

### **Appendix 3 – Proposals where objections are not upheld and are proposed to be implemented as advertised**

#### **4. Site 4 South Street (Ditchling)**

- 4.1 The proposed double yellow lines were requested by members of the public and are an extension to the existing double yellow lines at the junction of South Street and Beacon Road on the east side of the road.
- 4.2 Five objections have been received from residents of Ditchling. The grounds for the objections were concern over the loss of parking for residents and visitors, pedestrian safety due to the narrow footways, and the speed reducing effects of parked vehicles.
- 4.3 The proposed double yellow lines will aid visibility around the bend when leaving Ditchling, improve visibility when exiting Beacon Road and entering the village along Clayton Road and will alleviate the congestion caused by the current parking which backs up over the mini roundabout, especially at peak times.
- 4.4 Due to the historic nature of Ditchling, many footways in the area are narrow, some even more than those in South Street. The proposals will only be removing approximately three parking spaces, as the northern end of the proposed restrictions cover a private access which should not have parked vehicles over it.
- 4.5 A potential scheme to implement junction improvements and traffic calming measures on South Street has been previously assessed to determine if this might be a priority for future consideration. This proposal did not achieve the benchmark score to enable it to be taken forward at the present time.
- 4.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised.

#### **5. Site 5 North Way (Lewes)**

- 5.1 Following a petition from local residents, changes have been proposed in North Way and Windover Crescent in order to address problems being experienced by the local bus service due to parked vehicles obstructing the bus route.
- 5.2 Two objections have been received from residents in North Way. Although they are both in support of the double yellow lines on the junction with Windover Crescent they both feel that the proposed single yellow lines in North Way will just push vehicles further up the road. They both suggest that the bus should either be smaller or come around the estate another way. With regards to the bus size this has been passed to the relevant team for their consideration.
- 5.3 Officers have met with the local councillor and the bus operator. It is felt that the proposals are the minimum required to ensure the safe passage of the buses at this location. There are no plans to change either the bus route or the bus size as these are also felt appropriate for this location.

5.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised in order to maintain the scheduled bus timetable.

## 6. Site 6 Grange Road (Lewes)

6.1 Following requests from local residents to align the operational times of parking restrictions in Grange Road and to increase available parking spaces for residents, it was proposed to adjust some of the parking controls in this road. This included changing one of the parking bays from shared use to permit holders only, and adjusting the lengths and locations of single yellow lines to provide suitable passing places.

6.2 Three objections have been received. These were on the grounds that changing the passing places would just be a waste of money and would neither improve nor worsen the area, taking out an existing passing place would mean increased traffic speeds, delivery vans would stop in the road rather than on the single yellow lines, and that changing the shared use bay to permit holders only is in an area where vehicles have been vandalised.

6.3 Officers have met with the local councillor and the residents' association to develop the proposals. It was believed that the majority of residents were happy with the proposed plans when presented at their annual meeting. The change to the times of the single yellow lines will mean the restrictions along this road are aligned. The revised locations of the passing places (where the single yellow lines are) have been agreed with the local councillor and the residents association. The change to the shared use bay will increase the number of parking spaces available to residents. If there are any issues with vandalism then the residents should contact the police on their non-emergency number (101).

6.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised in order to increase available parking spaces for residents and to maintain adequate passing places.

## 7. Site 7 Priory Street (Lewes)

7.1 Following a safety assessment it was proposed to extend the double yellow lines at the east end of Priory Street. This would mean the adjacent shared parking bay would be reduced by approximately seven metres. To compensate for this loss, it was also proposed to change the shared parking bay to a residents permit holder only parking bay.

7.2 Four objections have been received. These were on the grounds that the times of operation should be the same as the adjacent parking zone (8am to 6pm), that the extension to the double yellow lines would mean a loss of parking space, visitors and workmen would find it hard to park, and traffic speeds would increase.

7.3 There are no current plans to change the operational times in this area of Lewes. To do so would require further extensive consultation and this is not within the remit of these proposals. The loss of parking due to the extension of the double yellow lines is compensated for by changing the bays to resident permit holders only. Visitors and workmen can still park here if they display a valid scratch-card.

7.4 The extension of the double yellow lines follows requirements from a safety audit. There is an existing 20 mph speed limit along this section of Priory Street. It is not felt that the changes will increase vehicle speeds here.

7.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised in order to maintain safety and increase available parking spaces for residents.

