

Committee:	<b>Regulatory Planning Committee</b>
Date:	<b>11 September 2019</b>
Report by:	<b>Director of Communities, Economy and Transport</b>
Title of Report	<b>Traffic Regulation Orders – Lewes District Parking Review 2018-2019</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Lewes District Parking Review</b>
Contact Officer:	<b>Michael Blaney -Tel. 01424 726142</b>
Local Members:	<b>Councillor Phillip Daniel, Councillor Nigel Enever, Councillor Darren Grover, Councillor Carolyn Lambert, Councillor Ruth O’Keeffe and Councillor Andy Smith</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**The Planning Committee is recommended to:**

- 1. Uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 to this report.**
  - 2. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.**
  - 3. Not uphold the objections to the revocation of the 2007 Traffic Regulation Orders as also set out in Appendix 2 of this report.**
  - 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 Lewes District are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in March 2019 to see whether there was enough public support to introduce controls, such as double yellow lines, or changes to permit parking schemes in a number of locations in the district.
- 1.2** Feedback from the consultations led to formal proposals being developed. These formal proposals were advertised, together with the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 2) in the Sussex Express on 14 June 2019. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 1000 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 5 July 2019.
- 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.

1.4 During the formal consultation 84 items of correspondence were received. These included 35 objections and 49 items of support. One of the objectors objected to all proposals but provided no grounds.

## **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 and 2. 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 withdraw the following proposal (summarised in Appendix 1):

- Clare Road, (Lewes) –

Officers are satisfied that the objections received are justified. Further investigation has shown that no application has been made to extend the existing dropped kerb at this location and vehicles should not therefore be driven over the footway to access or leave the widened hard-standing area at number 15. The resident must apply to East Sussex Highways for a Section 184 agreement to widen their dropped kerb. If this agreement is obtained it is likely that a new TRO will be proposed at a later date.

2.3 With regard to objections relating to Baxter Road (Lewes), Blatchington Road (Seaford), Central Avenue (Telscombe Cliffs), Claremont Road (Seaford), Cliffe Industrial Estate (Lewes), Fort Road (Newhaven), Mount Road (Newhaven), Pelham Rise (Peacehaven), Place Lane (Seaford), St Johns Terrace (Lewes), St Swithuns Terrace (Lewes), Sutton Avenue (Peacehaven), Sutton Park Road (Seaford), The Gallops (Lewes) as set out in Appendix 2, 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 With regard to the objections relating to the revocation of the 2007 TROs, as also set out in Appendix 2 of this report, it is not considered that these objections provide sufficient grounds to withdraw the proposed revocation. The 2007 orders are effectively redundant, having been replaced in 2014 by Map-based TROs.

2.5 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. It is felt for highway and road safety reasons, that with the exception of the objection in relation to Clare Road, Lewes, the objections should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as per the draft 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 1, does not uphold the objections in Appendix 2, and to recommend to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made in part.

**RUPERT CLUBB**

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

## Appendix 1 – Proposals where objections are recommended to be upheld

### **1. Site 1 Clare Road, Lewes (Councillor O’Keeffe)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing single yellow lines opposite number 15.
- 1.2 Three objections have been received from residents on the grounds that extending the single yellow line at this location will remove a parking space that is in constant use by many different households to accommodate visitors and tradesmen etc. Although there are no restrictions at the top of Clare Road, residents state that these are usually filled with school staff, parents or visitors and it means that the lower end of the close suffers.
- 1.3 The proposal follow requests from a local resident that they are being inconvenienced trying to exit their drive, especially in the early mornings when leaving to go to work because of vehicles parked opposite the drive.
- 1.4 Historically, number 15 had a driveway running up to a garage to the left of the property. There is a properly constructed dropped-kerb which provides this access. In recent years however the front garden has been re-landscaped to provide a wider hard-standing area to the front of the property. Officers are aware that no application has been made to extend the dropped kerb across the full width of the hard-standing area. As such, vehicles should only be using the dropped-kerb area to enter and leave the drive and should not be mounting the kerb and crossing the footway where the kerb has not been lowered.
- 1.5 Should the resident apply to extend the dropped kerb across the full width of their hard-standing area, and such an application is approved, it is likely that a new TRO will be proposed at a later date.
- 1.6 Having considered all of the objections and circumstances, officers are satisfied that the proposal can be withdrawn.
- 1.7 Councillor O’Keeffe has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 1.8 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal.

## **Appendix 2 – Proposals where objections are recommended to not be upheld and are proposed to be implemented as advertised**

### **1. Site 2 Sutton Park Road, Seaford (Councillor Lambert)**

- 1.1 The proposals at this location are to extend the times of the existing bus stop clearway by introducing a 24 hour clearway.
- 1.2 One objection has been received from Seaford Town Council. The grounds for the objection are that the change to a permanent clearway would have an adverse effect on late night takeaways in the area. The Transport Hub supports the bus operator's demand for these bus stop clearway restrictions to be changed to at any time except local buses.
- 1.3 The proposal follows a number of complaints regarding cars and other vehicles parked in the bus stop clearways. Both these bus stops are heavily used by bus passengers outside of the current bus stop clearway time period and buses are very frequently impeded due to parked vehicles. This makes it impossible for buses to safely deploy their wheelchair ramp and is in contravention of Accessibility Regulations.
- 1.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. Vehicles will still be able to load and unload on the single yellow lines, double yellow lines and the loading bay in the area.
- 1.5 Councillor Lambert has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 1.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

### **2. Site 3 Blatchington Road, Seaford (Councillor Lambert)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to remove a redundant taxi bay.
- 2.2 Two objections have been received. One provides no grounds for objection and the other is from a local business on the grounds that the bay is regularly used by their large HGV recovery truck.
- 2.3 The proposal follows feedback from previous parking reviews to create more parking in the area for both residents and visitors. The taxi bay in Blatchington Road was originally installed when the nearby nightclub was operating. As the club closed down in October 2016, the taxi bay is no longer needed. The removal of the bay will create five parking spaces which will allow anyone to park for an unlimited time period.
- 2.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 2.5 Councillor Lambert has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 2.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposals as advertised.

### **3. Site 4 Cliffe Industrial Estate, Lewes (Councillor Phillip Daniel)**

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to install new no waiting at any time restrictions in the turning head.

- 3.2 One objection has been received from an employee of a local business on the grounds that the double yellow lines are needed on the north side of the turning area only.
- 3.3 The proposal follows complaints and concerns about inconsiderate parking affecting access for businesses and emergency vehicles. Double yellow lines are being proposed in the turning head make it easier for larger vehicles to turn without the need to reverse along the industrial estate.
- 3.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. The proposed double yellow lines will keep the turning area clear at all times, improving visibility and facilitating the safe movements in both directions for lorries and other motorists.
- 3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Daniel has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 3.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

#### **4. Site 5 Baxter Road, Lewes (Councillor O’Keeffe)**

- 4.1 The proposal at this location is to install new double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) at the junction of Baxter Road and Meridien Road, and to extend the existing restrictions.
- 4.2 Two objections have been received from local residents to the proposed new double yellow lines on the grounds that these controls will take away valuable parking for residents and they will not be able to park outside their own homes.
- 4.3 The proposals follow requests from ESCC’s parking enforcement contractor (NSL) that cars parked at this location obstruct the junction and make it difficult to manoeuvre. Following the informal consultation in March 2019 the bus operator has reported that there are significant problems when vehicles park near this junction, as buses turn left from Baxter Road into Meridian Road.
- 4.4 It is recognised that it is often difficult to satisfy the needs of all road users and with a limited amount of kerbside space available, we have to strike a balance between the conflicting demands on that space. The proposals will ensure a safe passage of traffic and will protect sight lines at the junction, while maintaining as much parking for residents and other road users as safely possible. We are also mindful that an element of on street parking has a positive benefit in regulating vehicle speeds
- 4.5 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. ESCC’s Transport Hub supports this proposal as this will assist in ensuring buses are not impeded by parked vehicles.
- 4.6 Councillor O’Keeffe has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 4.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

#### **5. Site 6 The Gallops, Lewes (Councillor O’Keeffe)**

- 5.1 The proposal at this location is to change the existing permit holder only bay to a shared parking bay (for permit holders or pay and display).

- 5.2 One objection has been received from a local resident to the proposal on the grounds that if they were to move their vehicle during the day they may not be able to come back and get a space.
- 5.3 The proposal follows a feedback meeting with NSL where it was noted that the permit holder only bay at top of The Gallops is being underused and is left empty for the majority of the time on most days.
- 5.4 The Gallops currently has 10 spaces allocated for permit holders only and checks have shown that there are only four residents living in The Gallops who have permits. The proposal to change the bay to shared use will allow both visitors and permit holders to park in the parking bays along the main stretch (around 26 parking spaces). The five other permit only bays will remain unchanged.
- 5.5 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 5.6 Councillor O’Keeffe has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 5.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **6. Site 7 Central Avenue, Telscombe Cliffs (Councillor Smith)**

