

Public Document Pack

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling, please ask for

Monique Smart 033 022 22540
Email:
monique.smart@westsussex.gov.uk

www.westsussex.gov.uk

 @DemService

 <https://www.facebook.com/midsussextalkwithus>



CLC Development Team
Room 102
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RQ



28 January 2019

A meeting of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee will be held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 5 February 2019 at East Grinstead Library, 32-40 West Street, East Grinstead, RH19 4SR

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

Your local County Councillors



**Andrew
Lea**
Lindfield &
High Weald



**Bill
Acraman**
Worth
Forest



**Heidi
Brunsdon**
Imberdown



**Elizabeth
Bennett**
East Grinstead
Meridian



**Jacquie
Russell**
East Grinstead South
& Ashurst Wood

Invite you to come along to the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

County Local Committees consider a range of issues concerning the local area, and where relevant make decisions. It is a meeting in public and has a regular 'talk with us' item where the public can ask questions of their local elected representatives.

Agenda

7.00 pm 1. **Welcome and introductions**

Members of North Mid Sussex County Local Committee are Bill Acraman, Liz Bennett, Heidi Brunsdon, Andrew Lea and Jacquie Russell.

7.05 pm 2. **Declarations of Interest**

Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt contact Democratic Services before the meeting.

- 7.10 pm 3. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)
- To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 November 2018 (cream paper).
- 7.15 pm 4. **Urgent Matters**
- Items not on the agenda that the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.
- 7.20 pm 5. **Progress Statement** (Pages 11 - 12)
- The document contains brief updates on statements of progress made on issues raised at previous meetings. The Committee is asked to note the report.
- 7.30 pm 6. **Proposed Traffic Regulation Order - Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS09(18/19))** (Pages 13 - 28)
- Report by Director of Highways and Transport.
- A decision was made on this proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) at the last meeting of the North Mid Sussex County local Committee (CLC). However under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution, Members agreed to withdraw that decision and reconsider it at this meeting.
- The North Mid Sussex County Local Committee are asked to consider the objections raised and authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as detailed in the revised scheme at Appendix C.
- 7.45 pm 7. **Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies** (Pages 29 - 30)
- There are currently no nominations for Authority School Governors. Members are asked to note the vacancy attached.
- 7.55 pm 8. **Talk With Us Open Forum**
- To invite questions from the public present at the meeting on subjects other than those on the agenda. The Committee would encourage members of the public with more complex issues to submit their question before the meeting to allow a substantive answer to be given.
- 8.15 pm 9. **Date of Next Meeting**
- The next meeting of the Committee will take place at 7.00 pm on 25 June 2019 at a venue to be confirmed.
- Members wishing to place an item on the agenda should notify

Monique Smart via email: monique.smart@westsussex.gov.uk
or phone on 033 022 22540.

To: All members of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

Filming and use of social media

During this meeting the public are allowed to film the Committee or use social media, providing it does not disrupt the meeting. You are encouraged to let officers know in advance if you wish to film. Mobile devices should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

13 November 2018 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at Cophorne Village Hall, Cophorne Bank, Cophorne, RH10 3RE.

Present:

Mrs Brunsdon (Chairman) (Imberdown;), Mr Acraman (Worth Forest;), Mrs Bennett (East Grinstead Meridian;), Mr Lea (Lindfield & High Weald;) and Mrs Russell (East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood;)

Officers in attendance: Gulu Sibanda (Principal Community Officer), Monique Smart (Democratic Services Officer) and Richard Speller (Area Highways Manager)

12. Welcome and introductions

12.1 Members and Officers introduced themselves.

12.2 The Chairman thanked the officers from 'Your Energy Sussex' and 'Refill' who had provided information and advice prior to the meeting.

13. Declarations of Interest

13.1 None declared.

14. Minutes

14.1 RESOLVED – that the minutes of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee meeting held on 13 June 2018 be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

15. Urgent Matters

15.1 None.

16. Progress Statement

16.1 Members considered the statements on matters arising from previous meetings (copy appended to the signed minutes) and made the following comments:

- The Area Highways Manager reported that 8 replies had been received in response to the letter to Imberhorne Lane residents. All would be shared with Members once the deadline for responses had passed. The Local Member, Mrs Brunsdon, said that there was some concern as to whether the informal footpath would be closed off and the Area Highways Manager confirmed that would be the responsibility of the landowner.

