



REGULATORY COMMITTEE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING 10.30 am WEDNESDAY, 18 MARCH 2026

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 February 2026 (*Pages 3 - 6*)
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. Bus Service Improvement Plan A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven, Traffic Regulation Order 520/539/540 (*Pages 7 - 28*)
Report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
6. Any other items previously notified under agenda item 4

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

10 March 2026

Contact Summer Kelly, Governance and Democracy Officer,
01273 336654
Email: summer.kelly@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 February 2026.

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

ALSO PRESENT Councillor Ian Hollidge

48. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 DECEMBER 2025

48.1 The Committee approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2025.

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

49.1 There were none.

50. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

50.1 Councillor Daniel declared a personal interest in items 5 and 6 as a holder of a blue badge. He did not consider this to be prejudicial.

50.2 Councillor Kirby-Green declared a personal interest in item 6 as Local Member for the division in which the proposal is situated. She did not consider this to be prejudicial.

50.3 Councillor Hollidge declared a prejudicial interest as a resident within the vicinity of Site 13, Ridgewood Gardens, Bexhill. He did not speak on the Site.

51. URGENT ITEMS

51.1 There were none.

52. REPORTS

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

53. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING 30MPH SPEED LIMIT ON AVIS ROAD, NEWHAVEN

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

53.2 Committee Members have considered the report and agree with the conclusions and reasons for the recommendations as set out in the report.

53.3 The Committee RESOLVED to:

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

54. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - ROTHER PARKING REVIEW 3

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

54.2 Mr Trevor Owlett, Mr Graham Hooker and Mr Gary Saunders spoke for the proposal and against the officer's recommendations for Site 2 Zone F – Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue, Richmond Close, Richmond Grove, Richmond Road, South Cliff and West Parade, Bexhill.

54.3 Councillor Ian Hollidge, a Local Member spoke for the proposal and against the officer's recommendations for Site 2 Zone F – Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue, Richmond Close, Richmond Road, South Cliff and West Parade, Bexhill.

54.4 A motion to not uphold the objections for Site 2 Zone F – Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue, Richmond Close, Richmond Grove, Richmond Road, South Cliff and West Parade, Bexhill were proposed, seconded, voted on and won unanimously.

54.5 Councillor Ian Hollidge, a Local Member spoke in support of the officer recommendations for Site 3 Albany Road, Devonshire Road, Marina and Pankhurst Road, Bexhill, Site 4 Buckhurst Road and Buckhurst Place, Bexhill, Site 6 Egerton Road, Bexhill, Site 8 Magdalen Road, Bexhill, Site 9 Manor Road, Bexhill and Site 12, Ridgewood Gardens, Bexhill.

54.6 Committee Members have considered the report and comments of the public speakers and Local Members and agree with the conclusions and reasons for the recommendations as set out in the report with the exception of the site mentioned in Minute 54.4 above.

54.7 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Uphold the objection to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 to the report with the exception of Site 2 Zone F, – Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue, Richmond Close, Richmond Grove, Richmond Road, South Cliff and West Parade, Bexhill as mentioned in Minute 54.4.
- 2) Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report and Site 2 Zone F – Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue, Richmond Close, Richmond Grove, Richmond Road, South Cliff and West Parade, Bexhill; and
- 3) Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in part.

55. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS - HILL CREST COURT, HILL CREST ROAD, DISABLED BAY FORMALISATION

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

55.2 Committee Members have considered the report and agree with the conclusions and reasons for the recommendations as set out in the report.

55.3 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Not uphold the objections to the draft order as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

2) Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the Order be made as advertised.

(The meeting ended at 11.41 am)

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Regulatory Planning Committee
Date:	18 March 2026
Report by:	Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Title of Report	Bus Service Improvement Plan A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven – Traffic Regulation Order 520/539/540
Purpose of Report:	To consider the representations received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) Bus Priority Scheme on A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven.
Contact Officer:	Humphrey Basset - 01273 482416
Local Member:	Councillor James MacCleary

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

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

CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT.

1. Introduction

1.1 The A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven Bus Priority Scheme in Newhaven forms part of a package of bus priority measures that the County Council initially consulted upon with the public and stakeholders in summer 2023 at feasibility stage.