## 8. Site 8 Ferrers Road (Lewes)

8.1 The proposal in Ferrers Road was a technical change to the traffic regulation order to change the times of operation for the single yellow lines.

8.2 Two objections have been received. The objectors are happy with the current restrictions and say they do not see why anything needs to be changed.

8.3 The proposal is to ratify the traffic regulation order so that it reflects the existing signs in Ferrers Road. This is a technical change only and will have no affect to any members of public. Officers have contacted the objectors but at the time of writing this report have not received any response.

8.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to ratify the traffic regulation order.

## 9. Site 9 High Street (Lewes)

9.1 Numerous complaints have been received following congestion due to a number of vehicles stopping to drop off and pick up pupils attending Lewes Old Grammar School (LOGS). Informal consultation to introduce a loading ban in this area took place during September 2015. These proposals would have allowed the mini-buses serving LOGS to pick up and drop off pupils outside 127-131 High Street.

9.2 Officers met with the head teacher of LOGS following the informal consultation. The headteacher explained that it was not feasible for their mini-buses to pick up pupils at this location as it was deemed to be too far from the School's home assembly point. Safeguarding issues were discussed along with alternative pick up and drop off points.

9.3 The proposals were revised to provide a space immediately outside LOGS where two mini-buses can stop to pick up or drop off pupils. The formal proposal is to introduce a loading ban during peak times between St Peters Place and Westgate Street apart for that area between The Shelleys car park and No 138.

9.4 Twenty seven objections have been received. Three of these are from residents of High Street near Westgate Street. on the grounds that they will not be able to drop off or pick up their own children at home as they will have nowhere to park, that a short term residents loading bay should be introduced, that the times of operation are too long, and that the proposed loading ban will have an effect on deliveries to their business. Twenty three of the objections are from local residents of Paddock Road and one is from a

resident of New Road. These objectors raise concerns about the volume of traffic using these roads if the proposals are introduced.

- 9.5 There are no plans to introduce a residents only loading facility in High Street – types of parking restriction are covered by legislation, there are no current authorised parking bays which would provide a short term loading bay restricted to residents only.
- 9.6 The objectors concerns are noted about picking up their children, and of the effect such a ban may have on deliveries. There is a need to address the congestion caused by parked vehicles during peak times, and this can be achieved with the use of a loading ban. The ban is proposed to be operational during the hours of 8-10am and 4-6pm (Monday to Friday). Loading and unloading can take place outside of these hours.
- 9.7 Paddock Road has an existing ‘no entry, except for access’ restriction. Vehicles should not use this road unless they are servicing land or property adjacent to this road. LOGS has a back entrance in this road and vehicles do have a legitimate right to access this road if they are picking up pupils from the back entrance.
- 9.8 New Road is a cul de sac running off Westgate Street. There is no restriction on the type of vehicle entering this road.
- 9.9 The aim of the proposals is to maintain the free flow of traffic during peak times. The head teacher of LOGS has confirmed that the school will implement a traffic management scheme so that only two of their vehicles will be in this area at any one time. It is inevitable that other vehicles (such as parents picking up their children) will be displaced to nearby roads.
- 9.10 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised in order to maintain the free flow of traffic in Lewes High Street during peak times.

## **10. Site 10 Western Road, Gibbon Road (Newhaven)**

- 10.1 Double yellow lines are proposed to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements at the junction of Western Road at its junction with Gibbon Road.
- 10.2 Two objections were received from residents of Western Road on the grounds that the proposals would result in a loss of parking spaces, and result in fewer gaps for vehicles to pull in on the straight section of Western Road. Both objectors suggested a one-way system on Western Road and Northdown Road as an alternative solution.
- 10.3 During busier periods, there are often extended lengths of parking along the southeast side of Gibbon Road, where a westbound vehicle would be required to pass on the wrong side of the road. Given that there are few private accesses on this side of the road, there may be limited opportunities for a westbound vehicle to pull in if required, and conflicts may occur if an emerging driver has insufficient visibility to make the correct decision to proceed. The proposed restrictions will maintain sufficient sightlines prior to the bend for drivers to make the correct decision whether to proceed.

