

LEAD MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT

DECISIONS made by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment, Councillor Carl Maynard, on 20 July 2015 at County Hall, Lewes

Councillor Bennett spoke on item 5 (see minute 16)

Councillors Earl, Ensor, Maynard and Philips spoke on item 8 (see minute 14)

Councillor Stogdon spoke on items 6, 8 and 7 (see minutes 13, 14 and 17)

10 MINUTES

10.1 Councillor Maynard approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2015.

11 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

11.1 Councillor Maynard declared a personal interest in item 7 as the Leader of Rother District Council, but did not consider this to be prejudicial. He also declared a prejudicial interest in item 8 as Leader of Rother District Council. Councillor Elkin, Lead Cabinet Member for Resources, considered the item on his behalf.

12 REPORTS

12.1 Reports referred to in the minutes below are contained in the minute book.

12.2 It was RESOLVED to amend the agenda order. The revised order of items to be considered was: item 6; item 8; item 4; item 5; item 7.

13 ROAD SAFETY PRIORITIES

13.1 The Lead Member considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport.

DECISION

13.2 RESOLVED to (1) approve the process of prioritisation relevant to each scheme type; and

(2) approve the Road Safety Team to assess requests for road safety and traffic management interventions on a regular basis and progress the highest priority scheme(s) within the available budgets.

Reason

13.3 The Road Safety Engineering and Local Traffic and Safety Teams receive in excess of 4,000 logged enquiries each year. The vast majority of these enquiries are requesting that some form of intervention is undertaken. The Road Safety and Local Traffic and Safety Teams are unable to address all concerns that are brought to their attention and so need to prioritise their workload. An approved prioritisation process would provide a consistent approach and ensure an efficient use of the limited resources.

13.4 An approved prioritisation approach would give clarity to members of the public, Town and Parish Councils and Local Members about the scale of the requests received and ensure that priority is given to road safety and the reduction of crashes occurring on our road network.

NOTE

Councillor Elkin considered item 8 on behalf of Councillor Maynard (see minute 14).

14 BEXHILL PARKING REVIEW

14.1 The Lead Member for Resources, on behalf of the Lead Member for Transport and Environment who had declared a prejudicial interest in the item, considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport.

14.2 Rother District Councillors Abul Azad, Simon Elford, Ian Hollidge, Brian Kentfield and Doug Oliver spoke to bring particular concerns within Bexhill to the Lead Member's attention, and to encourage Sussex Police to commit resources to enforcement.

DECISION

14.3 **RESOLVED** to (1) approve the re-assessment of outstanding requests for parking restrictions in Bexhill, to identify those sites that will contribute to the reduction of an identified road safety issue; and

(2) approve the progression of sites identified as being a top priority within the resources available.

Reasons

14.4 There are presently a total of 269 individual sites identified for investigation as part of a Bexhill Parking review. As the level of enforcement that Sussex Police will devote to parking restrictions within Rother is minimal, to the degree that there is no effective enforcement regime, it is unreasonable to commit limited public resources to the management of parking restrictions within the district. It is therefore proposed to only prioritise requests for parking restrictions within Rother if they will positively contribute to the reduction of an identified road safety issue.

15 PETITION CALLING ON THE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON STATION ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE TO 20MPH

15.1 The Lead Member considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport which provided a response to a petition presented to the County Council in February.

DECISIONS

15.2 **RESOLVED** to advise the petitioners that a 20mph speed limit on Station Road, Groombridge is not a priority for the County Council at the present time.

Reasons

15.3 To introduce an effective 20mph speed limit on Station Road, Groombridge it would be necessary to introduce engineering measures to help reduce the drivers' speed in accordance with the lower speed limit. As the road has a relatively good safety record, and considering the circumstances of the injury crashes on the C70 Station Road, a 20mph speed limit is not a priority for the County Council at the present time.

16 PETITION CALLING ON THE COUNTY COUNCIL TO IMPROVE SAFETY ON THE ROADS AND LANES AROUND ARLINGTON, DUE MAINLY TO THEIR USE AS A 'RAT RUN' FROM THE A27 TO THE A22 AT HAILSHAM

16.1 The Lead Member considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport which provided a response to a petition presented to the County Council in February. Mr Keogh, spoke in support of the petition on behalf of the petitioners, and to present further evidence of crashes in the vicinity. Mr Stenning and Mr Johnson also spoke in support of the petition.

DECISION

16.2 RESOLVED to advise the petitioners (1) that a lower speed limit on the roads and lanes around Arlington is not presently a priority for the County Council; and

(2) that a review of warning signs, road markings and verge marker posts in the area will be undertaken to help make drivers more aware of the alignment of the road.

Reasons

16.3 To improve safety on The Street, Wilbees Road and Caneheath it would be more appropriate to ensure that appropriate warning signs, road markings and verge marker posts are in place to help make drivers more aware of the alignment of the road.

17 PRE APPLICATION CHARGES FOR DRAINAGE ADVICE

17.1 The Lead Member considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport.

DECISION

17.2 RESOLVED to (1) agree the schedule of charges set out in Appendix 1 as the County Council's tariff for pre-application advice and the provision of data; and

(2) delegate authority to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport to agree annual reviews of the tariff.

Reasons

17.3 The County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority is a statutory consultee on major applications having drainage implications; the response is provided free of charge. However, it is appropriate to charge for other actions which are not part of the statutory consultee role, but still contribute to the management of flood risk. The tariff reflects current hourly rates, makes allowance for costs and does not seek to place an undue burden on the development industry which is recovering from a protracted down turn.