- 6.1 The proposal at this location is to change the existing two-hour limited stay to a one-hour stay.
- 6.2 One objection has been received from a local business in the area on the grounds that the changes will adversely affect his business. He states that sometimes clients overrun their one-hour time slots and if they are fined or refuse to attend because of a lack of parking he will have lost business.
- 6.3 The proposal follows a request made by the local residents association who asked to change the existing two-hour limited stay to 30 minutes. Officers do not believe 30 minutes is manageable either for NSL or for members of public visiting the local shops, and a one-hour maximum stay would be more appropriate. This will allow a greater turnover of vehicles, in effect creating more parking availability for customers to the area. There is plenty of unrestricted parking nearby should any member of public wish or need to stay for longer than an hour.
- 6.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 6.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Smith has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 6.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **7. Site 8 Place Lane, Seaford (Councillor Lambert)**

- 7.1 The proposed change in Place Lane is to correct and ratify the written description in the traffic order. There will be no physical changes on street.

- 7.2 One objection has been received but no reasons have been given for the objection. Legally, objectors must provide the grounds for their objection (in order for their grounds to be considered). Officers have written to the objector twice and have received no response.
- 7.3 Although no grounds have been given for the objection, officers have included it in this report for completeness.
- 7.4 There is an anomaly with the traffic regulation order for the current double yellow lines in Place Lane. To address this issue it has been proposed to correct the TRO. Once corrected, NSL can resume enforcement in this area.
- 7.5 Councillor Lambert has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 7.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **8. Site 9 Claremont Road, Blatchington Road Seaford (Councillor Lambert)**

- 8.1 The proposed change at this location is to reduce the length of the double yellow lines at the junction and extend the length of the existing (time limited) parking bay.
- 8.2 One objection has been received from Seaford Town Council who said the current restrictions should be left in place. They did not provide any reason or grounds for this view.
- 8.3 Feedback from the last review in this area showed that residents, particularly near to the Claremont Road/Blatchington Road junction, were in need of more parking. The proposals to shorten the double yellow lines will increase parking for approximately three vehicles, while not compromising any safety issues.
- 8.4 Officers have written to Seaford Town Council asking for their reasons for objecting to the proposal and have received no further response.
- 8.5 Councillor Lambert has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 8.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **9. Site 10 Fort Road, Newhaven (Councillor Grover)**

- 9.1 The proposal at this location is to remove some of the double yellow lines to create free on street parking for local residents and visitors.
- 9.2 One objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds that the changes will mean cars stopping and starting right outside their window, whereas now they flow past without much noise. They believe the changes are unnecessary as all residents have either a double garage, parking spaces, or both.
- 9.3 The proposals follow requests from local residents asking for more parking in the area. The proposals are to make two small areas of unrestricted parking and as well as providing much needed parking, the presence of on-street parking will also help to keep vehicle speeds low.
- 9.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 9.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Grover has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.



9.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

**10. Site 11 Mount Road, Newhaven (Councillor Grover)**

- 10.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing double yellow lines in Mount Road near Tide Mills View.
- 10.2 One objection has been received from Newhaven Town Council (NTC) along with four items of support. The grounds for the objection were that NTC's planning committee felt that the loss of parking in this area for residents and visitors to the nature reserve would be detrimental.
- 10.3 The proposal to extend the existing double yellow lines follow requests by the bus company. There are very frequent bus services (sometimes 15 to 20 services per hour) travelling along this section of Mount Road to access the Denton Corner bus stops. Buses are impeded by parked vehicles in this area, including when making the right turn to access the bus stops in the turn-around section opposite Tide Mills View. In addition, residents of Tide Mills View say that there are near misses almost daily when exiting the close due to vehicles parked too close to the entrance to Tide Mills View. They have also said there have been countless times when residents have witnessed near misses between motor vehicles, pedestrians, and buses and believe that this area is an accident waiting to happen.
- 10.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 10.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Grover has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 10.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

**11. Site 12 Pelham Rise, Peacehaven (Councillor Enever)**

- 11.1 The proposals at this location are to install a new bus stop clearway and new no waiting at any time restrictions at the junction of Cripps Avenue and Pelham Rise.
- 11.2 One objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds that the restrictions will increase traffic speed. It will also mean that the resident will not be able to park outside their own home.
- 11.3 The proposals follow complaints from the bus company that vehicles parked at the bus stop prevent the bus from safely deploying its wheelchair ramp, meaning that the service is not complying with accessibility requirements. For this reason, a bus stop clearway is being proposed. This will displace vehicles and it is proposed to install double yellow lines to protect the junction of Pelham Rise and Cripps Avenue, to keep the junction clear of parked vehicles, and to enable adequate visibility when exiting and entering the junction. It must also be noted that there is a school nearby and introducing junction protection will increase safety for children attending the school.
- 11.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposals will ensure buses and passengers can safely use the bus stop, will ensure a safe passage of traffic and will protect sight lines at the junction.