1.2 The Lead Member for Transport and Environment approved to progress the schemes to preliminary design, detailed design and construction at a [decision-making meeting in January 2024](#).

1.3 To meet DfT programme targets the scheme has been split into two phases. Phase One has progressed into the detailed design phase with construction scheduled to follow in 2026/27. Phase Two will progress once further funding is identified.

1.4 The scheme is integral to fulfilling the objectives of the East Sussex Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4 - adopted October 2024) and the East Sussex BSIP which is a supporting document to the LTP4. The BSIP aims to expand access to high-quality bus services for residents, optimise journey times by minimising delays, and provide a frequent, integrated, and comprehensive alternative to car travel within Newhaven.

1.5 A summary of the Notice of the proposals is listed below. A full version of the Notice is detailed at Appendix 1.

East Sussex County Council proposes to introduce:

- **Bus Lanes** in the following roads in Newhaven:
 - Denton Roundabout (northern side)
 - A259 Seaford Road (southern side)
 - Mount Road Service Road (bus interchange)

- **One-way workings** in the following roads in Newhaven:
 - Mount Road Service Road (northern arm – north to south)
 - Mount Road Service Road (western and eastern arm – west to east)

- **40 miles per hour (mph) speed limit** in the following roads in Newhaven:
 - A259 Seaford Road (both sides)

- **No Waiting At Any Time** in the following roads in Newhaven:
 - Mount Road (south-west side)
 - Mount Road (north-east side)
 - Station Road (west side)

1.6 Bus stop restrictions were referenced in the public notice for transparency; however, they do not form part of the formal Traffic Regulation Order and may be introduced separately under the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions.

The locations referenced were the following:

- Mount Road Service Road (north side)
- B2109 Avis Road (north-east side)
- B2109 Avis Road (north-east side)
- Mount Road (north-east side)
- Station Road (east side)

2. Comments and Appraisal

2.1 An initial informal consultation on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven took place between 16 December 2024 and 16 January 2025 with the local District and County Councillors, bus operators, businesses, residents and statutory consultees including the emergency

services. 631 responses were received.

2.2 On 30 January 2026, the County Council gave notice under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, that it was proposing to make a Traffic Regulation Order - A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven - TRO/520/539/540. A copy of the Notice is included at Appendix 1.

2.3 The Notice was advertised in the Sussex Express on 30 January 2026. Copies of the Notice were placed on columns along the scheme extent. Hard copies of the documents relevant to the proposed TRO were available to view at Newhaven Town Council and County Hall in Lewes. 2,500 postcards with details of the consultation were delivered to residential and business properties along the scheme extent. 57 local Newhaven businesses were emailed with details of the proposed TRO and how to make a representation. Active travel groups and accessibility groups were also emailed. The consultation was placed on the Council's Consultation Hub website and residents were also invited to provide their feedback by email and by post. Residents were provided with a contact telephone number if they wished to request the TRO information in an alternative format. The formal period for representations ended on 22 February 2026.

2.4 During the formal consultation period, 76 representations were received in relation to the proposals. Of these, 73 were objections, of which 18 were specifically related to the orders proposed within the TROs. Seven representations expressed partial support, three were in full support of the proposals, and one objection was withdrawn following the provision of further information. Full copies of the correspondence received and responses from ESCC have been made available in the Members' Room and have also been made available to Planning Committee Members in electronic format.

2.5 Each objection has been considered individually and a summary of the objections and officer responses are included in Appendix 2.

2.6 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn and that the objections should not be upheld.

2.7 The recommendation is to not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2. The numbers listed in Appendix 2 exceed the total number of objections received since many objections referenced multiple themes and therefore many representations are counted under more than one theme.

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendation

3.1 The A259 The Drove and Seaford Road bus priority scheme in Newhaven is part of a wider package of bus priority measures that is funded through the BSIP funding that East Sussex County Council has received from Government to deliver bus priority infrastructure in the county.

3.2 Introducing the A259 The Drove and Seaford Road bus priority scheme is integral to delivering the objectives of the East Sussex LTP 4 and East Sussex BSIP, enabling residents to enjoy higher quality bus services, improved journey times with reduced delays, that provide a frequent, integrated and comprehensive choice and an alternative to the car. The proposals also aim to improve safety and accessibility for all road users within the area.

