

Committee:	<b>Regulatory Planning Committee</b>
Date:	<b>15 January 2020</b>
Report by:	<b>Director of Communities, Economy and Transport</b>
Title of Report	<b>Traffic Regulation Orders – Rother District Introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) initial restrictions 2020</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 introduction of the Rother District CPE</b>
Contact Officer:	<b>Daniel Clarke – Tel 01323 464057</b>
Local Members:	<b>Councillor Glazier, Councillor Davies, Councillor Elford, Councillor Field, Councillor Maynard, Councillor Ensor, Councillor Clark, Councillor Earl-Williams.</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**The Planning Committee is recommended to:**

- 1. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.**
  - 2. To uphold, in part, the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 to this report**
  - 3. Uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 3 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 At its Cabinet meeting on 26 June 2018 East Sussex County Council welcomed the request from Rother District Council to introduce Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) across the district. It was agreed that an application should be made to the Department for Transport (DfT) to seek the necessary powers to implement CPE. The application was made to DfT on 31 July 2019. When designing the scheme, the needs of all motorists were taken into account along with all of the parking concerns that had previously been raised with us about parking across Rother district.
- 1.2 Where relevant, proposals are designed to encourage short stay, low-cost parking that will create a turn over of parking spaces for customers and visitors, in turn increasing footfall to shops and businesses. Those who require longer stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks or alternative means of transport. Other proposals are designed to ensure that parking that may compromise road safety is clearly discouraged

- 1.3 CPE schemes should be self-funding. This means that the charges for pay and display, permits and penalty charge notices pay for the setup of the scheme and the ongoing costs to maintain and manage it.
- 1.4 Feedback from exhibitions and the informal consultation carried out in November 2018 through to January 2019 led to formal proposals being developed. These formal proposals were advertised, together with the [draft Traffic Regulation Order \(TRO\)](#) (available to view via this link and a copy of which is provided in the Members' Room) in the Sussex Express on 6 September 2019. Notices were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 11000 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 27 September 2019.
- 1.5 Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant District and Parish Councillors, County Councillors and statutory consultees including the emergency services.
- 1.6 During the formal consultation 544 items of correspondence were received. These included 1103 objections from 437 objectors with 107 items of support. Since the formal consultation nine objectors have withdrawn their objections.
- 1.7 Copies of all correspondence 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 Appendices 1, 2 and 3. Plans showing the areas and proposals objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack. All members of the Planning Committee have been provided with an electronic copy of all the outstanding objections. A hard copy of these objections is also available to view in the Members' Room.
- 2.2 If CPE is approved and once fair and consistent enforcement is being carried out, requests for additional restrictions will be managed through our review process, which we successfully use in Eastbourne, Lewes and Hastings. Anyone will be able to make requests online; more information can be found on our [Parking](#) pages.
- 2.3 Additional restrictions cannot be introduced by means of an amendment to this Order without further consultation. The Planning Committee can only consider what was in the original proposal, and cannot redesign the schemes to include additional restrictions, as this may adversely impact residents or road users without them being made aware of the changes.
- 2.4 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to modify the proposal summarised in Appendix 2

- 2.5 Officers are satisfied that the modification of this proposal does not involve a substantial change to the draft Order.
- 2.6 It is recommended that all other proposals not objected to should be implemented as advertised.
- 2.7 It is recommended that a minor amendment is made to the definition of resident in the TRO so that it now reads as “resident for the purpose of this Order means a person whose usual place of abode is at premises the postal address of which is in any street or property within the boundaries of the zones shown on the Permit Zones and eligibility areas maps in the Order Plans provided the street is not private”.

### **3. Conclusions and reason 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 detracting from the aims of the scheme.
- 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, upholds, in part, the objections in Appendix 2, does uphold the objections in Appendix 3 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**

## **Appendix 1 – Proposals where objections are recommended to not be upheld and are proposed to be implemented as advertised**

The following six sites are for School Keep Clears markings across Rother District. These are currently advisory markings installed outside local schools. As they are advisory, civil enforcement officers (CEOs) would have no authority to keep these markings clear of parked vehicles. It is necessary to introduce a TRO for these sites to maintain safety at the school entrances, and enable Civil Enforcement Officers to enforce all School Keep Clear restrictions consistently across the District.

### **1. Site 1 Little Common School, Hillborough Close, Bexhill (Councillor Earl-Williams)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise the existing School Keep Clear (Monday – Friday 8:00am-9:30am and 2:30pm-4:00pm) markings in Hillborough Close.
- 1.2 Two objections were received from residents close to the location, one objection asked why additional restrictions were needed and that the current restrictions needed to be enforced. The grounds for the other objection were that formalising the restrictions would create congestion and the times of enforcement were not specific to term times.
- 1.3 The proposal is part of introducing CPE in to Rother District to formalise and enforce the School Keep Clear across the district. This will help to improve safety at the school entrance during drop-off and pick-up times.
- 1.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEOs to enforce the restrictions improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area. The times of enforcement cannot be restricted to term times as the Department for Transport no longer authorise the use of 'term time' for school entrance markings.
- 1.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Earl-Williams has not replied to confirm whether she agrees with the recommendation.
- 1.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

### **2. Site 2 Brede Primary School, Udimore Road, Broad Oak (Councillor Maynard)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise the current School Keep Clear (Monday-Friday 8:00am-9:30am and 2:30pm-4:00pm).
- 2.2 One objection was received about the length of the restriction and that it should be reduced to allow parking.
- 2.3 The proposal is part of introducing CPE in to Rother District to formalise and enforce the School Keep Clear across the district.
- 2.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is to formalise the existing markings and there is no change to the length, which is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEOs to enforce the restrictions improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area.

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

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

**3. Site 3 Chantry Community Primary School, Barrack Road and Crowmere Avenue, Bexhill (Councillor Clark)**

3.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise the current School Keep Clear (At Any Time).

3.2 One objection was received about the restriction and that because it is on the opposite side of the road, displaced vehicles would park in front of the residents access, thereby blocking their off road parking.

3.3 The proposal is part of introducing CPE in to Rother District to formalise and enforce the School Keep Clear across the district.

3.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEO to enforce the restrictions, including against vehicles that block access, thereby improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area.

3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Clark 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 4 Glenleigh Park Academy, Turkey Road and Gunters Lane, Bexhill (Councillor Ensor)**

4.1 The proposal at this location is to remove the current School Keep Clear and install a Bus Stop Clearway (Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm).

4.2 One objection was received claiming that the installation of a bus stop clearway would cause additional congestion at the junction of Gunters Lane. The objection also raised concern that vehicles would park in front of their access.

4.3 The proposal was made because it was necessary to remove the School Keep Clear as it has not been installed appropriately as it is on the opposite side of the road to the school. Introducing the bus stop clearway would offer a similar level of protection by restricting parking and will also be used by local bus services.

4.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEO to enforce the restrictions, including against vehicles that block access, thereby improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area.

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

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

**5. Site 5 Westfield Primary, Workhouse Lane and Main Road Westfield (Councillor Maynard)**

5.1 The proposal at this location was to formalise the current School Keep Clear at this location.

5.2 One objection was received, and requested that the current restriction be enforced and extended.

5.3 The proposal is part of introducing CPE in to Rother District to formalise and enforce the School Keep Clear across the district.

5.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEO to enforce the restrictions improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area. We are not proposing to extend the restrictions at this time.

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

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

**6. Site 6 Salehurst Church of England Primary School, George Hill, School Keep Clear, Robertsbridge (Councillor Davies)**

6.1 The proposal is to formalise the current School Keep Clear (Monday to Friday 8:00am – 9:30am and 2:30pm – 4:00pm except August)

6.2 There were two unresolved objections. Both were about the displacement of vehicles that the restrictions would cause. One objection said that it would affect safety for other road users of George Hill, the other said displaced vehicles will restrict the residents from parking or make it difficult to access their driveways.

