

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Committee: | Planning Regulatory Committee |
| Date: | 19 March 2025 |
| Report by: | Director of Communities, Economy and Transport |
| Title of Report: | Traffic Regulation Orders – Eastbourne 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 Eastbourne Parking Review |
| Contact Officer: | Natalie Mclean – tel. 01273 482628 |
| Local Members: | Stephen Holt, Pat Rodohan, Colin Swansborough, David Tutt, John Ungar, Brett Wright |

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Committee is recommended to:

- 1. Uphold the objections 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; 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 Eastbourne Borough area are held on a priority ranking database, with those requests ranking high enough being progressed to consultation. Informal consultations began in October 2024 to see whether there was enough public support to introduce further controls such as double yellow lines or changes to permit parking schemes in the borough.
- 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 Eastbourne Herald on 17 January 2025. Notices and copies of the relevant plans were placed on posts and lamp-columns in the affected areas. Approximately 1500 items of correspondence 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 7 February 2025.
- 1.3** 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.

1.4 During the formal consultation 134 items of correspondence were received. These included 88 objections and 46 items of support. Three 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 and an additional assessment by the Road Safety team, it is recommended to uphold the objections summarised in Appendix 1 and withdraw the proposals at the following site:

- Seaside (near Roselands Avenue)

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

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;

- Arlington Road and Old Orchard Road
- Belmore Road
- Birch Close and Birch Road
- Blackwater Road
- Carlisle Road and Wilmington Gardens
- Cavendish Avenue
- Cavendish Place, Langney Road and Pevensey Road
- Cobbold Avenue and Willingdon Road
- Cornfield Road
- Dutchells Way, Hazelwood Avenue, Malvern Close and Woburn Way
- Hazelwood Avenue
- Hyde Gardens and Station Street
- King Edwards Parade
- Meads Road
- Meads Street
- Seaside (near Myrtle Road)
- Slindon Crescent
- Tideswell Road
- Victoria Gardens

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

3. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

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 one of the sites are considered to merit the withdrawal of the proposal.

With the rest of the objections, officers consider that, for highway and road safety reasons, (as set out in Appendix 2) 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 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