

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

1. Junction of Richmond Avenue /South Cliff (Cllr Ian Hollidge)

1.1. The proposal at this location is to introduce an additional length of double yellow lines at the junction of Richmond Avenue and South Cliff.

1.2. Ten objections have been received from residents on several grounds. Four raise concerns around a reduction in parking for residents. Five objectors do not think the proposals are necessary in this area. Two have proposed alternative routes. One raises concerns about the impact on property prices. One mentions this is a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere. One raises concerns about how it will be enforced.

1.3. Alternative route suggestions have been considered by officers and scheme designers and have not been considered feasible.

1.4. The proposal ensures the junction is not blocked by parked cars, so that cyclists can travel within the appropriate area [or part], with adequate visibility, while they are entering/exiting the junction. Officers consider this is necessary to mitigate safety concerns and support the objectives of the Cycle Route Scheme.

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Having considered the objections, officers are satisfied that there are not sufficient grounds for the proposals to be withdrawn.

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

2. Junction of Terminus Avenue/Collington Avenue (Cllr Nuala Geary)

2.1. The proposal at this location is to extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction at Terminus Avenue at its junction with Collington Avenue.

2.2. Eight objections have been received from residents on several grounds. Four do not feel the proposals are necessary in this area. Two raise concerns about enforcement. One mentions this is a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere. One is concerned about access to parking near Collington Surgery.

2.3. Two items of support have been received.

2.4. The proposals follow a parking study on the western end of Terminus Avenue which found that short stay parking/loading/unloading activities were particularly busy in this area. The proposed parking restrictions aim to reduce the conflict

between cyclists and vehicles near the junctions, a necessary mitigation of safety concerns to support the Cycle Route Scheme.

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

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

3. Colebrooke Road (Cllr Nuala Geary)

3.1. The proposal at this location is to introduce a Goods Vehicle only Loading Bay at any time at Colebrooke Road next to Tesco Express.

3.2. Nine objections have been received from residents on several grounds. Two objections are on the grounds that it will negatively impact parking for shoppers. Two objections are on the grounds it will displace residents parking. Two are concerned how it will be enforced. Two objectors do not think it is needed. One raises concerns that it will not improve the current situation. One states Tesco already have an off-road loading bay.

3.3. Four items of support have been received. Two are on the grounds that the current situation is dangerous.

3.4. The proposal follows the stage one road safety audit for the Cycle Route Scheme which identified a risk of collision between cyclists and heavy goods vehicles loading and unloading at Tesco Express and cyclists at this area. The addition of a loading bay has been agreed with the road safety auditors as an adequate mitigation for this risk.

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

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

4. Down Road (Cllr Abul Azad)

4.1. The proposal at this location is to replace the section of the existing no waiting restriction (Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm) in front of the King Offa Primary Academy, in Down Road, with a no waiting at any time restriction.

4.2. Seven objections have been received on several grounds. Three do not think the proposals are necessary. Two mention the proposals are a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere. Two have raised concerns that it will impact school drop-offs and pick-ups.

4.3. Three items of support have been received.

4.4. The restrictions are currently in place during school drop-off and pick-up times, the extension to the restrictions is not expected to impact school users.

4.5. The proposal is to address risks raised in the road safety audit for the Cycle Route Scheme. The restrictions ensure the crossing point will not be blocked by on-street parking and cyclists have adequate visibility. This is a necessary mitigation to support the objectives of the Cycle Route Scheme.

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

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

5. Holliers Hill west of Church Vale Road (Cllr Charles Clark)

5.1. The proposal at this location is to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions at Holliers Hill on both sides of the road west of Church Vale Road.

5.2. Five objections have been received on several grounds. Two objections are on the grounds of displacing residents parking. One mentions the proposals are a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere. One is concerned how this will improve the provision for cyclists.

5.3. One item of support has been received.

5.4. One responder objects in part and supports in part on the grounds it will be easier to see when pulling out of junction but has concerns about reducing parking for church visitors.

5.5. The proposal is to address the risks raised in the road safety audit to ensure buses are not blocked by parked vehicles and can remain on the correct side of the road to pass the proposed island after exiting the bus stop.

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

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

6. Chantry Avenue (Cllr Charles Clark)

6.1. The proposal at this location is to extend the existing no waiting restriction at any time at Chantry Avenue at its junction with Holliers Hill.

6.2. Five objections have been received by residents on several grounds. One objects on grounds of displacing residents parking. One is concerned how this will improve the provision for cyclists. One objects on the grounds of reducing parking near the hospital.

6.3. Two items of support have been received.

6.4. The proposal addresses risks raised in the road safety audit relating to visibility and sight lines being obstructed by parked vehicles. This is necessary to mitigate safety concerns and support the objectives of the Cycle Route Scheme.

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

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

7. London Road footpath (Cllr Abul Azad and Cllr Charles Clark)

7.1. The proposal at this location is to revoke the existing no cycling order along the length of footpath from London Road (north of Salisbury Road) westwards for approximately 43 metres.

7.2. Five items of correspondence have been received on several grounds. One objection has been received. Three items of support have been received. One comment regarding the rationale for revoking the restrictions has been received.

7.3. The objection is on the grounds the proposals are a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere.

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

7.5. **Recommendation:** To not uphold the objection and install the proposal as advertised.

8. Holliers Hill footpath (Cllr Charles Clark)

8.1. The proposal at this location is to revoke the existing no cycling order along the length of footpath from Holliers Hill (opposite Church Vale Road) south westwards for approximately 40 metres.

8.2. Nine items of correspondence have been received. Five support the proposals. Two objections have been received, and two comments regarding pedestrian rights of way and the rationale for revoking the restrictions have been received.

8.3. One objection is on the grounds that the footpath is not wide enough and would be dangerous for pedestrians. One mentions the proposals are a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere.

8.4. If the revoking of this Order is agreed, the footpath between Silvester Road and Holliers Hill will be widened to 3m, with a localised pinch point of 1.6m wide.

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

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

9. Footpath between A259 Little Common Road and Arthur Road (Cllr Nuala Geary)

9.1. The proposal at this location is to revoke the existing no cycling order along the lengths of footpath between A259 Little Common Road (east of Physiques Gym) and Arthur Road.

9.2. Four objections have been received from residents on several grounds. One mentions the proposals are a waste of public money which could be better spent elsewhere. One objector does not think the proposals are necessary.

9.3. Five items of support have been received.

9.4. Two comments, which have been considered as objections, have been received. One questions the rationale for revoking the restrictions. One requests assurance that no trees will be cut down when widening the footpath.

9.5. Scheme designers are working with East Sussex County Council's Arboriculturist to ensure there is no damage to existing trees. Trial holes will be undertaken to understand the extent of roots underground and ensure any construction will not cause harm to the trees.

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

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