6.3 The proposal is part of introducing CPE in to Rother District to formalise and enforce the School Keep Clear across the district.

6.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal is considered appropriate for the location and will enable CEOs to enforce the restrictions, including against vehicles that block access, thereby improving compliance and safety throughout the whole area.

6.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Davies has not replied to confirm whether she agrees with the recommendation.

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

### **The following locations are all in Battle**

58 objections were received to the proposals in Battle, of which 44 objections are to the proposal for Lower Lake and Abbotts Close areas (Appendix 2). Objections that included requests for additional restrictions will be considered for inclusion in future Parking Reviews for Rother District, provided that the implementation of CPE is confirmed by the Department for Transport and possible need is demonstrated after fair and consistent enforcement has been carried out.

### **7. Site 7 High Street, Battle (Councillor Field)**

- 7.1 The proposal at this location is to introduce Pay and Display Bays and change the time limits on the Blue Badge Holders Only Bays. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.
- 7.2 The four objections received about the proposals to the High Street are on the grounds that: the Loading Ban will not be observed and will not stop delivery vehicles from parking; resident parking is needed; current restrictions need to be enforced; and pay and display bays should have a maximum stay of 30 minutes, not one hour.
- 7.3 The scheme was originally designed to replicate the current restrictions as closely as possible. During the exhibitions and informal consultation concerns were raised that the 30 minutes for pay and display and one hour for the disabled bay was too short. Officers felt that extending the time limit to one hour for pay and display and two hours for the disabled bay would still meet the aims of the scheme, whilst also balancing the needs of all road users and efficiency of enforcement. If CPE is approved all restrictions will be enforced and drivers will be expected to observe the restrictions and may be issued a Penalty Charge Notice if ignored.
- 7.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 7.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

### **8. Site 8 Glengorse, Battle (Councillor Field)**

- 8.1 The proposal is to introduce Shared Use Permit Holder or Time Limited bays (two hour maximum stay no return within two hours, Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm). A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.
- 8.2 There were four objectors to the proposals, all objections were from people who lived outside of Glengorse. Three were that the two hour time limit was too short and unnecessary. One objection was because of the possible effects the restrictions would have on Battle Hill and surrounding roads.

8.3 The scheme is designed to provide the residents of Glengorse with protection against commuter parking whilst also providing an element of free parking for visitors and trades. All restrictions will be monitored and where restrictions are underutilised changes will be consulted on through regular reviews.

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

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

### **The following locations are in Bexhill**

342 objectors made 975 objections about different aspects of the proposals. There are five zones proposed in Bexhill – these are the Central, North, East, West and Seafront zones. As well as objections we have received a number of requests in addition to those advertised, and one petition from residents to include additional roads into the proposed zones. We understand that displacement parking will inevitably happen where new parking controls are introduced, but with any parking scheme there needs to be a boundary where the restrictions end. If approval is given for CPE we will monitor each location and if necessary include changes in the first parking review, which we expect to start about 12 months after the introductions of CPE. The petition was received from residents of Woodville Road, with requests for additional restrictions from Lionel Road, Brookfield Road, Cantelupe Road, Millfield Rise Lark Hill, Da La Warr Road, Amhurst Road, Richmond Grove, Richmond Road, Brockley Road and Sutton Place.

### **9. Site 9 Central Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

9.1 The proposal is to introduce a mixture of Permit Holder Only, Permit Holder or Time Limited, Pay and Display or Permit Holders, Pay and Display Only and Disabled Bays. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

9.2 There were 37 objectors that have made 81 objections, the majority of objections have been general and about the zone without specifying any roads in their comments about the zone. The most common of these are: lack of commuter parking and not being able to attract staff; improvements to local transport needed; two hour time limit not sufficient; the scheme design is too complicated; current restrictions need enforcing. There were also requests for more disabled bay spaces, loading bays and taxi ranks.

