

Committee:	<b>Regulatory Planning Committee</b>
Date:	<b>14 July 2021</b>
Report by:	<b>Director of Communities, Economy and Transport</b>
Title of Report	<b>Traffic Regulation Orders – Lewes District Parking Review 2020 - 2021</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 James MacCleary, Councillor Sarah Osborne, Councillor Johnny Denis, Councillor Chris Collier, Councillor Carolyn Lambert.</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**The Planning Committee is recommended to:**

- 1. Uphold the objection to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.**
  - 2. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.**
  - 3. 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 on 18 September 2020 and ran till 9 October 2020 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 3) in the Sussex Express on 5 March 2021. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 835 letters were delivered to local addresses and the consultation was placed on the Council's Consultation Hub for any member of the public to comment. The formal period for representations to be made ended on 26 March 2021.
- 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 and have also been made available to Planning Committee members in an electronic format.

- 1.4 During the formal consultation 81 items of correspondence were received. These included 20 objections and 60 items of support. One of the objectors objected to all proposals but has provided no reasons 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. Although no grounds have been given for the objection, officers have included it in this report for completeness. One objector has withdrawn her objection as she has moved away from the area and one objector has stated that he was not objecting but merely making observations. One letter was received advising us that the disabled bay in Deans Meadow was no longer required.

## **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. Again full copies of all correspondence are available in the Members' Room, plans and photographs showing the areas objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack.
- 2.2 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to modify the following proposals (summarised in Appendix 1):
- Springett Avenue, Ringmer – modify the proposal to reduce the length of the proposed double yellow lines on the north-west side outside number 44.

Officers are satisfied that this modification of this proposal does not involve a substantial change to the draft Order and it is unnecessary to consult again.

- 2.3 With regard to objections relating to Arundel Road (Peacehaven), Arundel Road West (Peacehaven), Broad Street (Seaford), Edith Avenue (Peacehaven), High Street (Newhaven), Roderick Avenue (Peacehaven), South Road (Newhaven), South Street (Lewes), Western Road (Newhaven) 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 It is also recommended that all other proposals not objected to should be implemented as advertised. The disabled bay in Deans Meadow is to be withdrawn.

## **3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendation**

- 3.1 The approach in trying to resolve objections to the Order has been to appraise the concerns raised by residents and other road users, whilst not compromising road safety or other factors. On balance, one objection can be accepted and a minor modification can be incorporated into the Order, whilst with the rest of the objections, it is felt for highway and road safety reasons, that they should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as per the draft TRO as advertised.
- 3.2 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in this report, that the Planning Committee upholds in part 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

### Appendix 1 – Proposals where objections are upheld

#### **1. Site 1 Springett Avenue, Ringmer (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to install new No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) at the junction with Ashcroft Close.
  - 1.2 One objection was received from a local resident on the grounds that the length of the double yellow lines at this location would remove at least two parking spaces. Many houses in the road do not have driveways or garages and the length of the yellow lines would take away valuable parking.
  - 1.3 The proposals follow requests that cars parked on the junction reduces driver visibility. Residents are experiencing difficulties when exiting Ashcroft Close due to inconsiderate and obstructive parking at the junction making it difficult to manoeuvre. A high hedge surrounding a property near to the junction also causes visibility issues.
  - 1.4 It is however recognised that the proposals can be modified slightly to allow one parking space on the north-west side near the junction with Ashcroft Close, outside number 44, while maintaining safety at the junction.
  - 1.5 All those that responded to the proposal have been written to and have supported a new shorter length. This includes Ringmer parish council.
  - 1.6 Councillor Denis has confirmed his agreement with the recommendation.
  - 1.7 **Recommendation:** To uphold the objection and to modify the proposal.
-