11.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Enever has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.

11.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and to install the proposals as advertised.

## **12. Site 13 St Swithuns Terrace, Lewes (Councillor O’Keeffe)**

12.1 The proposal at this location is to replace a section of the permit holders only parking bay with a disabled parking bay outside number 23.

12.2 Two objections have been received from local residents to the proposals on the grounds that a valuable parking space in an already overcrowded area will be removed.

12.3 The bay is being provided for a resident who already parks in this road so there will be no additional demand for parking as a result of this proposal. Officers are satisfied that the applicant meets the Council’s criteria for providing a disabled bay on the highway. A mobility assessment has been carried out by the Blue Badge team which confirms that the location of the bay is the most suitable location for the needs of the applicant.

12.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

12.5 Councillor O’Keeffe has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.

12.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

## **13. Site 14 Sutton Avenue, Peacehaven (Councillor Enever)**

13.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing double yellow lines in Sutton Avenue.

13.2 One objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds that a pedestrian crossing would be needed if on-street parking was removed.

13.3 The proposal at this location follows requests from residents and a local councillor to extend the existing double yellow lines to help with sight lines when exiting Fairfield. This is a heavily trafficked route and visibility is very poor when exiting Fairfield. Drivers say they are unable to see until they have pulled out increasing the likelihood of a collision.

13.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

13.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Enever has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.

13.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **14. Site 15 St Johns Terrace, Lewes (Councillor Phillip Daniel)**

14.1 The proposal at this location is to introduce two new permit holder only bays in an area where there are existing double yellow lines.

14.2 Two objections have been received to the proposals. The grounds for the objection were that the current restrictions work well for the local community and should be left in place, and that the area should be left as a free parking area or should be turned into a place for charging electric vehicles.

- 14.3 A member of public contacted ESCC's Highway Land Information team about an un-hitched caravan parked at this location and at the same time asked if anything could be done about the other vehicles also parking there. The Highway Land Information team have confirmed that the area is adopted public highway. As such, the current double yellow lines would apply to this area and the vehicles should be removed. However, as vehicles have been parking here for many years without incident, the proposal will formalise the parking arrangements and provide two additional permit holder parking places.
- 14.4 There are no current plans to introduce electric charging points to this area.
- 14.5 Any issues with un-hitched caravans will be addressed outside the TRO process.
- 14.6 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 14.7 At the time of writing, Councillor Phillip Daniel has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 14.8 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

## **15. Objections to revoked orders**

- 15.1 The parking scheme in Lewes town was introduced by way of Experimental TROs and in 2007 the TROs were made permanent. Since 2007 many changes to the scheme have been made through the parking reviews. In 2014 ESCC moved towards a more efficient way of making TROs by introducing Map-based TROs in Lewes town. These Map-based Orders essentially provide maps or plans showing the parking controls in place as opposed to the previous method of providing text descriptions depicting the controls. Around the time Map-based TROs were introduced, 'virtual' permits were also introduced, meaning no paper permits would be issued to residents.
- 15.2 This current parking review order lists all previous text-based TROs for Lewes town which will be revoked as they include articles or descriptions which are either no longer used, no longer operational, or are no longer as described.
- 15.3 13 objections have been received to the revocation of the 2007 TROs. These objections are essentially copies of each other and are based on the grounds that the 2014 TRO 'does not adequately replace the eligibility criteria for residents' permits contained within the 2007 Order. The objectors also say that Lewes town residents were not made aware that the eligibility criteria changed when the 2014 TRO was introduced and were not given adequate notice or opportunity to object, and that the changes to eligibility were not brought to the attention of the Committee. Full copies of the objections have been made available in the Members Room for the Committee to view.
- 15.4 Two of the objectors have also since written in saying they had parking rights which have now been removed, and as there are residents of Southover High Street who have two permits per property that this is discriminatory, that they are having difficulty letting out one of the flats in their property as they are finding it difficult to find a tenant who doesn't need a parking space.
- 15.5 The objectors all live in Priory Crescent, Lewes. Priory Crescent is a private street with on street parking available for around fifteen vehicles.
- 15.6 Historically, all our traffic regulation orders were text based, meaning that each stretch of yellow line or each parking bay needed a text description which specified the exact location

of that parking control. We were aware of other local authorities who were operating map-based traffic orders. This is a different way of representing parking controls by showing them graphically on a map, and therefore easier to understand than text-based descriptions and is a more efficient way of managing the traffic orders. The 2014 order replaced all the text descriptions and consolidated all the previous articles into an easier to manage, map based, traffic order. It is ESCC's ultimate aim to replace all our traffic regulation orders in Eastbourne, Lewes district, and Hastings with map-based traffic orders.