3.3 The scheme is currently at detailed design stage and is programmed for construction in 2026/27.

3.4 The TRO will enable:

- The introduction of a bus lane on the northern side of Denton Roundabout, the creation of a new bus interchange connecting Denton Roundabout and Mount Road Service Road with an eastbound exit onto the A259 Seaford Road, and the introduction of a westbound bus lane on the A259 Seaford Road.
- The introduction of one-way workings within the new bus interchange, north to south through the northern arm, and west to east from the western to eastern arm.
- The extension of the existing 40mph speed limit south-east along the A259 Seaford Road by 192.5 metres.
- The introduction of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on sections of Mount Road and Station Road.

3.5 The approach in trying to resolve objections to the Orders has been to appraise the concerns raised by residents and other road users, whilst meeting road safety standards and the objectives of the scheme. Officers consider that for reasons presented in this report, objections should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as advertised.

3.6 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in this report, that the Planning Committee does not uphold the objections in Appendix 2 and recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made as advertised.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984

East Sussex County Council (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting, No Stopping, Loading, Unloading and Parking Places) (Lewes District Consolidation) Order 2025 Amendment No. * 202* (Mount Road and Station Road, Newhaven)

The East Sussex (Lewes) (A259, The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven) (40mph Speed Limit) Order 202*

The East Sussex (Lewes) (Newhaven Bus Priority) Order 202*

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that East Sussex County Council proposes to make the above Traffic Regulation Orders under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended, and of all other enabling powers which will introduce:

No Waiting At Any Time in the following roads in **Newhaven**:

Mount Road - south-west side -

from the north-eastern junction of Mount Road (Bus Stop Interchange) to a point 1.3 metres south-west of a point opposite the common boundary of Nos. 3c and 3d.

Mount Road - north-east side -

from a point 3.8 metres south-east of the common boundary of Nos. 3c and 3d north-westwards for a distance of 35 metres.

Station Road - west side

from a point opposite the northern wall of No. 10 south-westwards for a distance of 24.3 metres.

40 miles per hour (mph) speed limit

A259 Seaford Road - both sides -

from a point 1 metre east of the common boundary of Nos. 1 and 1a south-eastwards for 192.5 metres (connecting to the existing 40mph speed limit).

Bus Lane in the following lengths of road in **Newhaven**:

Denton Roundabout - northern side -

between the entry and exit with B2109 Avis Road on the circulatory outer lane.

A259 Seaford Road - southern side (westbound) -

from a point 1.4 metres south-east of a point opposite the common boundary of Nos. 1b and 1c south-eastwards for a distance of 80 metres.

Mount Road Service Road (bus Interchange) -

for the entire length.

One-way workings in the following lengths of road in **Newhaven:**

Mount Road Service Road (bus Interchange) - northern arm -

from north to south.

Mount Road Service Road (bus Interchange) - western and eastern arm -

from west to east.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that East Sussex County Council proposes to introduce a number of Bus Stops restrictions in the following lengths of road in **Newhaven:**

Mount Road Service Road (bus Interchange) - north side -

from a point 17.3 metres north-west of the north-eastern kerb-line of A259 Seaford Road north-westwards for a distance of 30 metres.

B2109 Avis Road - north-east side -

from a point opposite 12 metres south-east of the north-western extremity kerb-line of Avis Road south-westward for a distance of 12.9 metres.

B2109 Avis Road - south-west side -

from a point of 1 metre south-east of a point opposite the north-western extremity kerb-line of Avis Road north-westward for 13 metres.

Mount Road - north-east side -

from a point 8.9 metres north-west of the kerb-line of Tide Mills View north-westwards for a distance of 15 metres.

Station Road - east side -

from a point 5.8 metres south of the northern wall of No.10, south-westwards for a distance of 15.1 metres.

