



**REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING 10.30 am WEDNESDAY, 16 JULY 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, LEWES**

**MEMBERSHIP -** Councillor Tom Liddiard (Chair)  
Councillors Philip Lunn (Deputy Chair), Abul Azad, Godfrey Daniel,  
Kathryn Field, Eleanor Kirby-Green and Pat Rodohan

**A G E N D A**

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025 (*Pages 3 - 4*)
2. Apologies for absence
3. Disclosures of interests  
Disclosures by all members present of personal interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the member regards the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.
4. Urgent items  
Notification of items which the Chair considers to be urgent and proposes to take at the appropriate part of the agenda. Any members who wish to raise urgent items are asked, wherever possible, to notify the Chair before the start of the meeting. In so doing, they must state the special circumstances which they consider justify the matter being considered urgent.

**Traffic Regulation Orders - report(s) by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport**

5. Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package Phase 2a Traffic Regulation Order (*Pages 5 - 20*)  
Report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
6. Lewes Parking Review 2 Traffic Regulation Orders (*Pages 21 - 36*)  
Report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
7. Any other items previously notified under agenda item 4

PHILIP BAKER  
Deputy Chief Executive  
County Hall, St Anne's Crescent  
LEWES BN7 1UE

8 July 2025

Contact Sophie Webb, Governance and Democracy Manager,  
01273 337495  
Email: [sophie.webb@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:sophie.webb@eastsussex.gov.uk)

**NOTES:**

- (1) Members are reminded that copies of all representations received are available for inspection in the Members' Room*
- (2) As part of the County Council's drive to increase accessibility to its public meetings, this meeting will be broadcast live on its website and the record archived. The live broadcast is accessible at: <https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/your-council/videos-of-council-meetings/webcasts>*

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Lewes on 11 June 2025.

---

PRESENT Councillors Tom Liddiard (Chair), Philip Lunn (Deputy Chair), Abul Azad, Godfrey Daniel, Kathryn Field and Eleanor Kirby-Green

ALSO PRESENT Councillors Anne Cross, Nuala Geary, Ian Hollidge and Wendy Maples

1. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 APRIL 2025

1.1 The Committee approved as a correct record the minute of the meeting held on 30 April 2025.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 There were no apologies for absence.

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

3.1 Councillor Maples declared a personal interest in item 5 as someone previously involved in volunteering with School Streets project and as someone living in the neighbourhood. Councillor Maples did not consider this to be prejudicial.

4. URGENT ITEMS

4.1 There were none.

5. REPORTS

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

6. SCHOOL STREETS EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (ETRO) - SOUTHOVER CE PRIMARY SCHOOL, LEWES

5.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport.

5.2 Mr Noel Fadden, District Councillor Graham Clews and Mr Kevin Moore spoke for the recommendation to not uphold objections to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) in relation to Southover CE Primary – Potters Lane, Cleve Terrace and that the ETRO be made permanent in relation to Southover CE Primary – Potters Lane, Cleve Terrace.

5.3 Councillor Wendy Maples, the Local Member spoke in support of the officer's recommendations.

5.4 The Committee Members have considered the report, together with the comments of the public speakers and the Local Member and agree with the conclusions and reasons for the recommendation set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

5.7 The Committee unanimously RESOLVED to:

1) Not uphold objections to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) in relation to Southover CE Primary – Potters Lane, Cleve Terrace and The Course Lewes; and

2) Recommended to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the ETRO be made permanent.

7. BEXHILL CYCLE ROUTE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

7.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport.

7.2 The following Local Members spoke on the following sites detailed in the report:

Site	Local Member
Junction of Arthur Road/ Piltdown Close/ Downlands Avenue	Cllr Nuala Geary
Junction of Richmond Avenue /South Cliff	Cllr Ian Hollidge
Junction of Terminus Avenue/Collington Avenue	Cllr Nuala Geary
Colebrooke Road	Cllr Nuala Geary
Down Road	Cllr Abul Azad
London Road footpath	Cllr Abul Azad
Footpath between A259 Little Common Road and Arthur Road	Cllr Nuala Geary

7.3 Committee Members have considered the report and comments of the Local Members and agree with the conclusions and reasons for the recommendations as set out in the report.

7.4 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Uphold, in part, the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
- 2) Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of the report; and
- 3) Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in part.

(The meeting ended at 11.53 am)

CHAIRMAN

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Regulatory Planning Committee</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>16 July 2025</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Director of Communities, Economy and Transport</b>
<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package Phase 2a Traffic Regulation Order</b>
<b>Purpose of Report:</b>	<b>To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package Phase 2a</b>
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Isobel Kellett</b>
<b>Local Members:</b>	<b>Councillors Stephen Holt and Brett Wright</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Planning Committee is recommended to:**

- 1) not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 of this report; and**
  - 2) recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised, be made in part.**
- 

## **CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT.**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 In 2014 East Sussex County Council secured Local Growth Fund (LGF) monies from the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) towards an Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package (ETCMAP Phase 1 and Phase 2a). Phase 1 was completed in January 2020.

1.2 The objectives for Phase 2a of the Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package, which focus on the section of Terminus Road between Banker's Corner and Marks & Spencer/Millets, are to:

- Upgrading the existing Terminus Road pedestrianised area from 'Bankers Corner' (the junction of Terminus Road with Cornfield Road) through to the junction with Langney Road;
- Introduce a new pedestrianisation section of Terminus Road. This will result in the removal of the current one-way traffic movement from Bolton Road through a short section of Terminus Road and into Langney Road, by introducing a two-way traffic configuration at the lower ends of both Bolton Road and Langney Road; and
- Subject to future funding, create a new pedestrianised civic space outside Marks and Spencer that continues the character, vibrancy and palette of materials used in the Phase 1 - Eastbourne Town Centre Improvement Scheme.

1.3 A public consultation was undertaken between November and December 2019 on the principal design of the overall Phase 2a scheme. This involved consultation with members of the public, local residents, local accessibility groups, statutory bodies, local businesses, taxi operators and bus operators.

1.4 The outcome of the public consultation was presented at the Lead Member for Transport and Environment's decision-making meeting on 22 April 2020. The Lead Member resolved that the scheme should progress to detailed design and construction stages. The final detailed design was subsequently approved on 19 July 2021 at the Lead Member for Transport and Environment's decision-making meeting.

