

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Committee: | Planning Regulatory Committee |
| Date: | 11 February 2026 |
| Report by: | Director of Communities, Economy and Transport |
| Title of Report: | Traffic Regulation Orders – Hill Crest Court, Hill Crest Road, Disabled bay formalisation |
| Purpose of Report: | To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order |
| Contact Officer: | Natalie Mclean – tel. 01273 482628 |
| Local Members: | Councillor James MacCleary |

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 Order be made as advertised.**

CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT.

1. Introduction and background information.

1.1 Following a successful application to install an advisory disabled bay in Hill Crest Court, Hill Crest Road, Newhaven the bay was installed in December 2024. Subsequent to the installation, the Applicant for the bay informed the Council that the bay was being abused with non-blue badge holders and requested the bay be made into a formal bay.

1.2 Advisory bays are not legally enforceable. Most motorists appreciate the purpose of them and leave the bays clear for the people who need them. Formal bays have a Traffic Regulation Order which means they can be enforced. In order to formalise an advisory disabled bay a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is required.

1.3 The TRO was formally consulted on from 12 December 2025 to 9 January 2026. The formal proposal was advertised, together with the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 2) in the Sussex Express on 12 December 2025. 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.

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

1.5 During the formal consultation 3 items of correspondence were received. These included 2 objections and 1 item of support.

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 Appendix 1. Plans and photographs showing the disabled bay are included in the Additional Information Pack.

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

3.1 The objections to the formalisation of the disabled bay have not raised sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. It is recommended that these objections should not be upheld.

3.2 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in this report, that the Planning Committee does not uphold the objections in Appendix 1, and recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made in full.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport