

Committee:	Planning Regulatory Committee
Date:	18 October 2023
Report by:	Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Title of Report:	Traffic Regulation Order – Hastings Parking Review 2022-2023
Purpose of Report:	To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Hastings Parking Review
Contact Officer:	Natalie Mclean – tel. 01273 482628
Local Members:	Councillors Matthew Beaver, Godfrey Daniel, Alan Hay, Julia Hilton, Sorrel Marlow-Eastwood, Phil Scott and Trevor Webb

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.**
 - 2. Uphold, in part, the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.**
 - 3. Not 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 with minor modifications as set out in paragraph 2.10 of this report.**
-

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 the Hastings Borough area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in November 2022 to see whether there was enough public support to introduce new or make changes to the existing parking controls in a number of locations in the borough.
- 1.2** In addition to requests ranking high enough to be progressed to consultation, many of the existing school keep clear markings in Hastings Borough have been identified as non-compliant due to the wording 'during school term times' on the associated signs, and the length of some markings. Changes involving school keep clear markings are therefore being proposed as it is not possible to enforce the current restrictions as signed.
- 1.3** 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 4) in the Hastings Observer on 9 June 2023. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 1607 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 30 June 2023.

- 1.4 Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant Borough 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 electronic format.
- 1.5 During the formal consultation 207 items of correspondence were received. These include 118 objections and 89 items of support. 14 of the objections have since been withdrawn. All objections made that have requested restrictions go further or requests for additional restrictions have been added to the request log for the next Hastings parking review.

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. Again full copies of all correspondence have been made available to Members. 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 uphold the objections summarised in Appendix 1 and withdraw the proposals at the following sites:
 - Exmouth Place
 - Queens Road, Wellington Place, York Gardens
 - St Pauls Road

Officers are satisfied that the objections received to these proposals do provide sufficient grounds to warrant their withdrawal.

- 2.3 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to modify the following proposals (summarised in Appendix 2):
 - Earl Street and Mann Street – modify the proposal, one existing pay and display only bay operational time increased to 9am-8pm and reduced in length.
 - Edmund Road, Githa Road and Godwin Road – modify the proposal reducing the double yellow lines where appropriate.
 - Mount Road - modify the proposal reducing the length of the loading ban.
 - Old London Road - modify the proposal reducing the time of operation of the loading ban to 7.00am-10.00am and 4.00pm-7.00pm and removal of proposed loading bay.
 - Sea Road – modify the proposal reducing the bus/ coach bay by half.
 - St Helens Crescent – modify the proposal removing extents of double yellow lines.

Officers are satisfied that these modifications do not involve a substantial change to the draft Order, and it is unnecessary to consult again on their implementation.

- 2.4 With regard to objections relating to All Saints Crescent, Bembrook Road, Bodiam Drive, Bohemia Road, Brightling Avenue, Castledown Avenue, Chapel Park Road, Coghurst Road, Collier Road, Cornfield Terrace, Cornwallis Gardens, Croft Road, Grand Parade, Harold Road, Horntyte Road, Lower Park Road, Middle Road, Milward Road, Oban Road, Priory Road, Robertson Terrace, Sedlescombe Road North, St Pauls Road, The Ridge, Warrior

Square, Whatlington Way, White Rock Road as set out in Appendix 3, 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 and effective use of parking space. It is recommended that these objections should not be upheld.

- 2.5 Objections have been received on proposals involving school keep clear markings, and the restrictions being enforceable while the school is closed. There is no description prescribed by the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) which allows for the inclusion of holidays and changes to the academic year. In order to include 'school holiday' dates signs would have to include each individual date of the school holiday period on them. The sign would then need to be changed every year following a consultation to match the school term. This would not be appropriate or even possible, due to the time required to consult on and implement the changes.
- 2.6 Objections were also received on proposals about the length of the school keep clear markings. There are prescribed lengths specified within the TSRGD, proposals changing the length of an existing School Keep Clear are to adjust the marking to a prescribed length.
- 2.7 When patrolling outside schools the Civil Enforcement Officers' first aim is to educate parents and make them aware of where they can and cannot park. They will advise drivers of vehicles parked on the restrictions to move to a safe place. The only exception to this is if the vehicle is stopped on enforceable school keep clear markings, in which case a penalty charge notice will be issued. These issues occur around all schools and the Council's enforcement contractor, NSL must prioritise and rotate visits.
- 2.8 Three objections have been received to all the proposals. Officers are satisfied that these objections are not sufficient grounds for all proposals to be withdrawn.
- 2.9 One objection to all changes to school keep clear markings has been received. The objection to school keep clear markings is addressed in paragraph 2.5 and 2.6.
- 2.10 Following investigations, it is recommended to modify the written TRO description of the road name for the proposal in St Helens Crescent as follows:

368	St Helen's Crescent St Helens Crescent	(c)	West Side	2	From the northern house wall of No. 16 north-eastwards, north-westwards and south-westwards for a distance of 19.5 metres
368	St Helen's Crescent St Helens Crescent	(c)	West Side	3	From the south-western boundary of No. 39, south-westwards for a distance of 7 metres
368	St Helen's Crescent St Helens Crescent	(c)	West Side	4	From the entrance of Alexandra Park Mansions, north-eastwards for a distance of 8 metres
368	St Helen's Crescent St Helens Crescent	(c)	West Side	5	From a point 3.9 metres south-west of the boundary of Nos.

					23/25, south-westwards for a distance of 10 metres
--	--	--	--	--	--

3. Conclusion and reasons for approval

- 3.1 The approach in trying to resolve objections to the Order has been to appraise the concerns raised by residents and other road users, whilst not compromising road safety or other factors. Objections on three of the sites as referenced in paragraph 2.2 and are considered to merit the withdrawal of the proposal. On balance, some objections can be upheld, and some minor modifications can be incorporated into the Order, whilst with the rest of the objections, officers consider that, for highway and road safety reasons, the remaining objections (as set out in Appendix 3) should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as per the draft TRO as advertised.
- 3.2 It is therefore recommended for the reasons set out in this report, that the Planning Committee upholds the objections in Appendix 1, upholds in part the objections in Appendix 2, does not uphold the objections in Appendix 3, and recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made in part with minor modifications.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

Background Documents

None