1.5 However, since the award of the LGF funding for the project in 2019, the construction sector has faced a significant rise in material costs, supply chain disruptions, and labour shortages, exacerbated by both the pandemic and the conflict in Ukraine. These factors have contributed to significant unexpected budget increases for Phase 2a of the Eastbourne Town Centre Improvement Scheme. This situation has also been experienced on similar Local Growth Funded packages being delivered by the County Council which have been reviewed and re-scoped to fit within their respective funding envelopes.

1.6 It was therefore resolved by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment in November 2024 to approve the revised scope for the scheme and move forward to construction in 2025/26 subject to final approval of the business case and project change request by the Lead Member for Strategic Management and Economic Development. The Lead Member for Strategic Management and Economic Development resolved to provide the final approval to the business case and project change request in December 2024.

1.7 The first formal advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) took place between 8 July and 29 July 2022. At this time 251 objections were received. Due to constraints outlined in section 1.5 of this report, the order could not be sealed within the statutory two-year time period and so the Traffic Regulation Order needed to be readvertised with the objections carried forward.

1.8 An informal consultation on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Phase 2a scheme was carried out between 6 January to 26 January 2025 with the local Borough and County Councillors and statutory consultees; the emergency services and bus operators.

1.9 On 4 April 2025, the County Council gave notice under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), that it was proposing to make a Traffic Regulation Order. A copy of the draft Traffic Regulation Order is included in Appendix 2. A copy of the advertised Notice of proposals was placed at 17 locations on and in the vicinity of Terminus Road, copies of the proposals were also placed on the County Council's Consultation website, [Eastbourne Phase 2a formal Traffic Regulation Order advertisement - East Sussex - Citizen Space](#). In addition, the Public Notice was advertised in the local newspaper (The Eastbourne Herald). Statutory Consultees were also contacted again to make them aware of the formal consultation. The formal period for representations ended on 25 April 2025.

1.10 The Phase 2a TRO proposals are as follows:

- Changes to Prohibition of Waiting At Any Time in Bolton Road, Lismore Road, Terminus Road, Langney Road.
- Changes to No Waiting At Any Time Except Taxis in Bolton Road, Langney Road
- Changes to Goods Vehicles Loading Only bays in Bolton Road, Langney Road, Terminus Road
- Changes to / Introduction of Disabled Persons Parking Places in Langney Road, Terminus Road, Lismore Road, Tideswell Road
- Removal of Pay and Display Parking Places, Monday to Saturday, 8am-6pm, maximum stay 20min, no return within 1 hour in Langney Road
- Changes to Permit Holders or Pay and Display Parking Places, Monday to Saturday, 8am-6pm, maximum stay 2 hours no return within 1 hour in Tideswell Road
- Introduction of Loading Bay, maximum stay 20min, in Langney Road
- Removal of One-Way Traffic in Bolton Road between Terminus Road and Lismore Road and Langney Road between Susans Road and Terminus Road
- Removal of No Right Turn in the following roads into Lismore Road from Bolton Road and into Langney Road from Susans Road
- Introduction of No Right Turn in the following road into Bolton Road from Lismore Road

## **2. Comments and Appraisal**

2.1 During the first formal consultation period (8 July 2022- 29 July 2022), 223 objections were received in relation to the proposed prohibition of cycling along the scheme extent. A further 27 items of correspondence were received from residents objecting on several grounds. During the second formal consultation period (4 April 2025- 25 April 2025), an additional 10 items of correspondence were received, 9 of these were objections and 1 was in support. Full copies of the correspondence received have been made available in the Members' Room and have also been made available to Planning Committee members in electronic format.

2.2 In relation to the timing of restrictions to loading and unloading, the proposed restrictions were to apply no loading and unloading between the hours of 10am and 6pm for Heavy Goods vehicles exceeding 7.5 tonnes gross weight during this time. After considering these proposed restrictions within the context of the wider scheme, it has been decided not to progress with the restrictions to vehicular traffic within the Traffic Regulation Order at this point in time. Further consideration and discussions will take place over the coming months to determine if and how these proposed timing restrictions for loading and unloading can be taken forward. Options will include the possibility of initially trialling the restrictions through an Experimental TRO.

2.3 Consideration was also given to the loss of on street parking, which equates to approximately 51 spaces. This is made up of 6 blue badge parking bays, 10 vehicle loading bays, 28 on street parking bays and 7 taxi parking bays. Alternative parking provision can be found at the nearby Beacon multi storey car park, alongside Trinity Trees Multi Storey Car park as well as Hyde Gardens and off road parking,

2.4 Overall the level of blue badge parking in the town has increased with the extension of the multi-storey parking at The Beacon Shopping Centre. However,

because of the restricted entry height into the car park, Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles (WAV) are not able to utilise these additional spaces. Therefore, WAVs have to use on-street parking and/or surface car parks in the town.

2.5 At present, space exists for 18 blue badge vehicles in Bolton Road, Langney Road and the section of Terminus Road outside the southern entrance to The Beacon between the two roads. With the pedestrianisation of this section of Terminus Road and conversion of the remaining sections of Bolton Road and Langney Road from one-way to two-way, there will be an overall loss of 6 blue badge parking spaces in the area, however 15 spaces are being reprovisioned in alternative areas as noted in paragraphs 2.6 and 2.7.

2.6 Blue badge parking bays, loading bays and the supply of taxi bays has been recognised as essential in continuing to provide access for those with physical and hidden disabilities who do not own a vehicle or cannot use public transport to access this section of the town centre. Consequently, their provision has been prioritised at the expense of pay and display parking with 5 x 6.6m blue badge bays to be provided in Bolton Road and 5 x 6.6m bays in Langney Road.

2.7 To offset the loss, alternative locations for blue badge parking in and around the town centre have been identified in discussion with members of local disability groups. These will include 1 space in Lismore Road (former on road 'Doctors' allocated spaces for the former Bolton Road surgery) and the potential to utilise 4 spaces in Tideswell Road (to the rear of Marks & Spencer).

2.8 Careful consideration has been given to the extent of the pedestrianised area whilst also ensuring access is maintained to private parking areas off Bolton Road, ensuring any turning movements can be made safely, as well as maximising the opportunity to provide blue badge, loading and taxi bays in the area.

2.9 Objections were received in relation to deliveries for businesses and loading and unloading access for food delivery drivers. Loading bays are proposed on both Langney and Bolton Road with an additional loading bay for waiting up to 20 minutes which can be used by food delivery drivers.