- Members expressed disappointment that there was still no progress regarding the East Grinstead Road Space Audit. They looked forward to the Cabinet Member Decision that was expected in December.
- It was reported that a petition was expected regarding speed cushions in West Street.
- The developers at Penlands Farm had requested a 10 week junction closure but the Area Highways manager reported that the Central & South Mid Sussex CLC had written to the Cabinet Member asking for other solutions to be explored.
- The Area Highways manager confirmed that some rejected Community Highways Schemes could be progressed via other routes such as the Local Transport Improvement Programme (LTIP).

17. **Talk With Us Open Forum**

17.1 The Chairman invited questions from those in attendance. The following matters were discussed:

- Mr Beale asked for an update on the changes at Glen Vue. The Chairman confirmed that Mr Beale had been forwarded the Cabinet Member decision that had recently been taken in respect of this. It was also agreed this would be [linked](#) in the minutes. Mr Beale asked that the Committee convey to the Cabinet Member that it is not just the patients but the carers' needs that should be taken into account before making any changes.
- Mr Beirne asked about missing or inaccurate signage in Christopher Street, King Street and other roads in East Grinstead. Mr Beirne stated he had reported this via both the County Council and District Council on many occasions over the last few years but it remained unresolved. The main issue was that enforcement officers cannot enforce restrictions if signage is incorrect or missing. Richard Speller agreed to follow this up and report back via the Progress Statement for the next meeting.
- A resident of Imberhorne Lane reported people walking through the hedgerow as a cut through and how dangerous this was. He had raised this with the developer who had responded stating they had no responsibility for this. The Area Highways Manager updated on planned works that include footpaths and crossing points. However the hedgerows are the responsibility of the landowner and Richard Speller undertook to help the resident liaise with the landowner to get the hedgerows maintained correctly.
- East Grinstead Cycle Forum asked about a rejected Community Highway Scheme for Railway Approach. The Area Highways Manager updated stating although rejected via that process it could still be progressed via other routes (LTIP). Further updates on LTIP schemes would be included in future Progress Statements.
- Dr Gibson submitted 3 questions in advance of the meeting. Those questions and the responses are attached.

18. **Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders (NMS05(18/19))**

18.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Highways and Transport which detailed applications for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). The Area Highways Manager introduced the report and explained that none of the requests had been formally scored but the Red, Amber, Green gave suggested the highest priority. The Area Highways Manager also explained that the Committee had 2 priorities to select as they had not selected last year's priority. He also suggested they want to choose a 3rd option as a reserve in case after scoring either of the top 2 could not be progressed

18.2 Following consideration of the report the Committee resolved to progress the 2 highest scoring TROs from the list attached at Appendix A, those being:

- Ship Street
- Lowdells Lane and Lingfield Road – to be progressed as 1 TRO.

18.3 It was also agreed that in the event of one of the above not being viable for progression as a TRO that the Committee approve the Area around Queen Victoria Hospital as their third option.

19. **Proposed Traffic Regulation Order - Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS06(18/19))**

19.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Highways and Transport that detailed the public consultation results of proposals for traffic restrictions on Calluna Drive, Copthorne.

19.2 The Area Highways Manager introduced the report and explained that the recommendation to Members was to approve a revised scheme, as detailed in Appendix C of the attached report.

19.3 Following consideration of the report the Committee resolved that the resulting benefits to the community outweighed the objections raised and the Committee therefore authorised the Director of Law and Assurance to make the order as per the revised scheme detailed in Appendix C of the attached report.

19.4 POST MEETING NOTE 21 November 2018: The proposed decision made by the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee in relation to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in Calluna Drive, Copthorne (NMS6(18/19) refers) has been withdrawn under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution. This allows the CLC to notify the Director or Law and Assurance of its intention to reconsider any proposal, at any time before the expiry of call-in, which in this case was 5.00 p.m. on Wednesday, 21 November 2018.

The scheme which was the subject of the proposed decision was a reduction of the original proposal as six objections had been received and the revised scheme took into account the views of those objectors. Since the meeting of the CLC, both the Chairman, Mrs Brunsdon, and the local member, Mr Acraman, have received representations from a considerable number of local people who want to see the larger scheme implemented.

Their views were not previously recorded as they had not formally responded to the consultation – perhaps assuming supporters did not need to respond.

All members of the CLC have therefore been consulted and the majority now agree that the TRO proposal should be reviewed and submitted for reconsideration to the next meeting of the CLC. The proposal has therefore been withdrawn for further consideration and will be submitted to the next meeting of the CLC on 5 February 2019.

