourhood from vehicles from other areas, using Round Hill purely for free "on-street parking", would surely help.

A yellow line request has already been granted to allow residents in Sylvan Hall (The Laurels) to use their pedestrian exit into Wakefield Road without being blocked off by parked vehicles. However, even with the yellow lines now in place, freedom of access remains unpredictable if a few motorists feel they can park on yellow lines and get away with it.

In relation to the other streets you mention, Peter, I would also like to see an end to pavement parking, and believe that a residents' parking scheme is the best route to a solution. As city neighbourhoods in the south of England are increasingly expected to function at higher densities, recognition that "pavements are for people" gains in importance. Forcing people onto one pavement to allow another to be colonised by motor vehicles is neither the way to encourage people to walk, nor a formula for managing Brighton's air quality problems. Guaranteeing safe pedestrian access for people who do not have cars (there's a circa 90-year-old lady in my street who still walks to The Round Hill bus-stop to make trips to the London Rd shops) is a "must". Disability groups, especially the RNIB, have been very effective in their campaigns against pavement parking. These have contributed to a ban on it throughout London and a recent initiative (Feb 2011) by Norman Baker enabling Councils to use signs to indicate a pavement-parking ban.

You are right, Peter, to affirm that Traffic Regulation Orders can be requested without your neighbourhood belonging to a CPZ. The introduction of yellow lines is a road safety/emergency vehicle issue, not strictly a CPZ residents parking issue. Yellow line requests are subject to individual approval and residents will have an opportunity to contest against/for each change to road markings one by one, whether the changes happen in the context of a CPZ or not.

I find it hard to support defences of "on-pavement/street parking space" in streets where the practice is often performed illegally i.e. obstructing the footway. What I find harder to understand is a stance (not yours, Peter) which first allocates one pavement in a narrow Round Hill street essentially to motor vehicles and then licences anybody whether or not they live in the neighbourhood to leave their vehicles there for unspecified periods of time.

Currently, a motorist living within one of our city's 14 CPZs and already possessing a residents' permit for their area, could leave their second or third vehicle (perhaps a commercial or holiday van) parked up for free in Round Hill. Even if the vehicle(s) were obstructing a pavement or access at a junction, we do not have the regular patrols which a CPZ pays for. The level of enforcement which a CPZ pays for:

[1] sees that on-street parking, a scarce resource, is fairly distributed among our own residents, and both "given a value" and "limited to reasonable periods" in the case of outsiders.

[2] sees that pavements are clear for pedestrians and junctions are safe & accessible.

Again, last Thursday, I witnessed the recycling collection vehicle having to reverse from the summit of Princes Road down to the (unlined) junction of Mayo Road due to problems

of access. Does a pet or a person have to get squashed before these "make-do manoeuvres" are discontinued?

The irony is that CPZs now cover much of Brighton and Hove. Motorists from other parts of the city taking up free on-street parking space in Round Hill are quite likely to be enjoying all the benefits of CPZs within their own neighbourhoods.

Ted

26 Nov 2011 Proposal to build "an earthship" on open space to west of Cat Creep



Vigilant residents Who use the footway on the Sylvan Hall side of Wakefield Road may have noticed a planning application for permission to erect "a detached two storey outbuilding" affixed to a post.

The proposed structure is described in application number BH2011/03323 as "a replacement for a derelict garden shed".

My concern is that the dimensions of the proposed "outbuilding" would more credibly define "a house".

I fear that if application BH2011/03323 is allowed to succeed, we will soon end up with a new building line, destroying the character of the spectacular "green ribbon" running between Wakefield Rd/Richmond Rd and Roundhill Crescent.

Please have a look at the pictures on <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> which illustrate the risk of further development along the ridge of a hillside which (contrary to the applicant's claim) is in the heart of our conservation area. There is also a link from <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> to the Council's Online Comment form.

The reality of this elusive proposal is that the two storey structure, described in turn as "an outbuilding" / "a replacement for a shed" / "an annex" / and "an earthship"/ would be used as an office, reading and writing room, studio and for various non-residential purposes including storage, a darkroom and a ping-pong table. The lower floor would be connected to the upper by an internal staircase. The front of the building would have solar cells attached for power. There would also be a WC.

With such a flexible list of uses, it is difficult to believe that the two-storey building would remain "non- residential". The Council would not be able to condition that all future users had the hobbies mentioned.

It is stated in the part of the application which requires details of ACCESS that "the annex will be within a few metres of the rear door of the house". The applicant does not say categorically that "access would be from the rear door of his (Wakefield Road) house". Instead of specifying SCALE (height, width and length or buildings in relation to its surroundings) in the relevant section of the Design and Access Statement, the applicant forces us to get this information from the PDF documents containing the drawings and plans. The latter reveal that far from having the proportions of a replacement garden shed, the footprint of the proposed structure is not much different from that of Fern Villa, the Victorian house which "the annex" would sit next to if application BH2011/03323 is permitted to succeed.

Fern Villa (1879), in keeping with the period architecture of its surroundings and unique in its greenbelt setting, is hardly a precedent (as the applicant contends) for new build in a totally different style.



Follow-up proposals involving change of use from "non-residential" to "residential" and "access to people's homes via the middle of the Cats Creep steps" would raise other concerns.

Ted Power

2 December 2011: Comment to protect the open space to the west of the Cat Creep



The photo illustrates both the period architecture of Round Hill (you may see your own home &/or garden) as well as the quality of our open spaces. It would be a pity to lose these green vistas and wildlife corridors (to redevelopment) forever.

The photo also shows the care taken in the early development of Round Hill to construct a street layout which is still pleasing to the eye with its deliberate arcs, segments and the restful 'green ribbons' in between.

Thank you, Wendy, and all residents who have already looked at the planning application and submitted a comment.

Other residents thinking of doing the same should note that The Council's official deadline for comments on application BH2011/03323 is Tuesday 6th December 2011.

Proposal BH2011/03323 has a footprint nearer to that of "a house" rather than a "replacement garden shed".

If passed this two-storey new build could be cited as a precedent by those proposing further re-development of the open space stretching between Wakefield Rd + Richmond Rd and Roundhill Crescent.

The easiest way to comment, is by using The Council's Online Comment Form at http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/index.cfm?request=c1199915&action=showDetail&application_number=BH2011%2F03323

Letters of comment can also be sent to:
Liz Arnold (Case Officer for BH2011/03323),
Development Control, Hove Town Hall
Norton Road, Hove BN3 3BQ.

Go to The Round Hill Society's website at <http://www.roundhill.org.uk> for more pictures and information and an easy link to The Council's online comment form.

Ted