

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

1. Site 2 West Hill Road (Councillor Webb)

- 1.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing double yellow lines along West Hill Road.
- 1.2 Twenty-Three objections have been received from residents on several grounds. Twenty-one of the objections raised safety concerns if the proposals are implemented or requested consideration of traffic calming measures. Sixteen of the objections stated there is a high demand for parking in the area. Nine of the objections stated that the proposals will not solve the current issues of the road. Four objections requested consideration of removal of other nearby restrictions to mitigate the effect of the proposal. One objection requested introduction of a permit scheme. Another objection states that the proposal is a waste of public money. One objection did not provide grounds for the objection. Five items of support have been received for this proposal.
- 1.3 The proposal follows a request to extend the existing double yellow lines from a bus service company as the current on street parking frequently cause service disruptions and delays.
- 1.4 The purpose of the proposal is to improve traffic flow allowing larger vehicles to navigate the area efficiently.
- 1.5 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 1.6 At the time of writing, Councillor Webb has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 1.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

2. Site 3 Denmark Place, Hastings (Councillor Daniel)

- 2.1 The proposal at this location is to replace the 8am-6pm loading bay with a section of blue badge holders only bay and a section of motorcycles only bay.
- 2.2 One objection has been received on behalf of 4 businesses on Castle Street on several grounds, these are that they only receive deliveries during the day while the pedestrian zone is in effect, properties with rear access cannot be utilised due to the layout of the road and existing restrictions, the loading bay along Breeds Place is too far away and not big enough. The objection states they have spoken to delivery bike riders, and they would not utilise the proposed space as they would not be able to see their vehicle from the restaurant. The objection also states that they believe the proposed blue badge holder bay would not be utilised as it is too far away from amenities. One item of support was received for this proposal.

- 2.3 The proposal follows two requests, one to increase provision of parking for blue badge holders within the town centre and the other to provide a bay outside of the Clearwell Mobility store which during the review process has closed. There is a need to provide motorcycle delivery vehicles a location to park while the pedestrian zone is in effect. The bay along Denmark Place is 18.9 metres in length and the bay along Breeds Place is 19.5 metres. With goods being delivered to the businesses, depending on the location of the property and the method of transporting goods, use of the loading bay in Breeds Place can be beneficial as it does not require negotiating a turn or incline.
- 2.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 2.5 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

3. Site 4 Alfred Street (Councillor Webb)

- 3.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the existing blue badge holders only bay replacing a section of shared use bay (permit holders or time limited Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm maximum stay 2 hours no return within 2 hours).
- 3.2 Four objections have been received from residents. Two objections are on the grounds that the bays should be resident only or resident and paid bays, one objection was on the grounds that the proposal was a waste of money, one objection was on the grounds that they could not find the proposal. One item of support was received for this proposal.
- 3.3 The proposal follows 2 applications for blue badge holder bays. Each applicant meets the criteria for the provision of an on-street blue badge holders only bay.
- 3.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 3.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Webb has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 3.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

4. Site 5 Blackman Avenue (Councillor Scott)

- 4.1 The proposal at this location is remove a blue badge holders only bay.
- 4.2 Two objections have been received. One is from a resident the other is from Councillor Scott. Both objections are on the grounds that both of the bays are needed.

- 4.3 The proposal follows a report that both of the bays at this location are not required. Officers wrote to residents to establish if anyone eligible needed the bay, one resident came forward requiring use of a bay. Site visits were conducted of the bays on different days of the week and at different times of the day in October 2022, June 2024 and November 2024. Out of 34 visits only on one occasion were both of the bays occupied.
- 4.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 4.5 Councillor Scott has confirmed their objection to the proposal as advertised.
- 4.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

5. Site 6 Burry Road (Councillor Marlow-Eastwood)

- 5.1 The proposal at this location is to formalise a blue badge holders only bay.
- 5.2 Two objections have been received from residents with no given reason for their objections. Both objectors have been provided with the reason for the proposal.
- 5.3 The proposal follows a request from a resident blue badge holder as the bay is not being respected by vehicles without a blue badge. The applicant has been assessed and meets the criteria for the provision of an on-street blue badge holders only bay.
- 5.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 5.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Marlow-Eastwood has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 5.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

6. Site 7 Chambers Crescent (Councillor Scott)

- 6.1 The proposal at this location is install double yellow lines at the turns of Chambers Crescent.
- 6.2 Two objections have been received from residents, one of which has since been withdrawn. The remaining objection is on the grounds that no vehicles park where the lines are proposed, and that the proposal is a waste of public money and they would rather money be spent on improving road and footway conditions. Three items of support have been received for this proposal.
- 6.3 The proposal follows 3 requests for parking controls due to vehicles parking restricting access along Chambers Crescent.