- 15.7 The 2014 order has since been amended through our regular parking reviews and accurately portrays what is currently on-street in Lewes. This is the current operational TRO (as amended) and takes precedence over any previous Orders.
- 15.8 There were no new or amended parking restrictions being proposed by the 2014 order and therefore it followed a slightly different process to previous Orders while still meeting legal requirements. The change in the 2014 Order was to the way the order was managed (as map-based rather than text-based) with no material changes to on-street parking arrangements. It was not necessary to place copies of the advertised notice in every street in Lewes or to deliver letters to all addresses. It was however advertised in the local newspaper. A report did not need to be presented to the Planning Committee because no objections were received.
- 15.9 The 2007 Order defined a resident (for the purpose of applying for a permit) as being a person whose usual address was included in a list of roads in 'Schedule G1' of that order. When the 2014 Order was introduced, a map of Lewes showing the permit zone areas replaced the list of roads so that the Council could manage the permit schemes more efficiently. This would allow, for example, newly built and eligible properties to become immediately able to apply for permits whereas under the previous 2007 TRO process they would have to wait possibly for a year or two until the next TRO review took place. The 2014 Order was changed to define a resident as being *"a person whose usual address is in any street or property with Permit Holders Parking Places, or Permit Holder or Pay and Display Parking Places as shown in the Order Plans"*. Both of these definitions are correct when they relate to the content of their own Order.
- 15.10 Officers have not made a decision about the eligibility for permits. In making the change from listing addresses to providing a map showing the parking places, it came to light that the Council could not issue permits to residents of Priory Crescent as this is a private street and not public highway. It was, therefore, appropriate that the Council did not issue further permits in relation to Priory Crescent. Unfortunately at the time of the 2014 Order no instruction was given to NSL to stop issuing permits in the private street, and regrettably they continued to do so. This oversight was identified in January of last year and NSL were then instructed not to issue any further permits. The Council does accept that errors have been made in relation to the inclusion of Priory Crescent in the 2007 TRO. The Council also accepts that residents should have been notified when it was realised that this error had been made, rather than when applying for permits. The Council however reconfirms its' position that permits will not be issued to residents of private streets.
- 15.11 Previous correspondence with the Chair of the Priory Crescent Residents Committee (PCRC) also highlighted to us that none of the TROs prior to 2014 had been revoked. The current proposals reflect this - the revocation of previous, now redundant, traffic orders.
- 15.12 Officers have previously explained the above to the Chair of the PCRC. The Assistant Director and the Assistant Chief Executive have also written to the Chair of the residents committee to confirm these details.
- 15.13 At the time of writing, Councillor O'Keeffe has not replied to confirm her agreement with the recommendation.

15.14 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and revoke all previous Orders

**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

**ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984, ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1991 &  
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004**

**The East Sussex (Lewes District) (Traffic Regulation) Order 2004 Amendment Order 2005  
No 1 (Amendment No x) 201x**

East Sussex County Council, in exercise of their powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (4), 3(2), 4(2), 32, 35(1) and (3), 45, 46, 49, 51, 52 and 53 of, and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”), as amended, the Road Traffic Act 1991, as amended, Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act hereby make the following Order:-

**1. Commencement and citation**

This Order may be cited as “The East Sussex (Lewes District) (Traffic Regulation) Order 2004 Amendment Order 2005 No 1 (Amendment No x) 201x and shall come into effect on xxxxxx

**2. When this Order comes into effect:**

(a) The East Sussex (Lewes District) (Traffic Regulation) Order 2004 Amendment Order 2005 No.1, as amended, shall have effect except as hereinafter contained.

**(iii) The Interpretation shall be amended as follows:**

1. Insert the following definition of “footway” before the definition for “goods”:

"footway" has the same meaning as defined in Section 329 (1) of the Highways Act 1980 or any re-enactment or modification thereof from time to time in force.

**(iv) Part II – Waiting and Loading Restrictions, that this be amended as follows:**

1. Insert Article 3 (6) as follows:

3	(6)	(i)	Save as provided in Article 3 (6) (ii), no person shall except upon the direction or with the permission of a Police Officer, cause or permit any motor vehicle to enter or wait in any of the lengths of road specified in Schedule 16.
		(ii)	Nothing in Article 3 (6) (i) shall render it unlawful to cause or permit any motor vehicle to enter those lengths of road specified in Schedule 16 if the vehicle:
		(a)	Is a licensed taxi, or
		(b)	Is being used for the purpose of loading and unloading, or
		(c)	Is a disabled person's vehicle which clearly and continuously displays a disabled person's badge such that; in the case of a vehicle fitted with a dashboard or facia panel, the badge is exhibited thereon so that Part 1 of the badge is legible from the outside of the vehicle; or in the case of a vehicle not fitted with a dashboard or facia panel, the badge is exhibited in a conspicuous position on the vehicle so that Part 1 of the badge is legible from the outside of the vehicle