20. **North Mid Sussex Community Initiative Funding (NMS07(18/19))**

20.1 The Committee welcomed Sarah Howland, Chairman of the Stone Quarry Crew. Sarah provided feedback on the successful crowdfunding project for a new café counter. She thanked Sue Barnes from the County Councils Community Team for all her help and support with the project and reported that the counter would be installed tomorrow. She stated that although the new West Sussex Crowd was positive for them, it did involve a lot of volunteer time to establish and promote the project and she worried that smaller group would not have the resources or time to put into such a system.

20.2 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes), which detailed applications for Community Initiative Funding. The Committee debated the respective merits of the projects for which funding was sought.

20.3 Following consideration of the report the Committee resolved that the following awards be made:

203/NMS – Sussex Clubs for Young People, Streetmate - £3,000 towards purchasing a new vehicle to transport sports coaches, youth workers and equipment.

20.4 The Committee also agreed to set aside up to £4,000 of their Community Initiative Fund to purchase a replacement Speed Indicator Device (SID).

21. **Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies (NMS08(18/19))**

21.1 The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director of Children, Adults, Families, Health and Education (copy attached to the signed minutes).

21.2 Following consideration of the report the Committee resolved that the following nomination for reappointment be approved:

Mrs Gillian Santi to St Marys CE Primary School, East Grinstead.

22. **Date of Next Meeting**

22.1 The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting of the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee would take place on Tuesday 5 February 2019 at a venue to be confirmed in East Grinstead.

Chairman

The meeting closed at 9.41 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

North Mid Sussex County Local Committee

Progress Report February 2019

Date	Item	Actions	Contact
Dec 2017	Member update	Imberhorne Lane	Highways Manager
Update: Awaiting confirmation of road booking space. Provisionally school holiday time preferred.			
June 2017	Talk with Us	East Grinstead Road Space Audit	CPZ Lead Professional
Update: The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure made a decision On-street parking to support traffic management in December 2018. This included a programme for Road Space Audits across the County and stated that for East Grinstead: RSA completed – Expected Early 2019 RSA Public Consultation - Expected June 2019 Parking Management Plan Design – Expected November 2019 Parking Management Plan Consultation – Expected January 2020 Submission of report outlining consultation results and seeking approval to undertake statutory consultation – Expected April 2020 Parking Management Plan Statutory Consultation – Expected June 2020 Submission of final decision report – July 2020 Parking Management Plan Implementation – Expected March 2021			
November 2018	Talk with Us	Missing or Inaccurate Signage in Christopher Street, King Street and other roads in East Grinstead	Highways Manager
Update: King Street signs addressed and continuing liaison with MSDC parking enforcement team to rectify any missing signs.			

Updates on Previously agreed Traffic Regulations Orders (TROs)

Traffic Regulations Orders (TROs)	Action / Comment
Worth Abbey School, Turners Hill Request for 50mph limit west of school entrance.	Awaiting traffic data to see if request meets policy.(not a CLC TRO)
Top Road, West Hoathly Request from parish for Top Road to have a 40mph speed limit.	Top Road does not meet the policy for a 40mph limit however remedial measures have been installed and the Area Team will monitor. (not a CLC TRO)
Queen Victoria Hospital and surrounding area	See Community Highway Scheme below. Reserve CLC TRO
Lingfield Road and Lowdells Lane	15 points scored. Recommendation CLC TRO for 2018/19 priority.

<p>Ship Street</p> <p>Request from residents to remove all or part of the parking</p>	<p>19 points scored. Recommendation CLC TRO for 2017/18 priority.</p>
<p>Middle Row</p> <p>No record of a TRO to support restrictions</p>	<p>Area Highway Team to repair damaged bollard and monitor situation. (not a CLC TRO)</p>
<p>Orchard Way</p> <p>Request for Double Yellow lines to assist refuge lorry accessing properties.</p>	<p>(within the existing CPZ)</p> <p>NDS to confirm outcome of review</p>