A copy of the proposed Orders, plans showing the length of road and a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing the Orders along with a copy of the Orders being amended can be viewed in Reception, East Sussex County Council, County Hall, St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes BN7 1UE or at the offices of Newhaven Town Council, 18 Fort Road, Newhaven, BN9 9QE on Monday to Friday between 9am and 4pm or online at;

<https://consultation.eastsussex.gov.uk/economy-transport-environment/bsip-newhaven-denton-tro>

Any person wishing to make an objection or other representation concerning this proposals must do so in writing, together with the grounds on which it is made, to Communities Economy & Transport, Parking, D Floor, East Sussex County Council, County Hall, St. Anne's Crescent, Lewes BN7 1UE, or by email to majorprojectsandgrowth@eastsussex.gov.uk to arrive no later than 22 February 2026. quoting the following reference(s):

- TRO/520 - No waiting at any time proposals
- TRO/539 - 40mph speed limit proposal
- TRO/540 - Bus Lane and one way traffic proposals

If you have any questions, require further information or would like paper copies of the proposals please telephone East Sussex Highways on 0345 60 80 193.

Philip Baker, Deputy Chief Executive

Governance Services Department, County Hall, Lewes, East Sussex BN7 1UE

30 January 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2

18 March 2026 – Planning Committee

BSIP A259 The Drove and Seaford Road, Newhaven – Traffic Regulation Order 520/539/540

Local Members: Councillor James MacCleary

Local Member was contacted on 26 January 2026. No representation received.

Proposals where objections are recommended to not be upheld and are recommended to be implemented as advertised

1. Introduction

1.1 Of the **76** objections received, **18** related to the specific traffic orders proposed in the TROs. These 18 objections have been split into themes:

2. Impact of the Bus Lanes

2.1 **Fourteen** objections raised concerns around the perceived negative impact of the bus lanes.

2.2 Objections to the proposed bus lane on the northern side of Denton Roundabout expressed concerns that it would reduce capacity for general traffic and increase risk of collisions on the roundabout due to potential lane confusion.

2.3 This short section of bus lane enables buses from the A259 The Drove to use the lefthand lane, normally left turn only for general traffic, to continue directly ahead into the new bus interchange and bus stop. It provides a clear, direct route for buses and supports the efficient operation of the interchange. Marking this area as bus only also reinforces correct lane discipline for general traffic, helping to prevent cars from using the wrong lane on the roundabout, which has been a source of conflict in the past. The measure is intended to improve clarity for all road users while ensuring buses can access the interchange safely and smoothly.

2.4 Objections to the proposed bus lane on the southern side of the A259 Seaford Road centred on the perceived reduction of two general traffic lanes to one, and the potential impact this could have on congestion, journey times and vehicle emissions.

2.5 The bus lane has been designed to end before the approach to Denton Roundabout, thereby maintaining the existing two-lane entry to the roundabout. Microsimulation (VISSIM) modelling has been undertaken and indicates that the network will continue to operate effectively with the introduction of the westbound bus lane, while delivering more reliable and consistent journey times for buses. The intention is to support improved bus performance and make services more dependable, helping to encourage sustainable travel along this corridor.

2.6 Objections to the proposed bus lane within the new bus interchange suggested that general traffic may use the interchange to bypass congestion during busy periods. Concerns were also raised that buses may find it difficult to safely emerge from the interchange onto the A259 Seaford Road due to fast-moving traffic, potentially increasing the risk of collisions. It was further suggested that this could impede the flow of buses and lead to the bus stop area becoming blocked if buses are required to wait for longer periods before joining the A259 Seaford Road.

2.7 Access and circulation within the interchange will be restricted to buses only and enforced through camera monitoring. The layout provides buses with a more direct route from Denton Roundabout and Mount Road, removing the previous longer diversion. This supports the relocation of the Denton Corner bus stops and enables additional services, including express routes, to serve the area more efficiently.

2.8 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

2.9 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

3. Proposed One-way Workings

3.1 **Three** objections related to the proposed one-way workings within the new bus interchange.

3.2 Objections raised concerns that it would be difficult for buses to safely emerge from the bus interchange onto the A259 Seaford Road due to fast-moving traffic, which could increase the risk of collisions. It was also suggested that this could impede the flow of buses and potentially lead to blocking of the bus stop area if buses are required to wait for longer periods before joining the A259 Seaford Road.