2.10 Objections were also received in relation to the restriction of cycling. The proposals mean that cyclists are still welcome to cycle up to the vicinity of the scheme, dismount, and push their bicycles within the scheme extent, or make use of proposed cycle parking provided at either end of the Phase 2a pedestrianised section of Terminus Road. It is accepted that those wheelers who rely on their bikes for mobility purposes, will still be able to pass through this section of Terminus Road. There are also alternative routes in place for cyclists to travel from the station to the seafront.

2.11 These alternative routes include an on-road route from the station via Old Orchard Road and the Little Chelsea area, the Devonshire area and theatres, and Wilmington Square. This scheme is currently at the detailed design stage and is programmed for construction in 2025/26. East Sussex County Council are also continuing to explore options for improving active travel as part of the relocation of the northern and western sections of the Ring Road from Ashford Road and Susans Road to The Avenue/Upper Avenue and Cavendish Place respectively.

2.12 Having considered the remaining objections; officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. In addition, it is not considered



possible to amend the proposal and still meet the aims of the scheme set out in paragraph 1.2.

2.13 There were 4 objections received in relation to the timing of restrictions to loading and unloading where it has been decided not to progress with the restrictions to vehicular traffic within the Traffic Regulation Order as detailed in paragraph 2.2. The objections received on this proposal therefore do not need to be considered by the committee. Objectors will be included in the further discussions for alternative options.

### **3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendation**

3.1 The Eastbourne Town Centre Phase 2a proposals aim to enhance accessibility and priority for walking and wheeling (people using wheelchairs and other wheeled mobility aids). It will improve connections for pedestrians and people with mobility issues in the town centre and to/from the seafront. This supports the earlier improvements which were delivered as part of Phase 1 between the railway station and Bankers Corner, as well as Cornfield Road and Gildredge Road. It also links with proposed plans for improvements between Seaside Road and Grand Parade.

3.2 The project aims to increase visitor numbers, support local businesses, reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality and improve the public space in this section of Terminus Road. This would enable a safer, healthier and more vibrant Eastbourne town centre for the people who live, visit, shop, and use the services within the town.

3.3 This TRO would allow the changes to parking and traffic movements in the section of Terminus Road between Banker's Corner and Langney Road. The 'pedestrianisation' aspect of the scheme will be given further consideration, potentially using an experimental TRO, to explore and test the proposals, taking account of feedback from traders and residents in the area.

3.4 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in the report, that the Planning Committee does not uphold the objections in Appendix 1, and recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport the Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised, be made in part.

**RUPERT CLUBB**

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix 1 - Proposals where objections are recommended to not be upheld and are recommended to be implemented as advertised**

### **1. Cycling**

#### **1.1 The objections received in relation to cycling are:**

- 1.1.1 223 objections were received on the grounds of a lack of safe cycling routes within the area, requiring users to dismount and push their bikes, not trialling the proposals before implementation, disabilities and health implications, traffic and that they do not think the proposals are necessary in this area. Objectors also provided comments in relation to the removal of cycling within the town centre negatively impacting access to the facilities.
- 1.1.2 Eight objectors raised concerns in reference to cycling and climate change, noting the removal of cycling within the town centre would encourage residents to return to the use of vehicles.
- 1.1.3 Three objectors raised concerns over removing access for cyclists and that they are not allowed in other areas, highlighting concerns for those with disabilities and visual impairments.
- 1.1.4 Two objectors raised concerns about the lack of support for cycle routes and the impact this change would have on the environment with encouraging more people to drive rather than cycle.
- 1.1.5 One objector raised concerns in respect of Climate change, cycling and potholes, referencing traffic congestion affecting health, lack of cycling provision in the town and unsafe surfaces for cyclists.
- 1.1.6 One objection referred to money, climate change, cycling, food deliveries and tourists highlighting their thoughts on alignment of improvements and the high provision of tourists which visit the town bringing supporting the economy.
- 1.1.7 One objector raised concerns around cycling, climate change and the impact on the environment with accommodating motor traffic movements.
- 1.1.8 One objection was received with concerns regarding climate change, cycling, environmental impacts and safety especially for children who wish to cycle to school through the town centre.
- 1.1.9 One objector raised concerns about the environmental impacts, climate change and the lack of cycle lanes within the area.

- 1.1.10 One objector referred to cycling and the importance of public realm, noting Active Travel policies which refer to supporting healthy transport in general.
- 1.1.11 One objection was received referring to climate change, cycling, sustainability and concerns for those with disabilities who will need to dismount their bikes and push them for a distance.
- 1.1.12 One objector referred to concerns relating to cycling, climate change, the increase of traffic and those with ill-health unable to dismount and push electric-cycles.
- 1.2 Alternative designs have been considered by officers and scheme designers and have not been considered feasible. Due to the width of Terminus Road, Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 advises that there should not be shared space for people who cycle and pedestrians. The footfall in this area has also been considered and there would be safety concerns for pedestrians if cycling was permitted within the restrictions to Terminus Road. Cycle parking will be provided at entry points into this section of Terminus Road and cyclists will be asked to dismount and park their cycles.
- 1.3 The Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package is a package of measures, developed in partnership with Eastbourne Borough Council, to enhance and promote the vitality of Eastbourne Town Centre by: Reducing the amount of through-traffic, providing more space for people through the completion of a pedestrian spinal route through the town centre, creating new public spaces and enhancing the existing pedestrian environment at key locations.
- 1.4 Phase 2a seeks to deliver improvements that will support and complement Phase 1 through improving pedestrian safety and accessibility (ease of movement for disabled people and/or older people, families with pushchairs etc.) by reallocating road space to pedestrians, creating a pedestrian 'spine route' through the primary retail area of Eastbourne Town Centre along Terminus Road between Eastbourne Station and Langney Road and coordinating the design of street furniture and signage with Phase 1, which will be finished to a high standard in the town centre.
- 1.5 Officers have been unable to find evidence that there is an environmental benefit of cycling rather than walking.
- 1.6 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