2. Insert Article 3 (7) as follows:

3	(7)	(i)	No person shall cause or permit any vehicle to stop at any time with two or more wheels on any part of the footway or verge in the lengths of road specified in Schedule 17
		(ii)	Where any vehicle is waiting in contravention of any of the provisions contained within this Section and a Civil Enforcement Officer has reason to believe that a penalty charge is payable, he may:-
		(a)	fix a penalty charge notice to the vehicle; or
		(b)	give such a notice to the person appearing to him to be in charge of the vehicle; and
		(c)	arrange for the vehicle to be removed from the parking place by any person duly authorised by East Sussex County Council, who shall provide for the safe custody of the vehicle where it is so removed; or
		(d)	cause to be altered the position of the vehicle in order that its position shall comply with those provisions; or
		(e)	in the case of an emergency cause to be removed any vehicle left in a parking place to any place he thinks fit.

**(v) Schedule 1, Part A, Prohibition of Waiting At Any Time, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following item shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Mount Road</b>	North-east Side	From a point 16 metres south-east of its junction with Station Road, north-westwards for a distance of 41 metres
<b>Murray Avenue</b>	South-west Side	From a point 13.7 metres north-west of its junction with the northern kerbline of Brighton Road, north-westwards for a distance of 33.3 metres
<b>Fort Road</b>	South-west Side	From a point 75 meters from its junction with Court Farm Road, south-eastwards for its entire length

2. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Beach Road</b>	West Side	From its junction with Transit Road, northwards for a distance of 15 metres
<b>Mount Road</b>	North-east Side	From a point 13 metres north-west of its junction with Station Road, south-eastwards for a distance of 62 metres
<b>Murray Avenue</b>	South-west Side	From a point 3 metres south-east of the south eastern building line of number 1 Murray Avenue, south-eastwards for a distance of 17 metres
<b>Fort Road</b>	South-west Side	From a point 75 meters from its junction with Court Farm Road, south-eastwards to a point 6.5 metres south-east of the boundary of Nos. 1/4 and 5/8 Mariners Wharf
<b>Fort Road</b>	South-west Side	From the south-eastern building line of 9/12 Mariners Wharf, south-eastwards for a distance of 47.5 metres
<b>Fort Road</b>	South-west Side	From a point 78.5 metres from the south-eastern building line of 9/12 Mariners Wharf, south-eastwards for its entire length
<b>First Avenue</b>	North-west Side	From its junction with Second Avenue, north-eastwards for a distance of 15 metres
<b>First Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From its junction with Second Avenue, north-eastwards for a distance of 11 metres
<b>First Avenue</b>	Both Sides	From its junction with Second Avenue, south-westwards for a distance of 17 metres
<b>Second Avenue</b>	Both Sides	From its junction with First Avenue, south-eastwards for a distance of 10 metres
<b>Second Avenue</b>	North-east Side	From its junction with First Avenue, north-westwards for a distance of 10 metres
<b>Southdown Road</b>	North-east Side	From the boundary of Nos. 28/30 Southdown Road, south-eastwards to the boundary of Nos. 36/38 Southdown Road

3. In the list of restrictions for Peacehaven, the following items shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Sutton Avenue</b>	Both Sides	From a point 85 metres north of its junction with the unnamed link road between Cavell Avenue and Sutton Avenue, northwards for a distance of 51.5 metres
----------------------	------------	---

4. In the list of restrictions for Peacehaven, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Cissbury Avenue</b>	East Side	From a point 10 metres north of the northern kerbline of Arundel Road, southwards to its junction with Roundhay Avenue
<b>Cripps Avenue</b>	South Side	From its junction with Pelham Rise, following the kerbline in a westerly then south-westerly direction to a point 2.5 metres north-east of the north-eastern building line of number 27 Cripps Avenue
<b>Cripps Avenue</b>	North Side	From its junction with Pelham Rise, westwards for a distance of 19 metres
<b>Pelham Rise</b>	West Sides	From a point 15 metres north of its junction with Cripps Avenue, southwards to a point 10 metres south-east of the junction
<b>Sutton Avenue</b>	North-west Side	From a point opposite a point 13.5 metres south-westwards of the boundary of Nos. 41/43 Sutton Avenue, south-westwards for a distance of 98.5 metres

<b>Sutton Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From a point 13.5 metres south-westwards of the boundary of Nos. 41/43 Sutton Avenue, south-westwards for a distance of 51.5 metres
----------------------	-----------------	---

5. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following items shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Church Street</b>	East Side	From a point 40 metres south of the southern kerbline of South Street, to its junction with Steyne Road
<b>Claremont Road</b>	North-east Side	From its junction with Blatchington Road, north-westwards for a distance of 15 metres

6. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Blatchington Road</b>	North-west Side	From its junction with Claremont Road, north-eastwards for a distance of 7 metres
<b>Church Street</b>	East Side	From its junction with Steyne Road, northwards for a distance of 12 metres
<b>Claremont Road</b>	North-east Side	From its junction with Blatchington Road, north-eastwards for a distance of 10 metres
<b>Place Lane</b>	South-east Side	From its junction with Broad Street, south-westwards for a distance of 10 metres

**(vi) Schedule 1, Part B, Prohibition Of Waiting, 8am to 6pm Monday to Sundays inclusive, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following items shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Beach Road</b>	Both Side	For its entire length
-------------------	-----------	-----------------------

2. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Beach Road</b>	East Side	For its entire length
<b>Beach Road</b>	West Side	From its northern junction with Transit Road, southwards for a distance of 77 metres
<b>Beach Road</b>	West Side	From its southern junction with Transit Road, southwards for its entire length

**(vii) Schedule 1, Part C, Prohibition Of Waiting, 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturdays inclusive, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following items shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Church Street</b>	East Side	From a point approximately 5 metres south of its junction with the south-western kerbline of South Street, southwards for a distance of 35 metres
----------------------	-----------	---

2. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Church Street</b>	East Side	From a point approximately 5 metres south of its junction with the south-western kerbline of South Street, southwards for a distance of 39 metres
----------------------	-----------	---

**(viii) Schedule 1, Part E, Prohibition Of Waiting, 7.30am to 8.30am and 2pm to 3pm Monday to Fridays inclusive, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following items shall be deleted as follows:



<b>Southdown Road</b>	North-east Side	From the eastern boundary of number 8, eastwards to the eastern boundary of number 14
-----------------------	-----------------	---

- (ix) **Schedule 3, Part B, Time Limited Waiting, 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturdays inclusive, maximum stay 2 hours, no return within 1 hour, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Telscombe, the following items shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Central Avenue</b>	East Side	From a point 39.5 metres north-east of the north-eastern kerbline of the A259, southwards for a distance of approximately 25 metres
<b>Central Avenue</b>	West Side	From a point of 47.5 metres north-east of the north-eastern kerbline of the A259, north-eastwards for a distance of approximately 25 metres

2. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following item shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Claremont Road</b>	North-east Side	From a point 15 metres north-west of the north-western kerbline of Blatchington Road, for a distance of 34 metres in a north-westerly direction
-----------------------	-----------------	---

3. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following item shall be added as follows:

<b>Claremont Road</b>	North-east Side	From a point 10 metres north-west of the north-western kerbline of Blatchington Road, north-westwards for a distance of 38 metres
-----------------------	-----------------	---

- (x) **Schedule 3, Part G, 1 hour no return within 1 hour, 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturdays inclusive, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Saltdean, the following item shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Longridge Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From a point 59.5 metres north-east of its junction with Nutley Avenue for a distance of 12 metres in a north-easterly direction
-------------------------	-----------------	--

2. In the list of restrictions for Saltdean, the following item shall be added as follows:

<b>Longridge Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From a point 24 metres south-west of its junction with Crowborough Road for a distance of 32 metres in a south-westerly direction
-------------------------	-----------------	---

- (xi) **Schedule 3, Part K, Time Limited Waiting, 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturdays inclusive, maximum stay 1 hour, no return within 2 hours, that this Schedule be inserted as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Telscombe Cliffs, the following item shall be added as follows:

<b>Central Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From a point 39.5 metres north-east of its junction with the A259, north-eastwards for a distance of approximately 25 metres
<b>Central Avenue</b>	North-west Side	From a point of 47.5 metres north-east of its junction with the A259, north-eastwards for a distance of approximately 25 metres

**(xii) Schedule 6, Disabled Persons Parking Places, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Newhaven, the following items shall be added as follows:

<b>Chapel Street</b>	South-west Side	From a point 1 metre north-westwards of the the boundary of Nos.75/77 Chapel Street, south-eastwards for a distance of 6.6 metres
----------------------	-----------------	---

**(xi) Schedule 14, Part B, Taxis Only 10pm-3am, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Seaford, the following item shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Blatchington Road</b>	South-east Side	From a point opposite the north-eastern boundary of The Club, Blatchington Road south-westwards for a distance of 22 metres
--------------------------	-----------------	---