9.3 The proposed scheme is designed to balance the needs of both residents and businesses, providing a turnover of spaces. Workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks or in the on street bays where parking is extended. The current lack of enforcement in Bexhill has encouraged people to use any available kerb space to park, including bus stops, disabled bays, loading and taxi bays. With fair and consistent enforcement improvements to both the availability of spaces and traffic flow are expected.



9.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

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

Within the Central Zone there are four locations that have been specifically mentioned in comments made during the consultations.

**10. Site 10 Sackville Road, Channel View East & West and Albany Road, Central Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

10.1 The proposals are a mixture of Permit, Shared Use Bays, Permit or Time Limited and Time Limited Only. Full plans and restriction times are in the additional information pack.

10.2 Every objection for these roads requested further restrictions including 24 hour permit holders only, additional permit holder bays and extending the hours of restriction to 8am-8pm.

10.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

10.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

**11. Site 11 Linden Road, Central Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

11.1 The proposals are to introduce Permit Holder Only 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday and Shared Use Permit Holder or Time Limited two hour maximum stay no return within two hours 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday Bays.

11.2 Four objections were received, one of which stated that the permit bays would remain empty and were unnecessary. Three objections were about the changing the current restriction of Resident Permit Holders to Permit Holders.

11.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. Through the review of restrictions it has become apparent that some of the current signage does not match the current TRO and incorrectly states Resident

Permit Holders. A Permit Holder only restriction will make spaces available to other services increasing the availability of spaces to traders and carers. Locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

11.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

## **12. Site 12 North Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

12.1 The proposal is to introduce a mixture of Permit Holder or Time Limited, Time Limited and Shared Use Permit and Pay and Display Bays. It is also proposed to formalise existing Disabled Bays and Bus Stop Clear Ways. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

12.2 There are 21 objectors that have made 37 objections. The majority of objections were about the zone and specific locations were not mentioned in their comments. These objections were that: residents will not be able to park close to their property; restrictions will be detrimental to the town; there is no commuter parking; that there is no guarantee of a space; residents are being penalised; two hours is not long enough; and the zone should be permit holders only.

12.3 The scheme has been designed to balance the needs of visitors wanting to stay for a short period whilst also providing resident parking. Whilst residents will not be guaranteed a parking space outside their property (such a guarantee does not exist at present), they will have the ability to park in all roads throughout the zone. Workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks, or in the on street bays where parking is extended.

12.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

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

Within the North Zone three locations have been specifically mentioned in the objection comments.

## **13. Site 13 Buckhurst Road and Garden Close, North Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

13.1 The proposal is to introduce a mixture of Time limited and Permit Holder Only and Time Limited Bays. Full plans of both locations can be found in the additional information pack.

13.2 There were two objections both of which were seeking a change to the proposed restrictions at each location. One was for a 20 minute limit and free parking on Buckhurst Road. There was also one objection seeking Resident Permit Only Parking in Garden Close.

13.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional/amended restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

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

#### **14. Site 14 Reginald Road, Leopold Road and Windsor Road, North Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

14.1 The proposal is to introduce Permit Holder or Time Limited two hours with no return within two hours 8am-6pm Monday to Saturday. Full plans are in the additional information pack.

14.2 There have been four objections related to the garage business that is located in the area around Reginald Road, Leopold Road and Windsor Road. They comment on not having enough space for customers in their premises and that they will not be able to use the street to park customer vehicles whilst they are waiting to be fixed or collected.

14.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. We accept that some businesses will have to review and adapt their work practises but feel the proposals balance the needs of the wider community who wish to use the parking bays. All restrictions will be monitored and if changes are identified after fair and consistent enforcement is in place locations will be added to our regular reviews.

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

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

#### **15. Site 15 East Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

15.1 The proposals are to introduce a mixture of permit holder or time limited bays and formalise existing disabled bays and bus stop clear ways. A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.

15.2 There were 54 objectors who made 186 objections. The majority of objections did not specifically mention a road, but they stated that: there is no problem with parking and the scheme was not needed; it would be detrimental to the town and is to raise revenue; concern that permits do not guarantee a space; two hours is not long enough; requests were also made for permit holders only restrictions and more disabled bays.