- 1.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

## **2. Proposed Parking Changes**

- 2.1 Two objections were raised during the advertisement, one raised concerns of the strain on parking within the area and one objector was in support of the scheme, however, raised concerns on the implications the scheme may have on local parking.
- 2.2 One objection was received raising concerns of the strain residents already face with parking and how they feel the removal of vehicle access to this area will impact not only residents but also local restaurants/businesses.
- 2.3 One objector raised concerns around additional disabled parking bays being introduced, they raised concerns around the further strain this will have on the resident parking within the area.
- 2.4 Part of the proposals within this scheme involve the removal of existing on street parking on Langney Road and Tideswell Road. The loss of this parking is to enable the pedestrianisation of this section of Terminus Road. This will reduce through traffic and provide more space for movement between the rail station, town centre and seafront on this busy section of Terminus Road which has a high footfall. In addition, there is off street parking elsewhere in the town centre at the Beacon shopping centre and Trinity Trees multi-storey car park as well as off-road in the streets around this section of Terminus Road. Alternative designs have been considered by officers and scheme designers and have not been considered feasible.
- 2.5 The scheme seeks to make changes to existing parking provision along Bolton Road, Terminus Road and Langney Road, with an emphasis on blue badge, loading and taxi parking in the available bays; and the conversion of 4 short term parking bays on Tideswell Road and 3 doctor permit bays on Lismore Road to provide additional disabled parking provision, offsetting the majority of the 9 disabled parking bays lost from Terminus Road and Langney Road.
- 2.6 The carriageway on residential streets is part of the local highway network, which is controlled by the local Highway Authority. The public highway is open to all road users, and no one has the exclusive right to park in a specific space, even outside their own home. The Highway Authority is responsible for maintaining the highway network in a condition that is safe for users.
- 2.7 There is no additional enforcement planned for the introduction of new parking restrictions. These restrictions will continue to be enforced as all other restrictions within the town.

- 2.7 Alternative designs have been considered by officers and scheme designers, and these have not been considered feasible. Blue badge, loading bays and the supply of taxi bays has been recognised as essential in continuing to provide access for those with physical and hidden disabilities who do not own a vehicle or cannot use public transport to this section of the town centre. Consequently, we have prioritised their provision at the expense of pay and display parking with 4 x 6.6m blue badge bays to be provided in Bolton Road and 5 x 6.6m bays in Langney Road. There is off street parking elsewhere in the town centre at the Beacon shopping centre and Trinity Trees multi-storey car park as well as off-road in the streets around this section of Terminus Road.
- 2.8 In the public consultation exercise undertaken between 12 November 2019 and 10 December 2019, the importance of taxi parking and blue badge parking was highlighted to East Sussex County Council.
- 2.9 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 2.10 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

### **3. Changes to Directional Traffic**

- 3.1 One representation that the scheme received was in relation to Lismore Road, they sought clarity on the directional travel of traffic and the turning provisions. A response was provided, however the representee did not return a response to confirm as to whether they wished to retain or revoke the representation.
- 3.2 Having considered the representation, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 3.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

### **4. Traffic**

- 4.1 Three objections were received in relation to concerns around a potentially higher volume of traffic.
- 4.1.1 One objector raised concerns around the increase of traffic due to prohibiting cycling, along with concerns around an increase of air pollution.
- 4.1.2 One objection was received in relation to concerns about more traffic build up within the area, causing disruption as well as being bad for the environment due to congestion.

- 4.1.3 One objection was received in relation to an increase in the already high volume of traffic as well as causing tailbacks, increasing emissions and creating a noisier and unhealthy environment.
- 4.2 The work undertaken on the business case for this scheme demonstrated that the scheme would have health benefits in terms of reducing air pollution in the town centre, as well as encouraging more walking with the further extension of the pedestrianised area of Terminus Road.
- 4.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

## **5. Scheme Design**

- 5.1 One objector, although excited for the scheme to take place, raised concerns around the designs. As the aesthetics of the scheme are not part of the TRO and have been consulted on previously as part of the statutory public consultation exercise between 12 November 2019 and 10 December 2019, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 5.2 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

This page is intentionally left blank



**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL  
ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984**

**THE EASTBOURNE (PRESCRIBED ROUTES) (CONSOLIDATION No 2) Order 2008  
AMENDMENT ORDER 202\* No. \*(ETCIS PHASE 2A)**

East Sussex County Council, in exercise of their powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (4), 3(2), 4(2) and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act"), as amended, and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act hereby make the following Order:-

**1. When this Order comes into effect**

- (a) The Eastbourne (Prescribed Routes) (Consolidation No 2) Order 2008, as amended, shall have effect except as hereinafter contained.

**(i) Part II – Restrictions, that this be amended as follows:**

Insert Items 25 and 26 as follows;

25. Between the hours of 10am and 6pm, no person shall cause or permit any vehicle exceeding 7.5 tonnes gross weight to proceed in any road or length of road specified in Part J of Schedule 5 (Restriction on vehicles over 7.5 tonnes gross weight between 10am and 6pm).
26. No person shall ride or cause to be ridden any pedal cycle on any road or lengths of road specified in Schedule 8 (Prohibition of Pedal Cycles).

**(ii) Schedule One, One Way Traffic, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

**1 Delete items 3 and 25 as follows;**

3	Bolton Road	northwards, from its junction with Lismore Road to its junction with Terminus Road
25	Langney Road	northeastwards from its junction with Terminus Road to its junction with Susans Road

**(iii) Schedule Four, Banned Movements, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

**1 Part A: No right turn, insert item 35 as follows;**

35	Lismore Road	no right turn into Bolton Road
----	--------------	--------------------------------

**2 Part A: No right turn, delete item 12 as follows;**

12	Langney Road	no right turn into Susans Road
----	--------------	--------------------------------

**3 Part C: Right turn only, insert item 1 as follows;**

1	Bolton Road	right turn only into Lismore Road
---	-------------	-----------------------------------

**4 Part G: Prohibition of right turn by vehicles exceeding 7.5 tonnes gross weight, insert item 1 as follows**

1	Susans Road	No right turn Into Langney Road
---	-------------	---------------------------------

**(iv) Schedule Five, Prohibition of Vehicles, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

- 1 Part B: Prohibition of entry, delete items 2 and 11 as follows;

2	Bolton Road	no entry into Lismore Road
11	Langney Road	no entry southwestwards beyond the junction with Susans Road

- 2 Part B: Prohibition of entry, insert items 2(i), 2(ii) and 11 as follows;

2(i)	Bolton Road	no entry into Lismore Road
2(ii)	Bolton Road	no entry southwards into that part of Bolton Road beyond the traffic island and Memorial roundabout
11	Langney Road	no entry into Terminus Road

- 3 Part C: Prohibition of motor vehicles except Terminus Road loading permit holders, insert item 5 as follows;

5	Terminus Road	between Cornfield Road and Bolton Road
---	---------------	--

- 4 A new Part J shall be inserted as follows:

Part J: Prohibition on vehicles exceeding 7.5 tonnes gross weight between 10am and 6pm

1	Bolton Road	northwards between its junction with Memorial Roundabout to its junction with Terminus Road
---	-------------	---

**(v) A new Schedule Eight shall be inserted as follows:**

Schedule Eight: Prohibition of pedal cycles

1	Terminus Road	from Cornfield Road to its junction with Lismore Road
---	---------------	---

2. This Order may be cited as “The Eastbourne (Prescribed Routes) (Consolidation No 2) Order 2008 Amendment Order 202\* No\*” (ETCIS Phase 2A) and shall come into effect on XXXX 202\*.