Updates on Previously agreed Community Highway Scheme and IWP schemes

<p>Ardingly Traffic Calming Scheme Phase 2</p>	<p>Area Highway Manager reviewing application prior to moderation.</p>
<p>West Hoathly</p>	
<p>Slaugham Traffic Calming Scheme</p>	<p>Detailed design in progress</p>
<p>Ashurst Wood</p>	<p>Maypole Road options being investigated School Lane options being investigated</p>
<p>Worth</p>	<p>Copthorne Brookhill Road options being investigated</p> <p>Crawley Down Sandy Lane. Vicarage Road and Bowers Place options being investigated</p>
<p>East Grinstead</p>	<p>Pedestrian Crossing, De La Warr Road Application being processed</p> <p>West Street. Further remedial measure been considered.</p> <p>Railway Approach Application being processed</p> <p>Sackville Pedestrian Crossing upgrade (LTIP)</p>
<p>Turners Hill</p>	<p>On-going Liaison between parish and Highway Authority</p>

Update on Major Schemes

Turners Hill- resurfacing cross roads Easter 2019.

North Mid Sussex County Local Committee	Ref No: NMS09(18/19)
5 February 2019	Key Decision: No
Worth – Copthorne – Calluna Drive Proposed Traffic Regulation Order	Part I
Report by Director of Highways and Transport and Head of Highway Operation	Electoral Division: WORTH FOREST

Summary

Calluna Drive has experienced a growing parking trend from commuter and car sharing individuals who park in the road and then car share to gain access to the nearby A23. Situated close to Gatwick Airport, there is an attraction for some drivers to park and travel avoiding the airport car parking fees. Concerns have been raised by local residents about cars parking on Calluna Drive, restricting visibility for passing traffic and causing congestion. Resolving this issue has been prioritised by the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee. A new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is therefore proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the affected length of road and to facilitate the safe passage of traffic.

The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 22nd March and 12th April 2018. Nine comments of support were received. Six objections were received which have been summarised in Appendix B to this Report.

At the North Mid Sussex CLC dated 13 November 2018 members agreed and supported the introduction of a reduced version of the original TRO proposal. Keeping the extended double yellow lines on the junction affecting Calluna Drive off Brookhill Road, further reinforcing rule 243 of The Highway Code.

Following the CLC some residents voiced concern to the local Member suggesting there was wider support for the original advertised scheme. The residents wanted the full scheme implemented, rather than the agreed limited version of extending the junction protection. It was suggested those who supported the advertised scheme did not respond as they understood only objectors needed to respond.

As a result the proposed decision was withdrawn under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution. This allowed the CLC to notify the Director or Law and Assurance of its intention to reconsider the proposal.

Local Member(s) then allowed views to be expressed outside of the usual TRO consultation parameters. West Sussex County Council Highways Officers had no knowledge of which roads were included within this informal engagement and therefore had no evidence if this was a fair reflection to the statutory consultation or if it formed any basis to alter the original CLC decision.

The result of this informal consultation was an additional six comments of support.

Recommendation

That North Mid Sussex CLC, having considered the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, authorise the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as detailed in the revised scheme at Appendix C.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 Obstructive and inconsiderate parking close to junctions is negatively affecting driver and pedestrian visibility.
- 1.2 The purpose of the proposed restrictions are to improve visibility for residents and visitors. There is concern that access for emergency vehicles could be impeded due to current parking practice in the road.
- 1.3 On 7th December 2016, the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee resolved to progress a new traffic regulation order in Calluna Drive, for an extension of double yellow lines.
- 1.4 The results of the public consultation were that 9 comments of support and 6 objections were received.
- 1.5 After acknowledgement of the objections received, further discussions were carried out with residents directly affected by the proposals. Despite efforts to reconfigure the proposals, their objections still stood. On that basis it was presented to the Local Member to make a final decision.
- 1.6 The Area Highway Manager for the Mid Sussex area met with the Local Member on 31st July 2018 to consider the situation. The Local Member made to final decision to remove the majority of the original proposals but decided to retain an extension of parking restriction near the Brookhill Road junction.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The original proposal was to alleviate congestion and access difficulties with new lengths of double yellow line. It was proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions, on sections of Calluna Drive and Kitsmead.
- 2.2 The original restrictions advertised included lengths of road that were the subject of the proposed Order, are shown on plans TQ3139SWS.

The original advertised plans are in Appendix A.

- 2.3 The Order is proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the road or for preventing such danger from arising, to facilitate the safe passage of traffic and improve the amenity of the area through which the road runs.
- 2.4 Based on the decision made by the Local Member on 31st July 2018, the scheme has been redrawn to reflect the decision, as shown in Appendix C.