15.3 The scheme has been designed to offer a certain amount of protection to the residents against displacement of vehicles from the Central Zone, whilst also balancing the requirements of other road users. Permit holders will not be guaranteed a space outside of their property but will be able to park in any road within the Zone. There is no evidence to suggest that introduction of CPE will have a detrimental effect on Bexhill and it is widely regarded that civil parking enforcement is needed (it is also not the role of the TRO process to decide whether CPE is implemented in Rother District, or not). Workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks or in the on street bays where parking is extended.

15.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

15.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

Within the East Zone four locations have been specifically mentioned in the objection comments.

#### **16. Site 16 Manor Road, Magdalen Road and Rotherfield Close, East Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

16.1 The proposals are to introduce permit holder or time limited two hour with no return within two hour bays, and standard junction protection 10 metre double yellow lines. A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.

16.2 There were three objectors one for each location. In Manor Road there was an objection to the proposed parking bay opposite Linley Close, as it was considered that it will narrow the road on a blind bend and will make exiting the objectors drive difficult. It was requested that this proposal should be removed and replaced with double yellow lines (DYLs). In Magdalen Road the objector wanted one side of the road to be DYLs with parking on the other. In Rotherfield Avenue the objector was concerned that cars would be able to block the private off street parking.

16.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. The proposed restrictions will offer more protection than is currently available with yellow lines protecting the junctions and driveways. The road is also at an acceptable width to introduce two metre wide bays. If CPE is approved all restrictions will be enforceable, including vehicles that are blocking accesses. Once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

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

**17. Site 17 De Le Warr Parade and Knole Road, East Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

17.1 The proposal is to introduce Permit Holder or Time Limited two hour with no return within two hour bays. A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.

17.2 Nine objectors made comments about the proposed restrictions along De Le Warr Parade and their comments can be summarised as: people avoiding Pay and Display charges and parking in the Time Limited Bays off from De Le Warr Parade; the proposed zone is too big and there should not be charging on De Le Warr Parade. Three objectors made comments about the proposed restrictions on Knole Road requesting permit holder only bays, suggesting that two hours was not long enough for those wishing to park here, and suggesting displacement would occur as a result of the proposal.

17.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. The scheme has been proposed to balance the variety of need to all road users and residents. It provides both long term permit parking and short term parking at no charge. Workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks or in the on street bays where parking is extended. The Zone will be monitored and if changes are necessary we will include them in our regular reviews.

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

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

**18. Site 18 West Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

18.1 The proposal is to introduce Permit Holder only 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday, Permit or Pay and Display Bays and formalise Disabled Bays and Bus Stop Clearways. A plan of the proposed bays, locations and tariff can be found in the additional information pack.

18.2 There are 22 objectors who have made 34 objections. The majority of objections were about the zone and specific locations were not mentioned in their comments. The comments were about no availability for commuter parking, requests for 8am-8pm restrictions, that there are not enough parking spaces, that we have proposed permit and not resident permit and a request for a motor home ban.

18.3 The scheme has been designed with permit holder only bays because a number of the properties within the zone have been developed into multiple occupancy properties. Permit holder only bays were proposed to protect the residents of these properties. The benefit of a permit holder only restriction over a resident permit holder restriction is that it will make spaces available to other services increasing the availability of spaces to traders and carers permits.

18.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. Although there is a high density of residential properties it is believed that the number of parking spaces will be sufficient. Workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks or in the on street bays where parking is extended. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

18.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

Within the West Zone one location was specifically mentioned in the objection comments.

### **19. Site 19 Egerton Road, West Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

19.1 The proposal is to introduce Permit Holders only 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday on the south side of Egerton Road and unrestricted on the north side, as well as removing an existing advisory disabled bay. A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.

19.2 There were two objections, one with a request for the north side to be permit holders only as well. The other requested time limited bays on the north side of Egerton Road, parking for the staff and volunteers of the museum and a drop off point.