THE COMMON SEAL of )  
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL )  
was affixed hereto )  
on the day of )  
Two Thousand and XXXX )  
in the presence of:- )

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 - para 4.2 joint report of Director  
of Legal & Community Services & County Engineer - Para 4

## **EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

### **ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984, ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1991 & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004**

**The East Sussex (Eastbourne)(Parking Places and Waiting, No Stopping and Loading Restrictions)Traffic Regulation Order 2021 Amendment No.\* Order 202\* (ETCIS Phase 2A)**

East Sussex County Council, in exercise of their powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (4), 3(2), 4(2), 32, 35(1) and (3), 45, 49, 51, 52, 53 of, and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”) as amended, the Road Traffic Act 1991 (as amended), Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act hereby make the following Order: -

#### **1. Commencement and citation**

This Order may be cited as “The East Sussex (Eastbourne)(Parking Places and Waiting, No Stopping and Loading Restrictions)Traffic Regulation Order 2021 Amendment No.\* Order 202\* (ETCIS Phase 2A)”

#### **2. When this Order comes into effect:**

(a) The East Sussex (Eastbourne)(Parking Places and Waiting, No Stopping and Loading Restrictions)Traffic Regulation Order 2021, as amended, shall have effect except as hereinafter contained.

(b) The Order Plans shall be amended as follows:

<b>The map tiles below shall be revoked</b>	<b>The map tiles below shall be inserted</b>
OG178	OG178 Revision*
OH177	OH177 Revision*
OH178	OH178 Revision*
OI177	OI177 Revision*
OI178	OI178 Revision*

3. Citation

This Order may be cited as “The East Sussex (Eastbourne)(Parking Places and Waiting, No Stopping and Loading Restrictions)Traffic Regulation Order 2021 Amendment No.\* Order 202\* (ETCIS Phase 2A)” and shall come into effect on xx xxxx xxxx

THE COMMON SEAL of EAST SUSSEX            )  
COUNTY COUNCIL was affixed                )  
hereto on the        day of                   two    )  
thousand and       in the presence of:-        )

Authorised Signatory

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 - para 4.2 joint report of Director of Legal & Community Services & County Engineer - para 4.

Committee:	<b>Planning Regulatory Committee</b>
Date:	<b>16 July 2025</b>
Report by:	<b>Director of Communities, Economy and Transport</b>
Title of Report:	<b>Traffic Regulation Orders – Lewes Parking Review 2</b>
Purpose of Report:	<b>To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Lewes Parking Review</b>
Contact Officer:	<b>Natalie Mclean – tel. 01273 482628</b>
Local Members:	<b>Sam Adeniji, Chris Collier, Johnny Denis, Carolyn Lambert, Wendy Maples, James MacCleary, Matthew Milligan, Sarah Osborne and Christine Robinson</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Planning Committee is recommended to:**

- 1) Uphold the objections to the draft order as set out in Appendix 1 of this report;**
  - 2) Uphold in part the objections to the draft order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report;**
  - 3) Not uphold the objections to the draft order as set out in Appendix 3 of this report; and**
  - 4) Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in part.**
- 
- 

## **CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT.**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Requests for new or for changes to existing parking and waiting restrictions in the Lewes District area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations ran from 7 February to 28 February 2025 to see whether there was enough public support to introduce further controls such as double yellow lines or changes to permit parking schemes in the district.
- 1.2 Feedback from the consultations led to formal proposals being developed. The formal consultation ran from 2 May to 28 May 2025. These formal proposals were advertised, together with the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 4) in the Sussex Express on 2 May 2025. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 700 postcards were delivered to local addresses, and the consultation was placed on the Council's Consultation Hub for any member of the public to comment.
- 1.3 Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant County, Town and District Councillors, Parish Councils and statutory consultees including the emergency services. Copies of all

supporting correspondence are available in the Members' Room and have also been made available to Planning Committee members in electronic format.

- 1.4 During the formal consultation 43 items of correspondence were received. These included 34 objections and 9 items of support. 6 objections have since been withdrawn.

## **2. Comments and Appraisal**

- 2.1 Each item of correspondence has been considered individually, and a summary of the objections and officer comments are included in Appendices 1, 2 and 3. Plans and photographs showing the areas objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack.
- 2.2 Three of the sites in this report relate to a proposed 3-hour maximum stay in the disabled bays on High Street, Station Street and Morris Road, which are included in Appendix 1. Based on all the representations, officers are satisfied that the objections received to these proposals do provide sufficient grounds to warrant their withdrawal.
- 2.3 Following consideration of the responses and comments from one of the disability access groups, officers have concluded that the objections summarised in Appendix 2 should be upheld in part for the following sites: Albion Street, Brook Street, Court Road and Grange Road.
- 2.4 With regard to objections relating to Blois Road, Crisp Road, East Street, Evelyn Avenue, Lawes Avenue, Lee Road, Lewes Road, Newick Hill, Old Malling Way, Sun Street, St Peters Avenue, Telscombe Cliffs Way, Waldshut Road, as set out in Appendix 3, it is not considered that these objections provide sufficient grounds to warrant the modification or withdrawal of the proposals. The proposals are considered to provide for the most efficient use of parking space. It is recommended that these objections should not be upheld.
- 2.5 It is also recommended that all other proposals not objected to should be implemented as advertised.

## **3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations**

- 3.1 The approach in trying to resolve objections to the Order has been to appraise the concerns raised by residents and other road users, whilst not compromising road safety or other factors. Objections on 4 of the sites are considered to merit the withdrawal of part of the proposal. Objections to 3 of the sites merit the proposals to be withdrawn in full. Officers consider that, for highway and road safety reasons, the remaining objections (as set out in Appendix 3) should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as advertised.
- 3.2 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in this report, that the Planning Committee upholds the objections in Appendix 1, upholds in part the objections in Appendix 2, does not uphold the objections in Appendix 3, and recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made in part.