- 6.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 6.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Scott has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 6.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

7. Site 8 Chapel Park Road and St John's Road (Councillor Webb)

- 7.1 The proposal at this location is to introduce double yellow lines along Chapel Park Road and its junction with St John's Road.
- 7.2 Two objections have been received. One objection is on the grounds that a permit scheme is not being considered, the other objection did not provide any grounds.
- 7.3 The proposal follows 2 requests for junction protection markings as vehicles park on the junction reducing visibility.
- 7.4 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 7.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Scott has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 7.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

8. Site 9 Cornwallis Gardens and Holmesdale Gardens (Councillor Daniel)

- 8.1 The proposal at this location is to introduce double yellow lines across two dropped kerbs along Holmesdale Gardens and extend the operational times of a paid parking bay from 9am-6pm to 9am-8pm along Cornwallis Gardens.
- 8.2 Three objections have been received from local residents, one of which has been withdrawn. One objection is on the grounds that they avoid parking machines and wish all paid for parking was up to 7pm. The other objection is on the grounds that extending the operational time of the paid bay will increase vehicles parking in the shared use bays in Holmesdale Gardens.
- 8.3 The proposal on Holmesdale Gardens follows an issue with enforcement of a vehicle access. Vehicle accesses within permit zones which have permit bays on either side usually have double yellow lines installed so that enforcement can be carried out in a fair and consistent manner. The proposal to extend the operational times of the paid bay on Cornwallis Gardens is for consistency. This paid bay is the only one to operate from 9am-6pm, all other bays along Cornwallis Gardens operate 9am-8pm. Having all the bays with the same operational times will help motorists avoid confusion over when the bays are in

operation. Minimal displacement would be caused from vehicles choosing to park along Holmesdale Gardens as the paid bay accommodates 4 vehicles.

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

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

9. Site 10 Fern Road (Councillor Beaver)

9.1 The proposal at this location is to install double yellow lines along Fern Road at its junction with Gresham Way.

9.2 Two objections have been received from residents, one on the grounds that the proposed restrictions need to be extended as vehicles parking on both sides of the road hinders traffic flow. The other objection is on the grounds that the proposed double yellow lines will displace vehicles into surrounding roads causing visibility and access issues. Two items of support were received for this proposal.

9.3 The proposal follows a request from a bus service provider for restrictions at this location as buses have difficulty navigating the junction due to parked vehicles. The proposal will also aid all vehicles navigating the junction.

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

9.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Beaver has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.

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

10. Site 11 Linton Road (Councillor Daniel)

10.1 The proposal at this location is to remove the blue badge holders only bay replacing it with resident permit holders or time limited Mon to Sat 9am to 6pm maximum stay 2 hours, no return within 2 hours.

10.2 Two objections have been received. One is on the grounds that the bay is used by a visitor who holds a blue badge that no longer lives at the address, who visits at least once a week and can stay overnight. The objector states that there are no parking issues in Linton Road and they do not find the proposed removal reasonable. The other objection is on the grounds that the maximum stay should be increased and the business permit holders bay in Linton Road is underutilised.

10.3 The proposal to remove the blue badge holders bay in Linton Road is due to there being no eligible resident in the road. Officers wrote to residents to

establish if anyone eligible needed the bay, it was found to be no longer needed by a resident living in the area. Site visits were conducted of the bay on different days of the week and at different times of the day in December 2024 and January 2025. The site visits found the bay was occupied on 4 visits out of 19.

- 10.4 As the bay is within a controlled parking zone the bay is formal. It requires a blue badge to be displayed within the vehicle at all times. This means that the bay remains empty when the visitor is not there. Blue badge holders can park without time limit in the shared use bays along Linton Road.
- 10.5 Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 10.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.

11. Site 12 Newgate Road (Councillor Webb)

- 11.1 The proposal at this location is to install a blue badge holders only bay.
- 11.2 One objection has been received on the grounds that the bay further reduces parking, another blue badge bay along Newgate Road is no longer in use and consideration should be given to removing existing controls to allow more vehicles to park along Newgate Road.
- 11.3 The proposal follows 2 applications for blue badge holder bays. Each applicant meets the criteria for the provision of an on-street blue badge holders only bay. The bay reported to be no longer in use is approximately 60 metres away from the existing bay and would not meet the mobility needs of either applicant.
- 11.4 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 11.5 At the time of writing, Councillor Webb has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 11.6 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

12. Site 13 Spring Street (Councillor Webb)

- 12.1 The proposal at this location is to extend the double yellow lines along Spring Street at its junction with Tower Road.
- 12.2 One objection has been received, on the grounds that the proposal is unnecessary.
- 12.3 The proposal follows a request to introduce parking controls as a resident is unable to enter or leave the property if a vehicle is parked on the road outside of the access.

- 12.4 The purpose of the proposal is to stop vehicles from parking within 10 metres of the junction as they block sightlines for vehicles entering and leaving the road. The proposal also allows access to the properties either side of Spring Street within 10 metres of its junction with Tower Road.
- 12.5 Having considered the objection, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.
- 12.6 At the time of writing, Councillor Webb has not replied to provide their views regarding the recommendation.
- 12.7 **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objections and install the proposal as advertised.