19.3 The north side of Egerton Road was left unrestricted to provide free parking to both Egerton Park and museum users. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

19.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

### **20. Site 20 Seafront Zone & Galley Hill, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

20.1 The proposal is to introduce Pay and Display 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday and install DYLS along a section of De La Warr Parade known as Galley Hill. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

20.2 There were 78 objectors who made 146 objections, the majority of objections were made about the charges and that charges would be detrimental to the town and put off visitors. Other comments suggested that beach hut and sailing club members should be exempt; there should be bans on motor homes and caravans; and tariffs should be seasonal.

20.3 CPE schemes should be self-financing, this means that the charges for pay and display, permits and penalty charge notices pay for the setup of the scheme and the ongoing cost to maintain and manage it. The charges for pay and display and permits have been set as low as possible to still meet the aims of the scheme. We have not proposed free parking, exemptions or seasonal parking tariffs on the seafront because this would mean that the parking charges and costs of permits would need to be higher. Yellow lines have been proposed on Galley Hill to allow a small amount of unrestricted parking as well as offering protection for access to the parking bays at the top of the hill.

20.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and included in our regular reviews.

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

20.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

Within the Seafront Zone one other location was specifically mentioned in objectors' comments.

#### **21. Site 21 De La Warr Parade between Dorset Road and Sutton Place, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

21.1 The proposal is to introduce Pay and Display 8am-6pm Monday to Sunday. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

21.2 There were 14 objections to pay and display bays on the north of De La Warr Parade and requesting permits for residents.

21.3 The proposal was made taking into account the wider area: all of the properties in this section of De La Warr Parade all back on to the unrestricted Lionel Road, with the majority if not all of the properties having access to off street parking. Officers believe that with both the amount of unrestricted parking and off street private parking, permit restrictions are not needed.

21.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

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

21.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised

## **The following locations are in Robertsbridge**

56 objectors made objections to the proposals in Robertsbridge, many of which made requests for additional restrictions and resident permit zones. If CPE is introduced requests for more restrictions will be processed through our regular reviews. It is therefore proposed to not uphold the objections that are requesting additional restrictions. Objections that were objecting to specific proposals were as follows;

### **22. Site 22 High Street, Station Road, Robertsbridge (Councillor Davies)**

22.1 The proposal is to change the current one hour maximum stay time limited with no return within two hours Monday to Friday 9am-5pm bays to Pay and Display maximum stay two hours with no return within two hours Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

22.2 The main reasons for objecting to the proposal were: that pay and display will damage local business; request for protection against commuters; the potential displacement that will occur; resident parking is needed; enforce current restrictions; disagreeing with paying to park; did not like the style of pay and display machines and the proposed time limit was not long enough.

22.3 The proposal was made to encourage and increase turnover of spaces, so there would be available spaces for short term visitors and shoppers. For residents and visitors requiring longer stay parking there is still unrestricted parking available.

22.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. Although there will be a proportion of displacement the volume expected from the 19 proposed bays would not have a detrimental effect to the surrounding areas. If CPE is approved and once there is fair and consistent enforcement, locations where we have received requests for additional restrictions will be monitored and if changes are necessary they will be included in our regular reviews of all parking restrictions.

22.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Davies has not replied to confirm whether she agrees with the recommendation.

22.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised

## **The following locations are in Rye**

As a general point of relevance to the following objections, if approval is given for the introduction of CPE and after fair and consistent enforcement has been in place for a year, it is East Sussex County Council's intention to carry out a local transport review of Rye. The review will take into account both on-street and off-street parking and will include engagement with Rye Town Council and Rother District Council. Objections that were objecting to specific proposals were as follows;