**RUPERT CLUBB**

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

## **Appendix 1 – Proposals where objections are recommended to be upheld**

### **1. Site 1 High Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to replace the current disabled persons' badge holders parking place at any time with a disabled persons' badge holders parking place 9am-6pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h bay.
- 1.2 Three objections have been received. Two objections, from the Lewes Area Access Group and a resident, are on the grounds that the bays should not have a maximum stay restriction. One objection is on the grounds that parking is in high demand and the proposal will reduce available spaces.
- 1.3 The proposal follows a request to provide a greater vehicle turnover for blue badge holder visitor parking to nearby amenities.
- 1.4 Having considered all the objections, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to withdraw the proposal.
- 1.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours.
- 1.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal

### **2. Site 2 Station Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to replace the current blue disabled persons' badge holders parking place at any time with a disabled persons' badge holders parking place 9am-6pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h bay.
- 2.2 Three objections have been received. Two objections, from the Lewes Area Access Group and a resident, are on the grounds that the bays should not have a maximum stay restriction. One objection is on the grounds that parking is in high demand and the proposal will reduce available spaces.
- 2.3 The proposal follows a request to provide a greater vehicle turnover for blue badge holder visitor parking to nearby amenities.
- 2.4 Having considered all the objections, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to withdraw the proposal.
- 2.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours.
- 2.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal.

### **3. Site 3 Morris Road, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to replace the current disabled persons' badge holders parking place with a disabled persons' badge holders parking place 9am-6pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h bay.

- 3.2 One objection, from the Lewes Area Access Group, is on the grounds that the bays should not have a maximum stay restriction.
- 3.3 The proposal follows a request to provide a greater vehicle turnover for blue badge holder visitor parking to nearby amenities.
- 3.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to withdraw the proposal.
- 3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours
- 3.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal.



## **Appendix 2 – Proposals where objections are recommended to be upheld in part**

### **1. Site 4 Albion Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to install a new disabled persons' badge holders parking place bay 8am-8pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h, replacing a section of the permit holders Mon-Sat 8am-8pm.
- 1.2 Four objections have been received, one from the Lewes Area Access Group on the grounds that the bay should not have a maximum stay restriction and three from residents on the grounds that parking is in high demand and the proposal will reduce available spaces.
- 1.3 The proposal follows a request to provide blue badge holder parking for visitors to nearby amenities including the dental practice nearby.
- 1.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to modify the proposal to remove the maximum stay. It is recognised that the proposal will reduce available parking for permit holders by one space, but this will allow blue badge holders to access the local shops and amenities., Outside of the operational hours, which are 8am to 8pm, the bay will be available for all users to park in it.
- 1.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours.
- 1.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold, in part, the objections and to modify the proposal by removing the maximum stay element.

### **2. Site 5 Brook Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to install a disabled persons' badge holders parking place bay 9am-5pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h, replacing a shared use paid for parking or permit holders parking place Mon-Sat 9am-5pm and a small section of no waiting at any time.
- 2.2 One objection has been received from the Lewes Area Access Group on the grounds that the bay should not have a maximum stay restriction.
- 2.3 The proposal follows a request to provide blue badge holder parking for visitors to nearby amenities.
- 2.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to modify the proposal to remove the maximum stay.
- 2.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours.
- 2.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold, in part, the objection and to modify the proposal by removing the maximum stay element.

**3. Site 6 Court Road, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to install a new disabled persons' badge holders parking place 9am-5pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h, replacing a shared use paid for parking or permit holders parking place Mon-Sat 9am-5pm.
- 3.2 One objection has been received from the Lewes Area Access Group on the grounds that the bay should not have a maximum stay restriction.
- 3.3 The proposal follows a request to provide blue badge holder parking for visitors to nearby amenities.
- 3.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to modify the proposal to remove the maximum stay.
- 3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal but requested the bays should be consistent with other bays which stand at 4 hours
- 3.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold, in part, the objection and to modify the proposal by removing the maximum stay element.

**4. Site 7 Grange Road, Lewes (Councillor Wendy Maples)**

- 4.1 The proposal at this location is to install a new disabled persons' badge holders parking place 8am-6pm, max stay 3hrs, no return within 1h, replacing a shared use paid for parking or permit holders parking place Mon-Sat 8am-6pm.
- 4.2 One objection has been received from the Lewes Area Access Group on the grounds that the bay should not have a maximum stay restriction.
- 4.3 The proposal follows a request to provide blue badge holder parking for visitors to nearby amenities.
- 4.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to modify the proposal to remove the maximum stay.
- 4.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Wendy Maples has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 4.6 **Recommendation:** To uphold, in part, the objection and to modify the proposal by removing the maximum stay element.

### **Appendix 3 – Proposals where objections are recommended to not be upheld and are recommended to be implemented as advertised**

#### **1. Site 8 Waldshut Road, Lewes (Councillor Wendy Maples)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to install no waiting Mon-Sat 7am-7pm.
- 1.2 Four objections have been received, on the grounds that the amount of parking spaces will be reduced, and that parking is already difficult around the estate, this will cause inconvenience for residents and that the proposal will not solve the current problems.
- 1.3 The proposal follows a request from the bus company due to parked vehicles creating a tighter width area for the buses. Following a survey carried out on the bus by the bus Civil Enforcement Office (CEO) it was reported that the bus cannot pass through at times, needs to deviate their route and there was damage to a bus once on the journey around the estate. Following other site visits to the area it was found that there is not enough road width for larger vehicles to pass when there are vehicles parked on both sides of the road. Feedback has been received from the refuse and recycling team that access for their vehicles is very difficult in the area. This proposal will help to facilitate the bus journey, increase safety and allow larger vehicles to pass through whilst still allowing residents to park outside of the operational hours.
- 1.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 1.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Maples has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 1.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