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

**2. Site 2 Arundel Road, Peacehaven (Councillor Chris Collier)**

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to install No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) at the junction with Bolney Avenue.
- 2.2 One objection has been received from a resident who believes that if the proposed change is implemented, the yellow lines would make it difficult for her carers to park. The disabled resident believes the proposed change will discourage carers from visiting as they will now have to spend time driving around trying to find somewhere to park rather than spending the allocated time with her.
- 2.3 The proposal follow requests from ESCC's parking enforcement contractor (NSL) that cars parked at this location obstruct the junction and make it difficult to manoeuvre. When exiting Bolney Avenue, vehicles parked at the junction force drivers to be on the wrong side of the road increasing the risk of collision with vehicles approaching from Arundel Road.
- 2.4 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 proposal 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. Carers and other visitors will need to park their vehicles in the nearest safe unrestricted area.
- 2.5 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 2.6 Councillor Collier has confirmed his agreement with the recommendation.
- 2.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**3. Site 3 Arundel Road West, Peacehaven (Councillor Chris Collier)**

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to install No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) at the junction with Lincoln Avenue.
- 3.2 Two objections have been received. One objector has stated that he was not objecting but merely making observations. The other objection was received from a local resident 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. The objector also believes that removing their parked vehicles from the road would increase speeds on an already dangerous rat run.
- 3.3 The proposal follows requests that cars parked at this location obstruct not only the junction but also the priority-working build-out that is in place. Vehicles are parking where there is a short length of hatched marking between the buildout and the give way markings, which was implemented to maintain sightlines to the build out.

- 3.4 It is accepted that residents would prefer to park outside their property, however it is sometimes necessary to introduce restrictions on parking to encourage people to park in a safe and responsible manner. At this location, the area between the build out and the give way markings needs to be kept free of parked vehicles to facilitate the safe operation of the priority working system and to allow sufficient space for larger vehicles to manoeuvre past the build out from a stationary start. Vehicles parked within this area may obstruct visibility to the 'keep right' bollard on the build out which could affect the safe operation of the priority working system during hours of darkness.
- 3.5 In urban residential areas it is challenging to achieve a balance between the competing needs of the street and ensuring safety. The objector is correct and vehicles parked on street do in fact act as natural traffic calming but on street parking has been retained where it can be safely accommodated. Restrictions are only installed where necessary to maintain the safe movement of traffic.
- 3.6 During the initial informal consultation our traffic and safety team recommended that the proposed yellow lines on the south side did not go far enough and on their recommendation officers have extended the proposals.
- 3.7 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 3.8 Councillor Collier has confirmed his agreement with the recommendation.
- 3.9 Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and to install the proposal as advertised.

#### **4. Site 4 Broad Street, Seaford (Councillor Carolyn Lambert)**

- 4.1 The proposal at this location is to relax the operational times of the taxi bay to increase parking availability and allow free parking in the evenings for local residents and other motorists.
- 4.2 Five objections were received. Four from Seaford residents on the grounds that the taxi bay is far too long and not used. Three objectors have since withdrawn on the conditional basis that further changes will be proposed as part of the next review.
- 4.3 Lewes District Councillor Macleod has objected but has not provided grounds for his objection. Officers have written to Councillor Macleod three times and received no response.
- 4.4 The proposal follows concerns from our enforcement contractor NSL about the lack of taxis using this bay especially in the evenings. As parking is in high demand, parking controls are continually being reviewed to ensure they meet the changing demands of local communities. The change to the operational times will create approximately five parking spaces which will allow anyone to park over night.
- 4.5 The request to either remove or shorten the taxi bay at this location cannot take place as part of these proposals as it did not form part of the original proposals advertised. It will require further assessment as part of the next parking review in Lewes.