### **23. Site 23 High Street, Rye (Councillor Glazier)**



- 23.1 The proposal is to change the current one hour with no return in one hour time limited bays 9am-6pm Monday-Sunday to Pay and Display two hours with no return in two hours 9am-6pm Monday to Saturday. The proposed tariff is set at 40p for one hour, 80p for two hours. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.
- 23.2 There are 76 unresolved objections and one petition to this proposal. The make and style of the Pay and Display Machines were the most common reason for objecting; followed by pay and display charges having a detrimental effect on local businesses with the removal of the free hour time limit and facilities for deliveries. The proposed time limits, lack of residential parking and general disagreement with having to pay to park were also cited reasons for objecting.
- 23.3 The proposal was made in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004. We developed the proposal for Rye that takes into consideration the unique demand on kerb-space. In designing the proposed parking scheme for Rye and across the district, the County Council is trying to encourage short-stay, low-cost parking in high streets that creates parking 'churn' and increases footfall to those shops and businesses. Those residents, workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks available in the town.
- 23.4 Having considered the objections and petition, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. Pay and Display machines are a necessary piece of infrastructure and is not part of the introduction of the TRO. Officers will look at reducing the number of machines on street and ensure that they are sensitively located.
- 23.5 Resident Permit and Pay and Display charges are necessary to cover the costs associated with the introduction and set-up of CPE, as well as maintenance costs, the cost of enforcement, the processing of penalty charge notices, and the administration of permits, but the County Council has kept the pay and display tariffs to a low level.
- 23.6 At the time of writing, Councillor Glazier has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 23.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

**24. Site 24 East Street, Market Street, Lion Street, Rope Walk, Landgate, Cyprus Place, The Strand, Wish Street, Wish Ward, Cinque Ports Street and Tower Street Rye (Councillor Glazier)**

- 24.1 The proposal is to change the current one hour with no return in one hour time limited bays 9am-6pm Monday-Sunday to Pay and Display two hours with no return in two hours 9am-6pm Monday to Saturday. The proposed tariff is set at 40p for one hour, 80p for two hours. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.
- 24.2 There are 68 unresolved objections, with lack of resident parking and the impact upon the townscape of the pay and display machines being the most commonly cited reasons for objecting. The rest of the objections were about the lack of provision for delivery facilities, the proposals

would be detrimental to local businesses, time limits too short, further restrictions requested and objecting about paying to park.

24.3 In designing the proposed parking scheme for Rye and across the district, the County Council is trying to encourage short-stay, low-cost parking in high streets that creates a turnover of parking spaces and increases footfall to those shops and businesses. Those residents, workers and visitors who require longer-stay parking are encouraged to use the off-street car parks.

24.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. Further restrictions would not be appropriate until CPE has been introduced and fair and consistent enforcement is taking place, including any expansion of the existing resident permit scheme. Retaining and enforcing the current one hour time limited with no return within one hour would be labour intensive and expensive. Pay and Display machines are a necessary piece of infrastructure. Officers will look at reducing the number of machines on street and ensure that they are sensitively located.

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

24.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

## **25. Site 25 Citadel Zone Rye (Councillor Glazier)**

25.1 The proposal is to change the current Resident Permit Holder or Time Limited two hour maximum stay 9am-6pm Monday-Sunday to Permit Holders Only 9am-6pm Monday-Sunday. A plan of the proposed bays and locations including the proposed tariffs can be found in the additional information pack.

25.2 There are five objectors who have made eight unresolved objections. Two objections are about Traders Passage and request that it is included within the permit zone. Concern was expressed from one resident about traders and how will they unload. Other objections claimed the permit holders zone is too small and that the scheme will only work if enforced.

25.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposals have been made in keeping with the current restrictions, and additional areas will be considered once CPE has been approved and fair and consistent enforcement is being carried out. Those currently out of the zone will not be included at this time. For traders that are eligible, waivers will be available that will allow parking at specific locations to assist with any work they are carrying out.