3. Resources

- 3.1 The cost to the Council for the installation of the TRO should be in the region of £500.00 to be met from the Community Traffic Order Regulation budget.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 **Members** - At the design stage, the local member for Worth Forest was consulted and supported the proposals.
- 4.2 **External** – Copthorne Parish Council supported the design of the proposed restrictions. Sussex Police were consulted at design stage and raised no objection.
- 4.3 **Public** - The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 22nd March 2018 and 12th April 2018. Notification of this was sent directly to a range of stakeholders including the Police and emergency services, District and Parish Councils and motoring organisations. During this consultation period, notices were erected on site, a copy of plans and a statement of reasons were placed at the local library, and the advertisement placed in the local press and on the County Council's website.
- 4.4 During the consultation period, nine comments of support were submitted. Six comments of objection were received about the proposals. They have been summarised in Appendix B to this report together with comments from the Director of Highways and Transport.
- 4.5 The local County Councillor has confirmed their support for the revised proposals based on the objections received.
- 4.6 Following the CLC some residents were not content with this outcome and voiced their opinions and claiming wider support for the original advertised scheme. The residents wanted the full scheme implemented, rather than the agreed limited version of extending the junction protection. As a result the proposed decision was withdrawn under Standing Order 5.12 of the County Council's Constitution. This allowed the CLC to notify the Director or Law and Assurance of its intention to reconsider the proposal.
- 4.7 Local Member(s) wanted further engagement with the residents, therefore allowed these views to be expressed outside of the usual TRO consultation parameters. WSCC had no knowledge of which roads were included within the engagement, so WSCC had no evidence if this was a fair reflection to the statutory consultation or if it formed any basis to alter the original CLC decision.
- 4.8 The results of the informal consultation received 7 comments of which 1 had already expressed views during the statutory public consultation, so only 6 were additional to the statutory advert phase.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 Due to obstructive parking at junctions, should the proposed TRO not be made the risk to the County Council is that parked vehicles will continue to obstruct access for residents, refuse vehicles and emergency services.
- 5.2 Should the TRO be made, the risk to the County Council is that car drivers will need to find alternative parking provision and may migrate further into the residential area and into neighbouring roads.
- 5.3 Making a decision based on comments outside of the statutory public consultation does compromise the core value of the statutory consultation itself which gave all stakeholders an opportunity to voice their feedback regardless if it was positive or negative. There is a potential risk that it exposes the TRO process to further public challenge and risks diluting the impartiality and consistent approach TRO's are conducted within the agreed process.
- 5.4 There is no evidence to the extent of roads or area the informal consultation encompassed, nor did it demonstrate engagement with key stakeholders, therefore it risks lack of integrity that the statutory consultation emulates. Those residents who may be negatively affected by the full scheme proposal, could now attempt to challenge the rationale of the events which led to a change of decision and encourage a second informal consultation or even the scheme be re-advertised to ensure all residents have their voice shared fairly.
- 5.5 Implementing the scheme as per original CLC decision, only risks a future re-visit if there is evidence that the scheme had not adequately address the facts discovered during the original investigations, thus possibly incorporate a more strategic assessment of the area to aid any future improvement.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 The proposed restrictions are considered the best option to ensure that the road junction is kept clear of obstruction and to discourage parking where it is not safe to do so.
- 6.2 To reduce the original scheme and to retain a section of junction protection near Brookhill Road, as discussed on 31st July 2018 and which the Local Member fully supported.

7. Equality Duty

- 7.1 The protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act were duly considered in the course of the development and design of this TRO proposal

7.2 The comments and objections received about the proposals did not raise Equality Act issues but were assessed in relation to the protected characteristics and no relevant impact emerged.

8. Social Value

8.1 The proposals to deter obstructive parking at junctions, on pavements and verges, align with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they aim to improve the local road environment for existing and future users.

8.2 It is acknowledged that loss of parking may be regarded as having an adverse impact on residential amenity but the primary concern of the Council must be to discharge its statutory duty to manage the highway network and ensure the safety of all road users.

9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

9.1 The County Council does not consider there to be any foreseeable Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with this proposal. The view of Sussex Police has been sought, who confirm they believe there are no issues in relation to the Crime and Disorder Act.

10. Human Rights Implications

10.1 It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a convention right. The policy objective to avoid danger to all road users and reduce congestion should then be set against these rights. Taking these points into consideration it is believed that the introduction of this Traffic Regulation Order is still justified.