#### **2. Site 9 Blois Road and Crisp Road, Lewes (Councillor Wendy Maples)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to install no waiting Mon-Sat 7am-7pm.
- 2.2 Four objections have been received, on the grounds that the amount of parking spaces will be reduced, and that parking is already difficult around the estate, this will cause inconvenience for residents and that the proposal will not solve the current problems.
- 2.3 The proposal follows a request from the bus company due to parked vehicles creating a tighter width area for the buses. Following a survey carried out on the bus by the bus CEO it was reported that the bus cannot pass through at times when there are vehicles parked on both sides of road with the buses needing to deviate their route. There was also damage to the bus once on the journey around the estate. Following other site visits to the area Officers found that there is not enough road width for larger vehicles to pass when there are vehicles parked on both sides. Feedback was also received from the refuse and recycling team that access is very difficult in the area, especially all along Crisp Road and by the junction with Blois Road. The current proposal will facilitate the bus journey, increase safety and allow larger vehicles to pass through whilst allowing residents to park outside of the operational hours.
- 2.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

- 2.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Maples has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 2.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

### **3. Site 10 Old Malling Way, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to extend double yellow lines on the west and south side of the road.
- 3.2 Six objections have been received, on the grounds that yellow lines will cause vehicle displacement, reduce available parking spaces for residents and that the proposal does not resolve the current issues with the Police HQ using the road to park. 2 of the objectors mention that a permit scheme would be more appropriate to address the current issues around the estate. One of the objections has since been withdrawn. Three items of support were received.
- 3.3 The proposal follows a request from the bus company and a resident due to the parked vehicles creating a reduced width for the buses with parked vehicles on both sides of the road causing difficulties for larger vehicles. According to the resident's comments an ambulance could not access the properties and pets are being run over. Site visits were carried out at various times on different days, and it was noted that when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road it creates a bottle neck with reduced widths that makes it impossible for any larger vehicle to pass through. Whilst it is acknowledged that some displacement of vehicles may occur the proposed double yellow lines will improve the traffic flow in the area, increase safety for all road users, and provide better access for larger vehicles including emergency services.
- 3.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal to be implemented as advertised.
- 3.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

### **4. Site 11 Lee Road, Lewes (Councillor Wendy Maples)**

- 4.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing double yellow lines on the south side of Lee Road.
- 4.2 One objection was received on the grounds that the council should provide dropped kerbs and white lines instead of banning vans from parking on street.
- 4.3 The proposal follows a request made by the bus company due to vehicles parking on both sides creating a reduced width for the buses to pass outside of the newsagents. The objector did not leave any information for a response to be sent. Extending the yellow lines by 10 metres will still allow vehicles to use the lay-by outside of the newsagent whilst enabling larger vehicles to safely navigate the road and provide better access for emergency services and other larger vehicles.
- 4.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

- 4.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Maples has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 4.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.
- 5. Site 12 Sun Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**
- 5.1 The proposal at this location is to replace a section of the permit holders only bay, Mon-Sat 9am-5pm, with a 6.6 metre disabled persons' badge holders parking place at all times.
- 5.2 Four objections have been received. One of the objections supports additional disabled spaces but parking spaces should not be lost for residents and spaces should be increased as a whole. One of the objections is on the grounds that parking is already in high demand and the proposal will remove an additional residents' parking space and that there is currently one other disabled bay on this street. One of the objections is on the grounds that on street parking should be kept only for residents and no more residents' permits should be sold. The other objection is on the grounds of the overall amount of lost parking spaces of other people within the community to non-blue badge holders.
- 5.3 Whilst it is acknowledged that the permit holders bay will be reduced, the proposal follows a request from a resident of the area who meets the eligibility criteria for an on street disabled parking bay.
- 5.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 5.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal to be implemented as advertised.
- 5.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.
- 6. Site 13 East Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**
- 6.1 The proposal at this location is to replace a section of the permit holders parking place Mon-Sat 8am-8pm, with a 6.6 metre disabled persons' badge holders parking place at all times.
- 6.2 Four objections have been received. One objection is that the provision of extra disabled bays should be provided on level ground. One of the objections is on the grounds that on street parking should be kept only for residents and no more residents' permits should be sold. Two objections are on the grounds that parking is already in high demand and the proposal will remove available spaces for residents.
- 6.3 Whilst it is acknowledged that the permit holders bay will be reduced, the proposal follows a request from a resident of the area who meets the eligibility criteria for an on street disabled parking bay.
- 6.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 6.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Denis has confirmed his support for the proposal to be implemented as advertised.
- 6.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

**7. Site 14 Lewes Road, Ditchling (Councillor Sarah Osborne)**

- 7.1 The proposal at this location is to install new school keep clear zigzags Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am and 2.30pm-4pm except August.
- 7.2 One objection has been received that the proposed restrictions are inadequate and will not prevent congestion, and this will not increase safety for children.
- 7.3 The proposal follows a request from the school for school keep clear markings to stop vehicles blocking the access to the school and increase safety. Installing the school keep clear will make the entrance to the school safer for all road users and the children attending this school.
- 7.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 7.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Osborne has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 7.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**8. Site 15 Evelyn Avenue, Newhaven (Councillor Sarah Osborne)**

- 8.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise an existing advisory disabled persons' badge holders parking place.
- 8.2 One objection has been received on the grounds that some disabled bays on Lawes and Evelyn Avenues are unused or misused, with one treated as a private space. Parking in the area is in high demand so unused disabled bays should be removed before new disabled bays are installed.
- 8.3 The proposal follows a request from a blue badge holder resident as the bay is not being respected by vehicles without a blue badge. The applicant has been assessed and meets the eligibility criteria for the provision of an on-street disabled persons' badge holders parking place.
- 8.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 8.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Osborne has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 8.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**9. Site 16 Lawes Avenue, Newhaven (Councillor Sarah Osborne)**

- 9.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise an existing advisory disabled persons' badge holders parking place.
- 9.2 One objection has been received on the grounds that some disabled bays on Lawes and Evelyn Avenues are unused or misused, with one treated as a private space. Parking in the area is in high demand so unused disabled bays should be removed before new disabled bays are installed.
- 9.3 The proposal follows a request from a blue badge holder resident as the bay is not being respected by vehicles without a blue badge. The applicant has been assessed and meets the eligibility criteria for the provision of an on-street disabled persons' badge holders parking place.