- 4.6 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 4.7 Councillor Lambert has confirmed her agreement with the recommendation.
- 4.8 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**5. Site 5 Edith Avenue, Peacehaven (Councillor Chris Collier)**

- 5.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise the existing advisory School Keep Clear markings
- 5.2 One objection has been received on the grounds that during the time the school is closed in August, maintenance crews with large vehicles attend the school and would be unable to get in if parking was allowed on the zig-zags. It is also believed that unrestricted parking on the zig-zags during August would be detrimental to the local residents and the neighbourhood in general.
- 5.3 The proposals will allow ESCC's parking enforcement contractor (NSL) to ensure effective enforcement at the entrance to the school during drop off and pick up times. There is no need to restrict parking outside of the school hours and this will maximise parking provisions for local residents.
- 5.4 Having considered the objection officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 5.5 Councillor Collier has confirmed his agreement with the recommendation.
- 5.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

**6. Site 6 High Street, Newhaven (Councillor Sarah Osborne)**

- 6.1 The proposals at this location are to make the existing controls enforceable.
- 6.2 The history of Newhaven High Street and enforcement of it goes back quite a way. When the scheme was designed and installed, concerns were raised about the visual aesthetics of the street and there was a desire not to have yellow lines. For that reason they were not installed and instead of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) an order was made through section 249 of the Town and County Planning Act (TPCA) which "*extinguishes the vehicular rights for certain vehicles to use the High Street*".
- 6.3 As there is no TRO it is not covered by civil parking enforcement (CPE) which means ESCC, are unable to carry out any parking enforcement in this area. Our civil enforcement officers (CEOs) cannot enforce but they do still visit the High Street so that their presence may deter people from parking.
- 6.4 There are signs at the entrance to the High Street which prohibit motor vehicles, except if they are loading, are taxis using the High Street for access, or are disabled badge holders. No other vehicles should be driving through the High Street. Sussex Police can enforce under the TPCA order and can issue fixed penalty fines.

- 6.5 There have been and continue to be many instances of people parking on the footway, blocking access for pedestrians, wheelchair users, people pushing prams etc. The only way CEOs can enforce parking in the High Street is for a TRO to be introduced. The TRO will prevent parking on the footway and also prevent vehicles from being left in the main carriageway. It will also formalise a layby where blue badge holders can park and provide a loading bay for vehicles needing to load and unload.
- 6.6 Five objections and fifteen items of support have been received. The grounds for objection are that many shops in the High Street do not have rear access for deliveries and there are not enough loading provisions for this. Other grounds are that the proposed loading bay in the High Street is not in the best location and it is believed delivery drivers will simply refuse to push heavy cages up the High Street, and that the amount of disabled parking being proposed is insufficient and again it is believed it is in the wrong location with it being on an incline.
- 6.7 The proposal follows requests for changes to Newhaven High Street in order to enable ESCC to keep the pavement clear of parked vehicles. Pavement parking has been a long-term issue in Newhaven High Street and is both a nuisance and safety issue. Many residents who use wheelchairs have complained that the issue of pavement parking prevents them from being able to access the High Street. Many others have complained about regularly having to walk in the road.
- 6.8 A new loading bay and disabled bays are also being proposed in this area to facilitate loading provisions and parking for blue badge holders. There are no changes to the construction of the road layout and officers have used the existing lay-bys to provide these provisions.
- 6.9 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn. Should the proposals go ahead, officers will passively monitor the area to see if any further changes need to be included in future parking reviews.
- 6.10 At the time of writing the report Councillor Osborne has not replied to confirm if she agrees with the recommendation.
- 6.11 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposals as advertised.

## **7. Site 7 Roderick Avenue, Peacehaven (Councillor Chris Collier)**

- 7.1 The proposal at this location is to remove a redundant taxi bay.
- 7.2 One objection has been received from Councillor Macleod but he has not provided any grounds for his objection. Officers have written to Councillor Macleod three times and received no response.
- 7.3 The proposal follows feedback that the taxi bay is never used by taxis and instead used by members of public visiting the local shops.
- 7.4 The taxi bay was previously installed as a time limited bay. Officers believe that returning it to a two-hour maximum stay bay 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.

