

Committee:	Regulatory Planning Committee
Date:	14 February 2018
Report by:	Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Title of Report	Traffic Regulation Order - Bexhill Parking Review
Purpose of Report	To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Bexhill Parking Review.
Contact Officer:	Claire Scriven (01424) 726347
Local Member:	Councillor Stuart Earl

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

1. Not uphold the objections to the draft order as set out in Appendix 1 to this report.
2. Recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the draft Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised.

CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Enforcement of parking restrictions in Bexhill is currently the responsibility of Sussex Police as Rother District is not part of a Civil Parking Enforcement area. Sussex Police have publicly stated that they will not actively enforce parking restrictions on a day to day basis unless there is an identified safety or obstruction issue and even then only if the resources are available to them at the time the incident is reported. In light of this it is unreasonable to commit our limited public resources to the management of parking restrictions within the district. It is therefore our working practice to only prioritise requests for parking restrictions within Rother if they will positively contribute to the reduction of an identified road safety issue and be self-enforcing.
- 1.2 This approach was approved by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment at his Meeting on 20 July 2015.
- 1.3 Over the last few years a number of safety concerns relating to parking, in the areas included in this review, have been raised by local residents. Requests for new or for changes to existing parking and waiting restrictions in Bexhill are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation as resources become available.

- 1.4 The identified priority locations were considered and site assessments carried out to determine suitable types and extents of restrictions to tackle the problems with obstructive parking observed at critical locations. As a general rule yellow lines are largely well observed by motorists and therefore considered self-enforcing, particularly at junctions.
- 1.5 Proposal plans were drafted and circulated to all statutory consultees for comment which included all relevant Ward County Councillors, Rother District Council, representatives for the Police, East Sussex Ambulance, East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service, road haulage and bus operators. This initial consultation allows for comments to be received and changes to be made prior to the proposals being formally advertised. Comments were received from the Police, Councillor Earl and Stagecoach during the initial consultation which ended on 11 July 2017. No suggestions were made for changes to the proposals.
- 1.6 The proposals, along with details of where a copy of the draft TRO could be viewed, were advertised in the Bexhill Observer on 29 September 2017 with a closing date of 20 October 2017 for formal representations to be made. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. A copy of the draft Traffic Regulation Order is attached as Appendix 2.
- 1.7 During the formal consultation 25 items of correspondence were received. A number of the items received were from the same person either providing further information in relation to their original objection or where different concerns were being raised from their original submission. One letter of support was received after the consultation period had closed and one resident formally withdrew their objection. In total there were 13 objectors to the proposals. In all cases the objectors supported changes but did not agree that the proposals were a suitable solution. The majority of the objectors asked for the restrictions to be extended as they did not feel that they went far enough.
- 1.8 Copies of all supporting correspondence received during the initial and formal consultation periods are available in the Members' Room.

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 areas objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack.
- 2.2 With regard to objections relating to Birkdale, Firle Road, Pinewoods, Westcourt Drive and Collington Avenue it is not considered that these objections provide sufficient grounds to warrant the modification or withdrawal of the proposals as set out in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 In respect to the objections surrounding the concerns that the restrictions should be extended further, the proposals have been intentionally limited to areas where parking causes or is likely to cause obstruction or danger to other road users. The proposals are limited to locations where collisions are more likely to occur to allow safe passage for all traffic and improve

pedestrian safety. We have been mindful of limiting the proposals so as not to have a detrimental effect on safety by increasing speeds.

- 2.4 Any consideration of measures beyond the limits of the proposals for this Traffic Regulation Order would need to be considered separately. If Members were minded to uphold objections, relating to requests for the restrictions to extend further, it would not be possible to introduce additional measures as part of this Traffic Regulation Order. This is due to the legal procedure in respect to Traffic Regulation Orders which includes statutory periods of advertising and consultation.
- 2.5 It is considered that the objections received should not be upheld. Appendix 1 provides further rationale for these recommendations. 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. On balance it is felt for highway and road safety reasons, that they 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 does not uphold the objections in Appendix 1, and to recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport that the draft order be made as advertised.

RUPERT CLUBB
Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None