- 10.4 A potential scheme to implement a one-way restriction and the associated traffic calming measures in this area has been previously assessed to determine if it might be a priority for future consideration. This proposal did not achieve the benchmark score to enable it to be taken forward at the present time.
- 10.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

## 11. Site 11 Norman Road (Newhaven)

- 11.1 A request has been received to enforce the existing advisory Disabled Parking bay in Norman Road due to abuse by non-Blue Badge Holders parking here. The proposal is to formalise the existing bay and extend it by approximately one metre.
- 11.2 Two objections were received from local residents on the grounds that parking is a problem in the area and extending the bay will only make the parking problems worse.
- 11.3 Guidance from The Department for Transport is that formal disabled bays must be 6.6 metres long. The proposal will extend the bay by approximately one metre. It is not felt that this extension will cause additional parking pressure in this area.
- 11.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to prevent abuse of the disabled bay by non-Blue Badge holders

## 12. Site 12 Sutton Avenue (Peacehaven)

- 12.1 The proposed double yellow lines were requested by Peacehaven Town Council and are an extension to the existing double yellow lines adjacent to the central traffic island.
- 12.2 The concerns raised by Peacehaven Town Council were that buses were experiencing difficulties passing the central island when vehicles were parked up to the existing double yellow lines. ESCC officers are also aware that buses are often forced to travel on the wrong side of the road past the island.
- 12.3 One objection was received from a resident of Sutton Avenue on the grounds of the loss of parking for residents and the displacement of parking to other locations.
- 12.4 There are hatched road markings on both approaches to the central traffic island. The hatched road markings are used to separate traffic for safety reasons. If vehicles are regularly parked adjacent to the hatched markings, drivers may fail to correctly interpret the road layout, resulting in sudden braking or damage to parked vehicles. This may also restrict the safe passage of larger vehicles. The proposal followed discussions with the Public Transport team and will increase safety and the safe passage of vehicles at this location.

12.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to increase safety and to facilitate the safe passage of traffic.

### 13. Site 13 Arundel Road (Peacehaven)

13.1 The proposed double yellow lines at this location will improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junctions of Arundel Road, Dorothy Avenue, and Steyning Avenue.

13.2 One objection was received from a resident of Arundel Road on the grounds that they had never experienced any problems with parked vehicles in this area, and they were concerned that the proposed length would affect their ability to park near their property.

13.3 The proposals will improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction, and were extended in a westerly direction to incorporate the 'give way' markings and triangle on the approach to the priority working chicane outside nos 157-159 Arundel Road. Vehicles parking at this location may obstruct the visibility of these markings and any drivers failing to observe the markings may not give way to oncoming vehicles. This may affect the affect the safe operation of the priority working system.

13.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

### 14. Site 14 Alfriston Road (Seaford)

14.1 Double yellow lines were proposed to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction of Alfriston Road with Vale Road and Cradle Hill Road, Seaford.

14.2 One objection has been received from a resident of Vale Road. The grounds for the objection are that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary as cars are seldom parked at any of the lengths of this proposal, and the junction is self-enforcing.

14.3 The restrictions were proposed after concerns were raised about difficulties for buses negotiating the junction when vehicles were parked in close proximity, particularly on Vale Road. The guidance provided in the Highway Code is intended as a code of good practice that drivers should adhere to, although it is not a legal requirement. The proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Alfriston Road and Vale Road correspond with the Highway Code.

14.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

### 15. Site 15 Fitzgerald Avenue and Steyne Road (Seaford)

15.1 The proposed double yellow lines at this location are to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction of Fitzgerald Avenue

and Steyne Road. These have been extended to include the junction of Chyngton Road as the junctions are closely linked.

- 15.2 Two objections were received from local residents on the grounds of displacement of parking to nearby junctions. A request was also received to introduce additional restrictions at the junctions of Bramber Road, Heathfield Road, and Sutton Avenue.
- 15.3 The proposals at the junction of Fitzgerald Avenue and Steyne Road were requested by a local resident and progressed after achieving a high ranking on the County Council's priority list for parking restrictions. The proposals were extended to include the junction of Chyngton Road as the two junctions are situated within 10 metres of each other and it was not possible to provide double yellow lines on Fitzgerald Avenue without overlapping Chyngton Road.
- 15.4 The request for additional restrictions at the junctions of Bramber Road, Heathfield Road and Sutton Avenue have been assessed and given a ranking on safety grounds. This request cannot be added to this review but will be included for consideration in the next review of parking in this area.
- 15.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