**(xii) Schedule 15, Taxis Only at any time, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

1. In the list of restrictions for Saltdean, the following item shall be deleted as follows:

<b>Longridge Avenue</b>	South-east Side	From a point 23 metres south-west of its junction with Crowborough Road for a distance of 22 metres in a south-westerly direction
-------------------------	-----------------	---

**Revocations**

**The East Sussex (Various Roads, Peacehaven) (Part) (Restriction of Waiting) Order 2012**

**In Schedule W1.1, No Waiting At Any Time:**

<b>Cissbury Avenue</b>	East Side	From the northern kerbside of Roundhay Avenue, northwards for a distance of 15 metres
------------------------	-----------	---

**3. Citation**

This Order may be cited as "The East Sussex (Lewes District) (Traffic Regulation) Order 2004 Amendment Order 2005 No 1 (Amendment No x) 201x and shall come into effect on xx xxxx xxxx

THE COMMON SEAL of )  
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL )  
was affixed hereto )  
on the xx day of xxxxxxx )  
Two Thousand and xxxxxx )  
in the presence of:- )

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY

**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

**ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984, ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1991 & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004**

**The East Sussex Lewes Town (Parking Places and Waiting and Loading Restrictions) Traffic Regulation Order 2014 Amendment No \* Order 201\***

East Sussex County Council, in exercise of their powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (4), 3(2), 4(2), 32, 35(1) and (3), 45, 49, 51, 52, 53 of, and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”) as amended, the Road Traffic Act 1991 (as amended), Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the Act hereby make the following Order:-

**1. Commencement and citation**

This Order may be cited as “The East Sussex Lewes Town (Parking Places and Waiting and Loading Restrictions) Traffic Regulation Order 2014 Amendment No.\* Order 201\*”

**2. When this Order comes into effect:**

(a) The East Sussex Lewes Town (Parking Places and Waiting and Loading Restrictions) Traffic Regulation Order 2014, as amended, shall have effect except as hereinafter contained.

**(i) Payment of the Parking Charge that the following article shall be amended as follows:**

1 Article 15. (2) (b) shall be deleted and the following shall be inserted:

15.	(2)	(b)	where facilities allow, by a credit card, debit card or other pre-paid card at a pay and display ticket machine which is approved in accordance with Section 35(3) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended); or
-----	-----	-----	---

**(ii) The Order Plans shall be amended as follows:**

<b>The map tiles below shall be revoked</b>	<b>The map tiles below shall be inserted</b>
Overview Revision 3	Overview Revision *
LI104	LI104 Revision 1
LI105	LI105 Revision 1
LJ103	LJ103 Revision 1
LK103	LK103 Revision 1
LK107 Revision 1	LK107 Revision 2
LL106	LL106 Revision 1
LL107 Revision 1	LL107 Revision 2
LM103 Revision 2	LM103 Revision 3
LM106	LM106 Revision 1
LN106 Revision 2	LN106 Revision 3
LN107 Revision 3	LN107 Revision 4
LO103	LO103 Revision 1

LO104	LO104 Revision 1
LO107	LO107 Revision 1
LP111	LP111 Revision 1
LQ111	LQ111 Revision 1
LR111	LR111 Revision 1

### 3. Revocations

The following Orders and associated Amendment Orders are hereby revoked in their entirety:

<b>Lewes (Various Roads, Lewes) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Disabled Persons Parking Places) Order 1989</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Parking Places) Experimental Traffic Order 2006</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Waiting and Loading Restriction) Experimental Traffic Order 2006</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Parking Places) Experimental Traffic Order 2006</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Waiting and Loading Restriction) Experimental Traffic Order 2006</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment No.1 2014</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Waiting and Loading Rest) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment 2013 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Waiting and Loading Restriction) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment 2008 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Waiting and Loading Restriction) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment 2013 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2015 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Waiting And Loading Restrictions) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2015 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre Extension) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2013 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2012 No.2</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2013 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order No.1 2014</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre) (Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007 Amendment Order 2008 No.1</b>
<b>The East Sussex (Lewes Town Centre)(Parking Places) Traffic Regulation Order 2007</b>
<b>The East Sussex(Lewes Town Centre)(Waiting and Loading Restriction) Traffic Regulation Order 2007</b>

### 4. Citation

This Order may be cited as The East Sussex Lewes Town (Parking Places and Waiting and Loading Restriction) Traffic Regulation Order 2014 Amendment No.\* Order 201\* and shall come into effect on xx xxxx xxxx

THE COMMON SEAL of EAST SUSSEX )  
COUNTY COUNCIL was affixed )  
hereto on the      day of              two      )  
thousand and      in the presence of:-      )

Authorised Signatory  
Director of Legal

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 - para 4.2 joint report of