- 9.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 9.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Osborne has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 9.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**10. Site 17 Telscombe Cliffs Way, Peacehaven (Councillor Sarah Osborne)**

- 10.1 The proposal at this location is to install new No waiting at any time, extend the existing No waiting at any time and install a bus stop.
- 10.2 Eleven objections were received. Eight of which supported the proposals but requested additional restrictions and were treated as objections. One objects to the proposal for a bus stop clearway on the grounds that the markings will cover the space in front of their driveway and this will not successfully deter vehicles parking over their driveway compared to a no waiting at any time restriction and requests the no waiting at any time on the opposite side to be extended too. One objection is on the grounds that the no waiting at any time on the opposite side of the bus stop should be extended as currently buses drive over the verge and the objector's driveway and damage the grass verge when there is a vehicle blocking the road. One objection is on the grounds that the area around the bus stop should be widened, and a 20 MPH should be considered. One objection is on the grounds that the no waiting at any time opposite the bus stop should be longer. One objection is on the grounds that resident permits should be available for residents of Telscombe Cliffs Way and a double red line be considered. One objection is on the grounds that parking issues will be moved to Warren Way and Tye View. Five of the objections have been withdrawn. Support was received, from Brighton & Hove buses, Telscombe residents and Telscombe Town Council.
- 10.3 The proposal follows a request from a resident of the area and Telscombe Town Council due to a report from Telscombe Residents Association about buses driving along St Peters Avenue struggling to turn into Telscombe Cliffs Way due to the parked cars. The County Council's Passenger Transport team requested that bus stop clearway markings, with an extension to the existing no waiting at any time restriction and a new no waiting at any time restriction at the junction, to facilitate the bus route.
- 10.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 10.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Osborne has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 10.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

**11. Site 18 Newick Hill, Newick (Councillor Matthew Milligan)**

- 11.1 The proposal at this location is a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) amendment only to legally formalise the current restriction that is on the ground.
- 11.2 One objection has been received on the grounds that motorists should not be exploited for profit and funds should be spent responsibly.

- 11.3 The proposal follows a request to extend the no waiting at any time on the junction. During investigations it was noted that the restriction marked on the road and the TRO description differed slightly, this proposal will amend the TRO anomaly.
- 11.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 11.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Milligan has replied to confirm he neither supports nor objects to the recommendation.
- 11.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.



## **Appendix 4 - Draft Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised**

### **EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

#### **ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984, ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1991 & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004**

#### **EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING, NO STOPPING, LOADING, UNLOADING AND PARKING PLACES) (LEWES DISTRICT CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2025 Amendment No 1 2025**

East Sussex County Council, in exercise of their powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (4), 3(2), 4(2), 32, 35(1) and (3), 45, 46, 49, 51, 52 and 53 of, and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”), as amended, the Road Traffic Act 1991, as amended, Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act hereby make the following Order:-

#### **1. Commencement and citation**

This Order may be cited as “EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING, NO STOPPING, LOADING, UNLOADING AND PARKING PLACES) (LEWES DISTRICT CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2025 Amendment No 1 2025” and shall come into effect on xxxxxx

#### **2. When this Order comes into effect:**

- (i) EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING, NO STOPPING, LOADING, UNLOADING AND PARKING PLACES) (LEWES DISTRICT CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2025 Amendment No 1 2025 as amended, shall have effect except as hereinafter contained.

Without prejudice to the validity of anything done prior or to any liability incurred in respect of any act or omission before the coming into operation of this Order, EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING, NO STOPPING, LOADING, UNLOADING AND PARKING PLACES) (LEWES DISTRICT CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2025 Amendment No 1 2025, have effect subject to the variations, insertions, substitutions, removals, and additions specified in the map schedules and map schedule legends of this Order:-

#### **1) Map schedule legend and map schedule for TRO/515 consisting of;**

Map 1 of 20	Map 6 of 20	Map 11 of 20	Map 16 of 20
Map 2 of 20	Map 7 of 20	Map 12 of 20	Map 17 of 20
Map 3 of 20	Map 8 of 20	Map 13 of 20	Map 18 of 20
Map 4 of 20	Map 9 of 20	Map 14 of 20	Map 19 of 20
Map 5 of 20	Map 10 of 20	Map 15 of 20	Map 20 of 20

- (ii) Part I - Preliminary - Interpretation shall be amended: by adding the following definitions

“school entrance markings” means an area of carriageway of a specified road which is comprised within the road markings prescribed in The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002;

“entrance marking” means an area of carriageway as shown by the order plans where a vehicle must not stop;

- (iii) Part II - Waiting and Loading restrictions and designation of Parking Place shall be amended by adding the following definitions:

3	(4)	Save as provided in Article 3(5), no person shall cause or permit any vehicle to stop on any of the lengths of road and on such days during the permitted hours as specified in the Order Plans as having a ‘No Stopping on Entrance Markings’ restriction.
	(5)	Nothing in Article 3 (4) of this Section shall render it unlawful to cause or permit any vehicle to wait in the length or road referred to in that Article for so long as may be necessary to enable:-
	(a)	The vehicle to be used for emergency services purposes;
	(b)	A vehicle to wait owing to the driver being prevented from proceeding by circumstances beyond his control or to such waiting being necessary in order to avoid accident;
	(6)	No person shall cause or permit a bus or coach to wait in any road or length of road in Lewes District

- (iv) Part III - Contraventions and Penalty Charge shall be amended by adding the following definitions:

6.4	A Penalty Charge Notice shall also be served by post by the Council (the enforcement authority) as defined in The Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations (CEPCGR) 2007 or any re-enactment or modification thereof from time to time in force where;
	(a) on the basis of a record produced by an approved device, the authority has reason to believe that a penalty charge is payable with respect to a

		vehicle which is stationary in a civil enforcement area; or
	(b)	A civil enforcement officer had begun to prepare a penalty charge notice for service in accordance with regulation 9 of CEPGCR, but the vehicle concerned was driven away from the place in which it was stationary before the civil enforcement officer had finished preparing the penalty charge notice or had served it in accordance with regulation 9 of CEPGCR,
		and references in these Regulations to a "regulation 10 penalty charge notice" are to a penalty charge notice served by virtue of this paragraph

- (v) Part III - Alteration of position, duty to move on, and contravention of restrictions shall be amended by adding the following definitions:

7.	(4)	Except as provided in this Order, if a person causes or permits a vehicle to be in a Bus Lane, whether it be for the purposes of driving, waiting, stopping loading, unloading, or any other reason during the prescribed hours then a contravention shall be deemed to have occurred and a penalty charge shall be payable.
----	-----	--

THE COMMON SEAL of )  
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL )  
was affixed hereto )  
on the xx day of xxxxxxxx )  
Two Thousand and xxxxxx )  
in the presence of:- )

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 - para 4.2 joint  
report of Director of Legal &  
Community Services & County  
Engineer - Para 4.

This page is intentionally left blank