## **16. Site 16 Fitzgerald Avenue and Lions Place (Seaford)**

- 16.1 Double yellow lines are proposed in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements at the junction of Fitzgerald Avenue and Lions Place.
- 16.2 During the objection period three objections were received along with one letter of support. The grounds for the objections were that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary, there were concerns over the loss of parking, and that the double yellow lines would have an adverse aesthetic impact.
- 16.3 The restrictions were proposed due to concerns about visibility when emerging from Lions Place. During busier periods, there are often extended lengths of parking along the east side of Fitzgerald Avenue, where a southbound vehicle would be required to pass on the wrong side of the road. Concerns were raised that visibility of such vehicles may be restricted for drivers emerging from Lions Place on occasions where vehicles were parked right up to the junction. Given that there are few private accesses on this side of the road, there may be limited opportunities for a southbound vehicle to pull in if required, and conflicts may occur if an emerging driver has insufficient visibility to make the correct decision to proceed.
- 16.4 Drivers should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction. The proposed double yellow lines are intended to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction, particularly during the peak periods when there is an increased demand for short-term parking in this area due to the nearby school.
- 16.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

## 17. Site 17 Sutton Avenue and Whiteley Close (Seaford)

- 17.1 The proposed double yellow lines were requested by a local resident and are an extension to the existing double yellow lines adjacent to the central traffic island at Sutton Avenue's junction with Kingston Avenue.
- 17.2 Two objections and one letter of support were received during the objection period from residents of Whiteley Close and Sutton Avenue. The main grounds for the objections were that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary, and concern was expressed over the loss of parking for residents. Further correspondence has also been received from one resident of Whiteley Close asking for additional restrictions in Sutton Avenue, eastwards to its junction with the A259 (Eastbourne Road).
- 17.3 Drivers should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction. It is understood that some vehicles, including large vans, often park closer to the junction with Whiteley Close. This restricts visibility between vehicles at the junction and approaching vehicles on Sutton Avenue. The purpose of the proposed restrictions is to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements at this junction. It should also be noted that there is an extended length of unrestricted parking to the northeast of the junction between Whiteley Close and the A259 (Eastbourne Road) where vehicles can be parked without obstructing visibility of the junction.
- 17.4 The request to install additional restrictions cannot be added to this review but will be included for consideration in the next review of parking in this area.
- 17.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

## 18. Site 18 Vale Road and Lexden Road (Seaford)

- 18.1 The proposed double yellow lines at this location are to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction of Vale Road and Lexden Road, Seaford.
- 18.2 One objection has been received from a resident of Vale Road. The grounds for the objection are that the proposed restrictions will displace parking further down Vale Road and result in vehicles parking on both sides of the road. The objector suggested that traffic calming measures are required on Vale Road.
- 18.3 The restrictions were proposed after concerns were raised about difficulties for buses negotiating the junction when vehicles were parked in close proximity, particularly along the approach to the junction on Vale Road. The proposed double yellow lines will improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction. The restriction proposed on the south-eastern side of Vale Road will prevent obstruction caused by displaced vehicles parking along this length of road.
- 18.4 A previous request for a scheme to implement traffic calming in this area has been assessed in accordance with established procedure. The request did not rank high enough for it to be taken forward.



**18.5 Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility, facilitate safe turning movements, and prevent obstructive parking by displaced vehicles.

## **19. Site 19 The Esplanade (Seaford)**

19.1 Concerns have been raised about pedestrians accessing the beach and The Esplanade through the openings of the 'wave walls' (the walls separating the beach from the road). Visibility and access is obstructed due to vehicles parked across the wall openings. The proposal is to extend the existing double yellow lines on the south-western side of The Esplanade to provide safe access to the wall openings, opposite the junction of West View

19.2 Three objections have been received from residents of The Esplanade on the grounds that the proposed restrictions will result in loss of parking for residents and visitors. In addition, requests have been received for additional restrictions at the junction with Martello Road.

19.3 Although there will be a slight loss of parking, the proposal to extend the existing double yellow lines will improve safety by providing pedestrians with greater visibility when exiting or accessing the beach area.

19.4 The request to install additional restrictions cannot be added to this review but will be included for consideration in the next review of parking in this area.

19.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve pedestrian safety

## **20. Site 20 Broad Street (Seaford)**

20.1 The proposal in Broad Street is to introduce a traffic regulation order (TRO) to cover the existing 'taxi only' parking bay at this location.