- 7.5 A usage survey was carried out in July 2020. Fourteen visits were carried out and on all visits there were no taxis present. A further usage survey was carried out during May and June 2021. Visits were carried out on eight days and taxis were only seen using those bays on four occasions.
- 7.6 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 7.7 Councillor Collier has confirmed that he does not agree with the recommendation and would like the taxi bays to remain.
- 7.8 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

## **8. Site 8 South Road, Newhaven (Councillor James MacCleary)**

- 8.1 The proposal at this location is to remove all the existing parking signs for the time limited parking and the associated existing traffic regulation order.
- 8.2 As there are currently no bay markings these parking controls are unenforceable. In September 2020, initial consultation was carried out, asking residents if they wanted the parking bays to be reinstated so enforcement of the parking controls could take place. No responses were received asking for the controls to be reinstated. As these controls are effectively redundant, it is proposed to remove them.
- 8.3 Two objections were received. One has since withdrawn and the other was asking for a new bay outside the old police station. Officers have written to the objector on three occasions and have received no response.
- 8.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 8.5 At the time of writing, Councillor MacCleary has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 8.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **9. Site 9 South Street, Lewes (Councillor Johnny Denis)**

- 9.1 The proposal at this location is to change the existing shared use bay (for permit holders or pay and display) to a permit holder only parking bay.
- 9.2 One objection has been received from a local business who said the current restrictions should be left in place. Reducing available spaces for its visitors would affect their customers who rely on those spaces to enable them to visit. The loss of those visitors would adversely effect the sustainability of the business.

- 9.3 The proposal follows requests from residents of the street that more parking is needed for them. The on-street parking bays in South Street have always been in high demand due to its proximity to the town and the low tariff charges. The proposal is to change one shared use parking bay which is directly outside of residential premises. The parking bays at the eastern end of South Street as well as the bay outside the business would remain available to non-permit holders.
- 9.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 9.5 Councillor Denis has confirmed his agreement with the recommendation.
- 9.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.

## **10. Site 10 Western Road, Newhaven (Councillor James MacCleary)**

- 10.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise the existing disabled parking bay outside number 97 (extending it by approximately 1 metre to meet the standard size of 6.6 metres).
- 10.2 Three objections have been received from local residents who believe that the disabled bay is already large enough as the applicant only has a small car and there are doubts that the resident actually needs a disabled badge.
- 10.3 The existing bay is an advisory disabled bay. It is not currently supported by a TRO and, consequently, no enforcement action can be taken if a non-blue badge holder parks here. To introduce a TRO the bay needs to be extended by 1.1 metres to meet the Department for Transport's minimum requirement of 6.6 metres for an enforceable disabled parking bay.
- 10.4 The bay is often abused with non-blue badge holders parking in the bay.
- 10.5 A mobility assessment has been carried out by the Blue Badge team which confirms that a bay is allocated and the location of the bay is the most suitable location for the needs of the applicant.
- 10.6 The bay is being provided for a resident who already parks in the road so there will be no additional demand for parking as a result of this proposal.
- 10.7 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that the applicant meets the Council's criteria for providing a disabled bay on the highway and there are not sufficient grounds for the proposal to be withdrawn.
- 10.8 At the time of writing, Councillor MacCleary has not replied to confirm whether he agrees with the recommendation.
- 10.9 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposals as advertised.



## **APPENDIX 3 – Draft Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised.**

### **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 \*) 202\***

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) 202\*" 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) In article 2 Interpretation the following definitions shall be added:**

"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;

"verge" means any part of a highway which is not a carriageway or footway;

**Insert article 3(6)** 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 roads specified in

#### **(i) Schedule 22.**

#### **(ii) 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 items shall be added as follows:

Gibbon Road	South Side	From a point 15 metres north-west of its junction with Hanson Road, south-eastwards to a point 18 metres south-east of its junction with Hanson Road
Hanson Road	Both Sides	From its junction with Gibbon Road, southwards for a distance of 17 metres
High Street	Both Sides	For its entire length
Hill Side	North Side	From its junction with South Road, south-westwards to its junction with Meeching Road
Hill Side	South Side	From its junction with South Road, south-westwards to its junction with Hillcrest Road