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

25.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

**Appendix 2 – Proposal where objections are recommended to be upheld in part and revised proposals implemented as shown in the additional information pack.**

**1. Site 1 Old Manor Close, East Zone, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

- 1.1 The proposal is to introduce Permit Holder or Time Limited two hour with no return within two hour bays. A plan of the proposed bays and locations can be found in the additional information pack.
- 1.2 16 objectors have made 91 objections about the proposals for Old Manor Close, the majority of the objections have been: about the size and length of the parking bays; that the positioning of the bays will restrict and make exiting driveways dangerous; passing the bays on the opposite side of the road is dangerous; request for resident parking only; request for the parking to be available for the residents of Old Manor Close only; the lines will ruin the aesthetics of the close; request for the DYs to be extended both on Old Manor Close and Old Manor Road.
- 1.3 To try and resolve objections minor adjustments to reduce the length of bays and confirming the length and width of others was carried out. The width of the road has been measured between 4.9 metres and 5 metres along its length. The proposed parking bays are 2 metres wide leaving between 2.9 and 3 meters available for residents' vehicles to safely access their driveways and pass parked vehicles. A vehicle using the wrong side of the road to pass parked vehicles is no different to the current situation and is the same for many roads of a similar width, where parking does not allow two-way traffic. The close is lightly trafficked, and due to the width and nature of the road vehicle speeds are low. There are gaps between the proposed bays which vehicles can pull into should they need to let a vehicle traveling in the opposite direction to pass. A resident permit or Old Manor Close resident permit scheme would not be an efficient use of the kerb space, the proposal will balance the protection of residents' spaces whilst providing spaces for visitors, carers, trades people, etc to the close.
- 1.4 The Road Safety team have been consulted on the proposals and have not raised any concerns. They commented that, at present, there are no parking restrictions within the Manor Close area and that formal restriction will regulate parking to the benefit of residents. A minimum of 10 metres of double yellow lines are to be provided at the Manor Close/Manor Road junction. This conforms with rule 243 of the Highway Code which states "DO NOT stop or park: opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space". There have been no crashes involving personal injury recorded at the Manor Road/Manor Close junction in the last ten years and the proposed restriction should not negatively impact on this record.
- 1.5 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not enough grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. The scheme has been proposed to balance the variety of need to all road users and residents. It provides both long term permit parking and short term parking at no charge. The zone will be monitored and if changes are necessary we will include them in our regular reviews.
- 1.6 At the time of writing, Councillor Elford has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 1.7 **Recommendation:** To uphold, in part, the objections and install the revised proposals as shown in additional information pack.

## **Appendix 3 – Proposals where objections are recommended to be upheld and proposals to be withdrawn**

### **1. Site 1 Lower Lake, Battle (Councillor Field)**

- 1.1 The proposal is to introduce a Single Yellow Line No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm. The plan can be found in the additional information pack.
- 1.2 There were 26 objections from the residents of Lower Lake who cited that the proposals would restrict their ability to park outside of their properties.
- 1.3 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. The proposal was put forward at the formal stage after some residents raised concerns that they were not part of the permit zone. To make the properties eligible the Single Yellow Line restriction was proposed.
- 1.4 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal for Lower Lake.

### **2. Site 2 Abbots Close, Kingsdale Close, St Mary's Villas, Battle (Councillor Field)**

- 2.1 The proposal is to introduce a Permit Holder Area on unadopted highway. The plan can be found in the additional information pack.
- 2.2 There were 23 objections from residents within the proposed area. As the area is unadopted highway we require the consent of all residents before we can introduce parking restrictions.
- 2.3 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal for Abbots Close, Kingsdale Close and St Mary's Villas.

### **3. Site 3 De Moleyns Close, Bexhill (Councillor Elford)**

- 3.1 The proposal was to introduce Double Yellow Lines No Waiting. The plan can be found in the additional information pack.
- 3.2 There were 4 objections, two wanted the yellow lines extended on the south side of the close, one wanted the yellow lines extended on the south side but reduced on the north side and one did not want yellow lines around the close.
- 3.3 The proposals were made to extend the junction protection into the close, residents were concerned that yellow lines would encourage drivers to park and block their drives as driveway entrances would be unrestricted. If CPE is introduced CEOs will be able to enforce against vehicles blocking access.
- 3.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn. As CEOs will be able to enforce against blocking access the addition of yellow lines is unnecessary.
- 3.5 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objections and withdraw the proposal for De Moleyns Close.