3.3 The scheme design has considered existing traffic conditions on the A259 and ensures that buses have appropriate visibility, markings, and give way arrangements to merge safely. While it is recognised that this section of the A259

can be busy at peak times of the day, the proposed layout has been developed to operate safely and effectively within those conditions.

3.4 Safety has been a fundamental consideration throughout the development of the project. Road Safety Audits (RSAs) have been undertaken at the appropriate stages of the design process. These audits are carried out by independent specialists who are not involved in the preparation of the scheme design, ensuring an impartial assessment.

3.5 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

3.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

4 No Waiting At Any Time restrictions

4.1 **Four** objections related to the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on Mount Road and Station Road.

4.2 Objections raised concerns that the restrictions would result in the loss of existing uncontrolled on-street parking on Mount Road and Station Road, and would therefore push parking further up Station Road and onto Beresford Road.

4.3 It is recognised that some parking and brief stopping currently takes place in these locations, and that some displacement may occur. However, while waiting will not be permitted where restrictions are introduced, passengers can continue to be set down or collected in nearby areas where stopping is allowed. The proposed restrictions are required to ensure that buses can safely travel without obstruction in locations where the road is narrower or visibility is restricted. Parked vehicles in these areas can create conflict, force vehicles to cross the centre line, and cause delay. The proposed measures are intended to provide a more consistent and reliable operating environment as part of the wider Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP).

Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

4.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

5 Proposed Bus Stops

5.1 Of the **76** objections received, **30** related to the proposed bus stops, which were advertised alongside the TRO proposals for transparency, but are not themselves part of the TRO. Of these 30 objections:

5.2 **28** objections raised concerns about the purpose of suitability of proposed bus stop locations.

5.3 **Fourteen** objections related to safety at proposed bus stops.

5.4 **Seven** objections related to potential flooding near the proposed bus stops on B2019Avis Road

5.5 **Recommendation:** Not required. These objections fall outside the scope of the TRO proposals. Objections recorded for transparency only.

6 Congestion

6.1 **43** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would worsen congestion or would have no effect on existing congestion levels.

6.2 While congestion levels fall outside the scope of the TRO process, traffic conditions have been assessed as part of the wider scheme design. Comprehensive traffic surveys were undertaken across the area, including queue length observations, classified turning counts and signal timing data, with detailed analysis of peak-period conditions. This data informed microsimulation modelling using VISSIM to understand how the proposals interact with traffic flows and junction performance.

6.3 This modelling shows that the scheme is not expected to result in a significant increase in congestion. The design has been developed as part of the East Sussex Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), with the aim of improving bus journey time reliability while avoiding unnecessary detriment to general traffic. The modelling work has supported this approach by testing performance under the busiest conditions.

6.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

7 Bus Journey Times

7.1 **18** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would have no, or only minimal, impact on bus journey times.

7.2 The scheme forms part of the BSIP, which is specifically intended to improve bus journey time reliability and overall service performance along key corridors. Development of the proposals has been informed by comprehensive traffic and

operational surveys, along with microsimulation modelling, to understand how buses operate through the network during peak periods

7.3 This assessment work demonstrates that the scheme will deliver meaningful improvements for bus services. In particular, the revised layout at Denton Corner will remove the need for westbound buses to undertake the current diversion through Mount Road in order to serve the stop, reducing delay and improving journey time consistency. Relocating the Denton Corner stops to the A259 will also allow express services to serve the area without diversion, increasing frequency and convenience for passengers. These improvements are supported by local bus operators, who have indicated that the measures will help deliver more reliable and efficient services.

7.4 The proposals have therefore been designed to achieve clear bus priority benefits in line with BSIP objectives and the purpose of the scheme's funding.

7.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

8 Proposals as a waste of money

8.1 **Twenty-four** objections suggested that the TRO proposals were a waste of money or that funding would be better spent on other priorities.

8.2 The County Council received £41.4 million from the Department for Transport (DfT) to deliver the BSIP. Of this, £18.5 million is specifically allocated for bus priority measures. This funding is ring-fenced by the DfT and cannot be used for other purposes, such as general highway maintenance or unrelated transport projects. The proposals have therefore been developed to ensure that this funding is used for its intended purpose and delivers the improvements required under the BSIP programme.