20.2 One objection has been received from Seaford Town Council on the grounds that the bay is not being used by taxis, and should either be used as a parking bay for the local shops, or it should be reduced in length so that only one taxi can use the bay at any one time.

20.3 This taxi bay has not previously been covered by a TRO, meaning the restriction is not enforceable. As a consequence, other types of vehicle are parking here. By introducing a TRO the bay can be managed so that only taxis park in this area.

20.4 Reducing the length of the bay would leave an unmanageable section of road with no parking restriction. This could lead to vehicles being parked all day in this busy commercial area of Seaford, reducing the turnover of spaces for customers and shoppers. The request to change the use of the bay cannot be added to this review but will be included for consideration in the next review of parking in this area.

20.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to formalise the existing parking arrangements.

## **21. Site 21 Millberg Road (Seaford)**

- 21.1 There are existing advisory school keep clear markings in Millberg Road outside Chyngton School. The proposal is to formalise the markings so they are enforceable during school pickup and drop-off times.
- 21.2 One objection was received from the school, along with three items of support. The grounds for the objection were that the proposals do not go far enough to ensure the safety of the children and the objector suggests additional restrictions should be introduced as well as a zebra crossing. The objector also raises concerns that he believes the proposed restrictions will not be enforced.
- 21.3 The request for additional restrictions cannot be added to these proposals, although the site will be assessed further as part of the next review to see if additional restrictions are needed. The request for a zebra crossing has been forwarded to the council's Road Safety team for assessment. If the current proposals are installed the council's enforcement contractor NSL will patrol and enforce the restrictions. Officers have written to the objector with this information, but at the time of writing this report no further response has been received.
- 21.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to formalise the existing school keep clear markings to ensure they can be enforced.

## **22. Site 22 Steyne Road (Seaford)**

- 22.1 There are existing advisory school keep clear markings in Steyne Road outside Seaford Head Lower School. The proposal is to formalise the markings so they are enforceable during school pickup and drop-off times.
- 22.2 One objection was received on the grounds that the proposals do not go far enough as parents park at the nearby junctions. The objector has asked for traffic calming measures and double yellow lines at all nearby junctions.
- 22.3 The request for additional restrictions cannot be added to these proposals, although the site will be assessed further as part of the next review to see if additional restrictions are needed. The request for traffic calming has been forwarded to the council's Road Safety team for assessment.
- 22.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to formalise the existing school keep clear markings to ensure they can be enforced.

## **23. Site 23 Central Avenue, South Coast Road (Telscombe Cliffs)**

- 23.1 Double yellow lines have been proposed at this location to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junctions of Central Avenue and South Coast Road.
- 23.2 One objection has been received from Telscombe Town Council on the grounds that they would not like to see the parking area on the South Coast Road outside Central House lost to yellow lines and hatched markings as this

parking area serves local businesses and would impact on trade in the local area, particularly the restaurant and fish and chip shop opposite, which has little alternative parking to sustain custom.

- 23.3 The proposals will fill the short gap between the existing double yellow lines and the controlled zone (zigzag markings) at the puffin crossing. The Highway Code states that drivers should not park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction. The proposed double yellow lines would extend by a distance of 11 metres from the junction with Central Avenue, which joins up with the existing controlled zone for the pedestrian crossing, and were proposed to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements through the junction.
- 23.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised in order to improve visibility and facilitate safe turning movements.

#### **24. Site 24 Telscombe Cliffs Way (Telscombe Cliffs)**

- 24.1 The proposal to implement a limited waiting restriction within the layby was requested by Telscombe Town Council to maintain a regular turnover of parking spaces during the peak periods, when parents drop off and collect their children from the School, in order to alleviate pressures on the surrounding area.
- 24.2 Five objections were received from staff members of Telscombe Nursery and a local resident. Three letters of support were received from the Residents Association and local residents. The grounds for the objections were concern over loss of parking for staff and local residents.
- 24.3 The proposed section of Limited Waiting applies to a 20 metre length at the southern end of the layby, which is approximately 4-5 parking spaces. The aim of the proposal is to maintain a balance between the demand for short term parking by parents during the peak periods, and longer term parking by local residents and members of staff. The remaining length of the layby will be retained as unrestricted parking, and would be available for long stay parking by residents and members of staff.
- 24.4 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised to maintain a regular turnover of parking spaces during peak periods.