

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

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