

Committee:	Regulatory Planning Committee
Date:	18 May 2016
Report by:	Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Title of Report	Traffic Regulation Orders - Lewes Parking Review
Purpose of Report	To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Lewes Parking Review
Contact Officer:	Michael Blaney - Tel. 01424 726142
Local Member:	Councillors Buchanan, Butler, Carstairs, Charlton, Howson, Lambert, O'Keeffe, Sheppard, St Pierre

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 to this report.**
 - 2. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 3 of this report**
 - 3. Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the draft 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 area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in September 2015 to see whether there was enough public support to introduce controls such as double yellow lines or changes to permit parking schemes in the Lewes area.

1.2 Feedback from the consultations led to formal proposals being developed. These formal proposals were advertised in the Sussex Express on 5 February 2016. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 1200 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 26 February 2016.

1.3 Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant district and parish Councillors, County Councillors and statutory consultees including the emergency services. Copies of all supporting correspondence are available in the Members' Room. A copy of the draft Order is included in Appendix 1 to this report.

1.4 During the formal consultation 104 items of correspondence were received. These include 63 objections and 41 items of support. Five of the objections have since been withdrawn.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 2 and 3. 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 modify or withdraw the following proposals (summarised in Appendix 2):

- High Street, Barcombe – reduce the length of the proposed double yellow lines to two metres to maintain access to the fire hydrant.
- Denton Rise, Newhaven – withdraw the proposed no waiting at any time (double yellow lines) on the north side of Acacia Road
- Keymer Avenue, Peacehaven – withdraw the proposed double yellow lines on the west side of Keymer Avenue opposite the junction with Roundhouse Crescent.

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.

2.3 With regard to objections relating to Alfriston Road (Seaford), Arundel Road (Peacehaven), Broad Street (Seaford), Central Avenue (Telscombe Cliffs), Fitzgerald Avenue (Seaford), Grange Road (Lewes), High Street (Lewes), Keymer Avenue (Peacehaven), Millberg Road (Seaford), Norman Road (Newhaven), North Way (Lewes), Priory Street (Lewes), South Street (Ditchling), Sutton Avenue (Peacehaven), Telscombe Cliffs Way (Telscombe Cliffs), The Esplanade (Seaford), and Vale Road (Seaford) 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.

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

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendation

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. On balance, some objections can be accepted and some minor modifications can be incorporated into the Order, whilst with the rest of the objections, it is felt for highway and road safety reasons, that they should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as per the 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 2, does not uphold the objections in Appendix 3, and to recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the draft Order be made in part.

RUPERT CLUB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None