

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Committee: | Planning Regulatory Committee |
| Date: | 10 July 2024 |
| Report by: | Director of Communities, Economy and Transport |
| Title of Report: | Traffic Regulation Order – Rother Parking Review 2 |
| Purpose of Report: | To consider the objections received in response to the formal consultation on the draft Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Rother Parking Review |
| Contact Officer: | Natalie Mclean – tel. 01273 482628 |
| Local Members: | Abul Azad, Charles Clark, Kathryn Field, Keith Glazier, Ian Hollidge, Eleanor Kirby-Green |

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Uphold, in part, the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 1 to this report;**
 - 2. Not uphold the objections to the draft Order as set out in Appendix 2 of this report;
and**
 - 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 the Rother District area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in February 2024 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 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 Hastings Observer, Rye & Battle Observer and Bexhill Observer on 17 May 2024. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 795 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 17 June 2024.
- 1.3** Copies of the formal proposals were sent to relevant Town and Parish Councils, County and District 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.

1.4 During the formal consultation 77 items of correspondence were received. These included 43 objections and 34 items of support. Three of the objections have since been withdrawn.

2. Comments and Appraisal

2.1 Each item of correspondence has been considered individually and a summary of the objections and officer comments are included in Appendices 1 and 2. Plans and photographs showing the areas objected to are included in the Additional Information Pack

2.2 Following consideration of the responses, it is recommended to modify the following proposals (summarised in Appendix 1):

- Mary Stanford Green, Rye – modify the proposal to reduce the length of no waiting at any time on the west side of the junction by 7.5m.

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

2.3 With regard to objections relating to the sites listed below, and 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. The sites objected to and where it is recommended that the objections are not upheld are;

- Dorset Road South, Bexhill
- Gunters Lane, Bexhill
- Turkey Road, Bexhill
- Jubilee Road, Mount Idol View and Pankhurst Rise, Bexhill
- London Road, Bexhill
- Reginald Road, Bexhill
- School Place, Bexhill
- Upper Sea Road, Bexhill
- Western Road, Bexhill
- The Finches, Bexhill
- Church Road and The Green, Catsfield
- High Street and Church Street, Ticehurst

2.4 It is also recommended that all other proposals not objected to should be implemented as advertised.

3. Conclusion and reasons for approval

3.1 The approach in trying to resolve objections to the Order has been to appraise the concerns raised by residents and other road users, whilst not compromising road safety or other factors. Officers consider that for highway and road safety reasons the objections should not be upheld and the proposals in these areas should proceed as per the draft TRO as advertised with a minor modification incorporated into the Order as per paragraph 2.2.

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 recommends to the Director of Communities, Economy, and Transport that the Order be made in part.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport