

Committee:	Planning Regulatory Committee
Date:	12 July 2023
Report by:	Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Title of Report:	Traffic Regulation Order – Rother Parking Review 2022
Purpose of Report:	To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Rother Parking Review
Contact Officer:	Daniel Clarke– tel. 01273 464057
Local Members:	Councillors Abul Azad, Charles Clark, Kathryn Field, Nuala Geary, Keith Glazier, Ian Hollidge, Carl Maynard, and Paul Redstone.

RECOMMENDATION

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 to this report.**
 - 3. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 3 of this report.**
 - 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 Rother District area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in July 2022 to see whether there was enough support to introduce controls such as double yellow lines or changes to permit parking schemes in the district. This is the first Parking Review undertaken in Rother District since Civil Parking Enforcement was introduced.
- 1.2** Feedback from the consultations led to formal proposals being developed. These formal proposals were advertised, together with the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 4) in the Bexhill Observer on 24 February 2023. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 6150 letters were delivered to local addresses and the consultation was placed on the Council's Consultation Hub for any member of the public to comment. The formal period for representations to be made ended on 17 March 2023.
- 1.3** Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant District Councillors, County Councillors, Parish/Town Council's 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 1133 items of correspondence were received. These include 601 objections and 532 items of support. Seventeen of the objections have since been withdrawn. All

objections made that have requested restrictions go further or requests for additional restrictions have been added to the request log for the next Rother review.

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. Again full copies of all correspondence have been made available to Members. Plans and photographs showing the areas objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack.

2.2 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to uphold the objections summarised in Appendix 1 and withdraw the proposals at the following site:

- Bridge Road, Rye

Officers are satisfied that the objections received to this proposal do provide sufficient grounds to warrant its withdrawal.

2.3 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to modify the following proposals (summarised in Appendix 2):

- Military Road and North Salts, Rye – modify the proposal to withdraw the permit scheme, keeping the no waiting at any time markings at the junction to North Salts and directly opposite;
- Penland Road and Dorset Road, Bexhill – modify the proposal by reducing the no waiting at any time markings;
- London Road and Sedgewick Road, Bexhill – modify the proposal by reducing the no waiting at any time markings;
- Whitesand Drive, Badgers Way, Baker Way, Linnet Lane and Scotts Avenue, Camber – modify the proposal by reducing the no waiting at any time markings;
- Millfield Rise and Larkhill, Bexhill – modify the proposal by removing a bay;
- Woodville Road, Bexhill – modify the proposal by removing two bays;
- De La Warr Road and Dorset Road, Bexhill – modify the proposal by reducing the no waiting at any time markings;

Officers are satisfied that these modifications do not involve a substantial change to the draft Order and it is unnecessary to consult again on their implementation.

2.4 With regard to objections relating to the sites listed below and 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, and the proposals provide for the most efficient use of parking space. It is considered that these objections should not be upheld. A number of the objections received on many of these sites are seeking additional/extended restrictions to those that were consulted upon. As such measures were not consulted upon, it is not possible to uphold those particular objections and make

much additions and extensions to those restrictions already consulted upon. The sites objected to and where it is recommended that the objections are not upheld are;

- Glengorse (Battle);
- High Street (Battle);
- Sunny Rise and North Trade Road (Battle);
- Hastings Road, The Spinney, Starrs Mead and Starr's Green Lane (Battle);
- Ninfield Road, Turkey Road and All Saints Lane (Bexhill);
- Barrack Road, Crowmere Avenue, Silvester Road and Hanover Close (Bexhill);
- Chantry Avenue, Wrestwood Road and Abbey View (Bexhill);
- Peartree Lane (Bexhill);
- Church Hill Avenue and Shepherd's Close (Bexhill);
- Cooden Drive, Richmond Avenue and Westcourt Drive (Bexhill);
- Dorset Road (Bexhill);
- Hollier's Hill, Chantry Avenue, Jacob's Acre and Church Vale Road (Bexhill);
- Richmond Road, Cooden Drive, Richmond Grove and West Parade (Bexhill);
- Royston Gardens and Third Avenue (Bexhill);
- Terminus Road (Bexhill);
- Warwick Road (Bexhill);
- Denham Way and Peter James Close (Camber);
- Main Street (Northiam);
- George Hill, Blenheim Court and George Close (Robertsbridge);
- Harbour Road (Rye);
- Landgate (Rye);
- Bodiam Road, Weald View and Sheringham Close (Staplecross);
- Moor Lane, Main Road, Wheel Lane, Cottage Lane and Workhouse Lane (Westfield);
- Brassey Road (Bexhill);
- Bolebrooke Road and Middlesex Road (Bexhill);
- De La Warr Parade (Bexhill);
- Knole Road (Bexhill);
- Linden Road and Albany Road (Bexhill);
- St Leonards Road, Wilton Road and Sea Road (Bexhill);
- Jameson Road (Bexhill);
- Eversley Road and Wilton Road (Bexhill);
- Bedford Avenue (Bexhill);
- Cantelupe Road (Bexhill);
- De La Warr Parade and Bethune Road (Bexhill);
- Dorset Road South (Bexhill);
- Lionel Road (Bexhill);
- Sutton Place (Bexhill);
- Amherst Road and Mitten Road (Bexhill);
- Mitten Road and New Park Avenue (Bexhill);
- Reginald Road, Windsor Road, Leopold Road, Victoria Road and Terminus Road (Bexhill);
- Brockley Road (Bexhill);
- Cornwall Road (Bexhill);
- Egerton Road (Bexhill);
- Park Road (Bexhill);
- West Parade and South Cliff (Bexhill), and;
- Wickham Avenue (Bexhill).

2.5 It is also recommended that all other proposals not objected to should be implemented as advertised.

3. Conclusion and reasons for approval

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 one of the sites are considered to merit the withdrawal of the proposal. On balance, some objections can be accepted, and some minor modifications can be incorporated into the Order, whilst with the rest of the objections, 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 per the draft TRO 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