Meeching Road	Both Sides	From its junction with High Street, south-eastwards for a distance of 19 metres
North Lane	Both Sides	From its junction with North Way, southwards then eastwards for its entire length
St Lukes Lane	Both Sides	From its junction with High Street, north-westwards for a distance of 22 metres

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

Arundel Road	Both Sides	From its junction with Bolney Avenue, westwards for a distance of 15 metres
Arundel Road	South Side	From its junction with Bolney Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 24 metres
Arundel Road	North Side	From its junction with Bolney Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 32 metres
Arundel Road West	Both Sides	From its junction with Malines Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 15 metres
Arundel Road West	Both Sides	From its junction with Malines Avenue, westwards for a distance of 15 metres
Arundel Road West	Both Sides	From its junction with Cairo Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 15 metres
Arundel Road West	South Side	From its junction with Cairo Avenue, westwards for a distance of 15 metres
Arundel Road West	North Side	From its junction with Cairo Avenue, westwards for a distance of 13.5 metres
Arundel Road West	North Side	From its junction with Lincoln Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 25 metres
Arundel Road West	South Side	From its junction with Lincoln Avenue, eastwards for a distance of 35 metres
Arundel Road West	Both Sides	From its junction with Lincoln Avenue, westwards for a distance of 15 metres
Bolney Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road, northwards for a distance of 10 metres
Bolney Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road, southwards for a distance of 10 metres
Cairo Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, northwards for a distance of 10 metres
Cairo Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, southwards for a distance of 10 metres
Lincoln Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, southwards for a distance of 10 metres
Lincoln Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, northwards for a distance of 10 metres
Malines Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, northwards for a distance of 10 metres
Malines Avenue	Both Sides	From its junction with Arundel Road West, southwards for a distance of 10 metres

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

Ashcroft Close	Both Sides	From its junction with Springett Avenue, north-westwards for a distance of 10 metres
----------------	------------	--

Springett Avenue	North-west Side	From its junction with Ashcroft Close, south-westwards for a distance of 9.5 metres
Springett Avenue	North-west Side	From its junction with Ashcroft Close, north-eastwards for a distance of 17 metres

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

Esplanade	North-east Side	From its junction with Martello Road, north-westwards for a distance of 15 metres
Esplanade	South-west Side	From a point opposite the south eastern kerbline of Martello Road, north-westwards for a distance of 21 metres
Martello Road	Both Sides	From its junction with Esplanade, north-eastwards for a distance of 15 metres

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

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

South Road	North-east Side	From the south-eastern boundary of Nos. 24 and 26 South Road, north-westwards to the southeastern boundary of No. 16 South Road, 114 metres south of the junction with South Way
South Road	North-east Side	from From the south-eastern boundary of No.10 South Road, north-westwards to a point 12 metres southeast of its junction with the south-eastern kerbline of South Way

2. In the list of restrictions for Peacehaven, delete item 1(a)1 (Roderick Avenue) and add the following item:

Roderick Avenue	North Side	From a point 13.5 metres north of its junction with South Coast Road, for a length of 6 metres in a northerly direction. 3 bays perpendicular to the kerb across the width of the carriageway
-----------------	------------	---

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

Warwick Road	South-west Side	From a point 11 metres north-west of the north-western kerb line of Sutton Park Road, north-westwards for a distance of 6 metres
Warwick Road	South-west Side	From a point 16.4 metres south-east of the south-eastern kerbline of Stafford Road south-eastwards for a distance of 18 metres

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

Warwick Road	South-west Side	From a point 21.5 metres north-west of the north-western kerbline of Sutton Park Road north-westwards for a distance of 30 metres
--------------	-----------------	---