8.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

9 Disruption

9.1 **Six** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would lead to significant disruption in the area during construction.

9.2 The County Council will work closely with its primary contractor, Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP), to carefully plan and coordinate the construction programme. This approach is intended to minimise disruption wherever possible by reducing the need for road closures, maintaining access for vehicles and pedestrians where feasible, and phasing works to limit local impact. Where temporary restrictions

are unavoidable for safety reasons, these will be communicated in advance and managed to minimise disruption to the community.

9.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

10 Local Voices

10.1 **Nine** objections suggested that the TRO proposals were against local opinion or that local voices had been ignored.

10.2 ESCC has undertaken several stages of public engagement on this scheme, including a full public consultation in 2023 and an informal TRO pre-consultation in late 2024. Officers acknowledge that some respondents feel their views have not been reflected in the current proposals. All feedback received, both supportive and opposing, has been reviewed and has informed the development of the scheme where feasible. In some cases, competing priorities, safety requirements or national funding conditions mean that not every suggestion can be taken forward, however, this does not mean that local views have been disregarded. ESCC remains committed to considering community feedback as the project progresses.

10.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

11 Impact on local businesses

11.1 **Five** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would have a negative impact on local businesses.

11.2 Throughout the development of this scheme, ESCC has actively engaged with local businesses and provided multiple opportunities for them to comment on the proposals. Nearby businesses were contacted directly during the 2023 public consultation, which included in-person engagement events on 14 September 2023 where business representatives had the opportunity to speak directly with the project team. Further opportunities for feedback were provided during the informal TRO pre-consultation in late 2024, and all business comments have been considered in refining the design.

11.3 While officers recognise that some businesses have concerns, the scheme aims to improve accessibility, enhance bus service reliability, and support the overall movement of people in the area, which can help sustain local footfall and economic activity in the longer term. ESCC will continue to work with businesses during delivery to minimise disruption and maintain access wherever possible.

11.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

12 The Wider Scheme Consultation

12.1 **Six** objections suggested that the TRO proposals and the wider scheme had not been properly consulted upon.

12.2 ESCC has undertaken extensive engagement throughout the development of this scheme, and local feedback has played an important role in shaping the proposals. A full public consultation took place between 31 July and 25 September 2023, with information hosted on the ESCC Consultation Hub and in-person events where residents and businesses could speak directly with the project team. Consultation postcards were delivered to nearby homes and businesses, supported by press activity to ensure broad awareness.

12.3 An informal TRO pre-consultation was carried out between 16 December 2024 and 16 January 2025, setting out the updated design and outlining the proposed traffic regulation measures. Feedback from both consultation stages has been reviewed and has informed the development of the detailed design and the TRO proposals now being formally considered. ESCC recognises that views differ within the community and remains committed to ensuring that local voices are heard and considered as part of a transparent decision-making process.

12.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

13 Clarity of context

13.1 **Eleven** objections fed back that the parts of the TRO consultation were unclear or that additional context would have been helpful.

13.2 As this consultation focused specifically on the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) proposals, the materials were centred on explaining the legal restrictions that the TROs would introduce rather than outlining the wider bus priority scheme. ESCC acknowledges this feedback and recognises the importance of providing clear and comprehensive information. Comments regarding the clarity and presentation of TRO materials, both online and in physical formats, will be taken into account to help improve how future proposals are communicated.

13.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

14 Surveys and Modelling

14.1 **Five** objections questioned the extent of the surveys and modelling used to inform the TRO proposals.

14.2 To inform development of the scheme, a comprehensive set of traffic surveys was undertaken across the full scheme area, including queue length surveys, signal timing surveys and classified turning counts. At each location, 12 hours of video footage were collected, with detailed analysis focused on the morning and afternoon peak periods (typically 7am–10am and 3pm–7pm). This approach follows standard industry practice, as peak periods provide the most robust indication of how the network performs under its busiest and most constrained conditions.

14.3 Survey data was used to build a VISSIM microsimulation model of the scheme, enabling detailed assessment of the dynamic interactions between vehicles, junctions and redesigned road layouts. Whole-day modelling is not normally undertaken, as peak period analysis provides the clearest and most representative understanding of the conditions the scheme is intended to address. The survey and modelling methodology adopted is therefore consistent with established industry standards and appropriate for assessing the impacts of the proposals.

14.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

15 Cyclists

15.1 **Two** objections suggested that the TRO proposals had not fully considered cyclists or provided appropriate design provision for them, including requests for measures such as converting existing signalised pedestrian crossings to toucan crossings.

15.2 While this scheme forms part of the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and is therefore primarily focused on improving bus reliability and the operation of services through the Denton Roundabout area, ESCC recognises the importance of accommodating cyclists and ensuring appropriate integration with the wider cycle network.

15.3 Within the constraints of available space and the operational requirements of the interchange, the scheme maintains cycle access where feasible and provides connections to the existing A259 cycle facilities. However, the interchange itself functions as a dedicated bus operational environment, which limits opportunities for additional cycle-specific infrastructure within its internal layout.

15.4 Regarding crossing facilities, the scheme does not include changes to the existing signalised pedestrian crossings or their conversion to toucan crossings. This reflects the outcomes of VISSIM modelling, which has been used to ensure that the intended bus journey time and reliability benefits can be delivered without introducing significant delays to the wider network. Altering signal phasing or upgrading to toucan operation would increase traffic and bus delays and would not support the

objectives of the BSIP programme. For these reasons, the existing crossing types and staging are being retained.

15.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

16 Pedestrian Crossing Points and Desire Lines

16.1 **Three** objections suggested that the TRO proposals had not properly considered pedestrian crossing points or pedestrian desire lines.

16.2 Officers note concerns that indirect routes may encourage informal shortcuts and could create potential conflict with vehicle movements. As this scheme forms part of the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), the interchange layout has been developed primarily to support safe and efficient bus operations. Within these operational constraints, pedestrian routes have been designed to provide safe and clearly defined connections that minimise interaction between pedestrians and buses. The alignment of footways and crossing points also reflects site gradients and level changes to ensure routes remain accessible for all users.

16.3 The designated paths have therefore been planned to guide pedestrians along safe, step-free routes while maintaining the space required for bus manoeuvring. These considerations will continue to be reviewed as the scheme progresses.

16.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

17 Tree Loss

17.1 **Six** objections raised concerns over the proposed loss of trees or greenery that would be required to implement the TRO proposals.

17.2 As part of the scheme's development, detailed arboricultural assessments have been undertaken, including an Arboricultural Constraints Report and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. These studies identify existing trees and vegetation, assess their condition, and determine how they may be affected by the proposed works.

17.3 For the A259 Newhaven Denton Roundabout (Phase 1) scheme, this includes some tree and shrub loss at Mount Road, as well as vegetation cutback along sections of the eastern side of the A259 Seaford Road.

17.4 Any trees that require removal will be replaced at a 3:1 ratio, and where appropriate the project team will work with landscape designers to identify suitable

replacement or alternative planting options as part of the landscaping and planting plan. This approach ensures the scheme complies with relevant arboricultural guidance and British design standards, while supporting the long-term enhancement of local green infrastructure.

17.5 A dedicated tree consultation will also be held in 2026, focusing specifically on the proposed vegetation and tree loss associated with this scheme.

17.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

18 Wildlife

18.1 **Two** objections suggested that the TRO proposals represented a potential threat to wildlife.

18.2 As part of the scheme's design process, extensive ecological surveys have been undertaken, including a *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal* and an *Environmental Risk Assessment*. These assessments covered all relevant protected and priority species and habitats within the study area. Their findings have informed the scheme's development to ensure that both the design and construction phases comply fully with statutory environmental requirements, and that appropriate measures are in place to avoid or minimise any potential impacts on wildlife and their habitats.

18.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

19 Vehicle Emissions

19.1 **Nine** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would lead to an increase in vehicle emissions and therefore air pollution.

19.2 The Government's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance has been reviewed, noting the triggers for an air quality assessment. Currently, the proposed scheme for Newhaven Denton Roundabout is not expected to significantly alter the volume of traffic in the area to require an air quality assessment.