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

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

Deans Meadow	North-east Side	From the boundary of numbers 13 and 15 Deans Meadow, north-westwards for a distance of 6.6 metres
--------------	-----------------	---

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

High Street	North-west Side	From a point 62 metres from its junction with Bridge Street, south-westwards for a distance of 20 metres
Western Road	South Side	From the eastern building line of number 97 Western Road, westwards for a distance of 6.6 metres

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

Warwick Road	South-west Side	From a point 11 metres north-west of the north-western kerb line of Sutton Park Road, north-westwards for a distance of 6.6 metres
--------------	-----------------	--

- (v) **Schedule 19(a), School Keep Clear Marking, No Stopping, Mondays to Fridays, 8am-5pm, (except August) that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

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

Edith Avenue	West Side	From a point 1 metre north of the boundary of numbers 31 and 31a Edith Avenue, southwards for a distance of 31 metres
Roderick Avenue	East Side	From a point opposite the boundary of numbers 40a and 42 Roderick Avenue, southwards for a distance of 51.5 metres

- (vi) **Schedule 19, School Keep Clear Marking, No Stopping, Mondays to Fridays, 8am-9.30am and 2.45-4pm, (except August) that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

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

Millberg Road	South-east Side	From a point 5 metres north-west of the boundary of Nos. 78 and 80 Saltwood Road north-west, then north-east for a distance of 22.2 metres
---------------	-----------------	--

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

Millberg Road	South-east Side	From its junction with Saltwood Road, north-eastwards for a distance of 13 metres
---------------	-----------------	---

Saltwood Road	North-east Side	From its junction with Millberg Road, south-eastwards for a distance of 10 metres

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

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

Roderick Avenue	North Side	From a point 13.5 metres north of its junction with South Coast Road, for a length of 6 metres in a northerly direction. 3 Taxi bays perpendicular to the kerb across the width of the carriageway
-----------------	------------	--

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

Broad Street	North-east Side	From a point 1.5 metres north-west of the north-western boundary of No. 4 Shepway Parade, Broad Street, south-eastwards for a distance of 21 metres
--------------	-----------------	---

**(viii) Schedule 14, Part C, Taxis Only Mondays to Saturdays 8am-6pm, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

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

Broad Street	North-east Side	From a point 1.5 metres north-west of the north-western boundary of No. 4 Shepway Parade, Broad Street, south-eastwards for a distance of 21 metres
--------------	-----------------	---

**(ix) Schedule 20, Ambulances Only at any time, that this Schedule be amended as follows:**

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

Warwick Road	South-west Side	From a point 21.5 metres north-west of the north-western kerbline of Sutton Park Road north-westwards for a distance of 12 metres
--------------	-----------------	---

**(x) Schedule 22, Prohibition of Stopping on the footway at any time, that this Schedule be added:**

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

High Street	Both Sides	For its entire length
Meeching Road	Both Sides	From its junction with High Street, south-eastwards for a distance of 19 metres
St Lukes Lane	Both Sides	From its junction with High Street, north-westwards for a distance of 22 metres

**(xi) Schedule 23, Loading Bay all hours on all days, that this Schedule be added:**

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



High Street	South-east Side	From a point 20 metres from its junction with Bridge Street, south-westwards for a distance of 13 metres
-------------	-----------------	--

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

#### AUTHORISED SIGNATORY

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 – para 4.2 joint report of Director of Legal & Community Services & County Engineer - Para 4.

## **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 202\***

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 202\*" and shall come into effect on xxx xxx xxx

#### **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) In article 1 Interpretation delete the definition of resident and replace with the following definition:

"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 Lewes Permit Zones map of the Order Plans, provided that the street is not private;

#### **(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 *
LH102	LH102 Revision 1
LK103 Revision 1	LK103 Revision 2
LN110	LN110 Revision 1
LP103	LP103 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>

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

Authorised Signatory

H & T Ctte. 2.4.74 - para 4.2 joint report of Director of  
Legal & Community Services & County Engineer - para 4.