19.3 Under the Climate Change Act (2008), the UK aims to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. In East Sussex, transport contributes 35% of CO₂ emissions; hence, decarbonising transport is crucial for reaching net zero. Local authorities in East Sussex, including the County Council and Lewes District Council, are working towards net-zero emissions by 2050 and 2030 respectively.

19.4 Additionally, the East Sussex Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) focuses on planning for people and places, enhancing capacity, resilience, reliability, and connectivity through public transport interventions by increasing buses' ability to capture a greater share of short, medium and longer distance trips, reducing the number of private car trips taken, limiting carbon emissions from transport and improving air quality.

19.5 Policy B5 in the East Sussex LTP4 addresses air quality by promoting less polluting forms of travel, such as buses, active travel, and electric vehicles. This includes implementing infrastructure like bus lanes and leveraging advancements in vehicle technology, including ultra-low and zero emission vehicles. In summary, developing bus priority infrastructure for urban and rural areas will support decarbonisation and improve air quality.

19.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

20 Safety Risks

20.1 **Nineteen** objections suggested that the TRO proposals would present safety risks.

20.2 Safety has been a fundamental consideration throughout the development of the project. Road Safety Audits (RSAs) have been undertaken at the appropriate stages of the design process. These audits are carried out by independent specialists who are not involved in the preparation of the scheme design, ensuring an impartial assessment.

20.3 The purpose of an RSA is to identify any potential safety issues and recommend measures to mitigate or remove risk where necessary. Feedback which has been provided forms part of the considerations assessed through this process. Where issues have been identified, they have either been addressed through amendments to the design or appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated.

20.4 All Road Safety Audit recommendations are formally reviewed and responded to by the design team, and the process is signed off at the relevant stages of the scheme to ensure that the proposals meet the required highway safety standards before progressing further.

20.5 The potential effects of the wider scheme proposals on protected groups are being assessed through the scheme's ongoing Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). This examines how different groups may be affected by the proposals. The concerns raised will form part of that assessment and will be taken into account as the design and implementation progress.

20.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

21 Other Schemes

21.1 The following concerns were raised during the consultation but fall outside the scope of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) proposals. These either relate to separate schemes or to elements that have been removed from the current scheme design.

21.2 **Twelve** objections related to the one-way system on the Newhaven Ring Road (separate scheme).

21.3 Officers acknowledge concerns about the operation of the Newhaven Ring Road and the town-centre one-way system. These issues are being addressed through the Newhaven Virtual Bus priority scheme, which includes new bus priority measures and signals in the town centre to improve journey-time reliability and reduce delays for buses.

21.4 This scheme is already under construction and is expected to improve congestion and bus movements once complete. As this work forms part of a different BSIP project, it is not part of the Newhaven Denton Roundabout TRO proposals. However, together the schemes contribute to wider improvements across Newhaven's transport network.

21.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

22 Eastbound Bus Lane

22.1 **Twelve** objections referred to an eastbound bus lane that formed part of an earlier design but is no longer included in the current proposals (descope item).

22.2 Following the Cabinet decision to re direct £11.128m of grant funding from the Newhaven and Peacehaven bus priority schemes to the Exceat Bridge Replacement Project, the County Council committed to using part of the 2025/26 BSIP allocation to deliver the Newhaven bus priority scheme. To meet Department for Transport programme requirements, the original scheme was divided into:

- Phase 1 – Denton Roundabout (current TRO)
- Phase 2 – The Drove (paused)

22.3 The eastbound bus lane on A259 The Drove appeared in early informal consultation drawings (Dec 2024–Jan 2025), but is not part of Phase 1, which the current TROs cover. Phase 2 is paused pending further funding.

22.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

23 Out of Scope Tree Loss

23.1 **Three** objections related to out of scope tree loss which does not form part of these TRO proposals.

23.2 Earlier design drawings indicated that tree removal along the south side of A259 The Drove would be required to support the eastbound bus lane in Phase 2. As Phase 2 is not included in the current TROs, no tree removal on A259 The Drove is required as part of these proposals.

23.3 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

24 Exceat Bridge

24.1 **One** objection suggested that Exceat Bridge should be looked at instead, this is a separate project, and not part of the TRO proposals.

As the Exceat Bridge project is a separate programme of work, it is not part of the current TRO proposals.

24.2 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

This page is intentionally left blank