Matt Davey
Director of Highways &
Transport

Michele Hulme
Assistant Head of Highway
Operations

Contact: Richard Speller, 0330 222 6394

Appendices

Appendix A – plans of existing restrictions and advertised proposals
Appendix B – summary of objections
Appendix C – revised final proposal

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation Response Summary

	Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways & Transport
	<p><u>Resident of Brookhill Road</u></p> <p>I would be grateful if someone could contact me with reference to the above TRO proposal. I live on the corner of Calluna Drive and Brookhill road which would see my driveway which is the first on the right on Calluna Drive covered by double yellow lines. This poses a big problem to us as a family as we help to care for elderly disabled parents who are unable to walk more than a few steps. Currently the car can pull up in front of the drive and we can assist them to get into the house, however if you put the double yellow lines there this won't be possible. The parking area on your plan located further down the road will not be any help as this is too far for them to walk and also will be full up with the cars parked with Gatwick customers which is a big problem here. Please can someone discuss some options with us, something also to note, our house has single storey living and sleeping arrangements for disabled/elderly people so taking away appropriate parking for ease of care is very concerning.</p> <p>I have filled in the comment form but feel an e-mail is more appropriate to raise our concerns.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Disabled persons displaying a Blue Badge have dispensation to park their vehicles on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours.</p> <p>Meeting with resident on site 24.05.18</p>
	<p><u>Resident of Brookhill Road</u></p> <p>My concerns and reasons for opposing the implementation of planned parking restrictions are as follows:</p> <p>The proposal is based on incorrect information. In the years I have lived nearly opposite the end of Calluna Drive, I have never seen the parking on both sides of the road. Therefore the risk and danger described does not exist. Having a dog, I walk along the road at least twice a day every day, Parking occurs on the north side regularly, but I have never observed parking on the south side. On average there are between 2-4 cars parked on the stretch under consideration. In addition two larger vehicles are</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed. The local Parish Council requested restrictions on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on a considerable length of Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

<p>parked near the junction with Kitsmead, by the resident who lives opposite the junction. Cars will park up to the start of double yellow lines at the junction of Brookhill Road. This means cars can be quite close to the junction. If this is deemed dangerous, this could be addressed simply by extending the double yellow lines by a couple of metres.</p> <p>The proposal removes a local and amenity for those in Brookhill Road and creates a risk greater than it addresses. Brookhill Road, has in recent years become increasingly dangerous due to the volume and speed of vehicles, generally using it as a cut through to avoid the delays caused by traffic controls on the B2036 at Forge Wood. In addition, the use of heavy vehicles ignoring the nearby weight restriction has increased. In both cases, no enforcement takes place. As a result, the road is hazardous for pedestrians and for residents emerging from the drives. Of relevance to this consultation, it would be dangerous to park on Brookhill Road, so Calluna Drive offers a safer place for on street parking. The removal of this amenity will necessitate parking on Brookhill Road, despite the danger or parking further along Calluna Drive. Parking further down Calluna Drive will annoy local residents and result in parking opposite driveways and on a bend.</p> <p>Finally, if funds are available to address local traffic issues, this proposal does not address those of most local concern. This are the speed, size and volume of vehicles using Brookhill Road and Copthorne Bank. Failure to address this and spend money on an ill conceived proposal for Calluna Drive is a waste of public money and will only increase the dangers to and frustrations of local residents.</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Enforcement of existing speed and weight restrictions lies outside the scope of this proposed TRO.</p>
---	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>I am one of 2 houses that are affected by yellow lines 1 putting lines down will only push airport parking deeper into the estate 2 I also will have nowhere to park my van 3 I have a disabled grandson so how will he visit me 4 the people that want these lines don't even live at the end of the road that is affected so if the lines went ahead the cars will still park but on their door step and they will be complaining again for more lines</p> <p>I do agree there is a problem that needs to be addressed so why not permit parking for residents only then this I think will work.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>New permit parking schemes for local residents, are no longer available because of reduction of local authority funding and limited budgets for the administration required to run such schemes.</p> <p>Meeting with resident on site 30.05.18</p>
--	---	--

Consultation Response Summary

<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>We live at the entrance to Calluna Drive and totally object as we have two work vans that are parked outside our house and they will get broken into if moved elsewhere. We need that parking space airport parking does not interfere with this section. Listen to the people please who live in this part not the people who don't!</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on Calluna Drive obstruct visibility and affect the free flow of traffic on a bend. The introduction of lengths of double yellow lines here will mean cars are not forced to overtake parked vehicles on a bend and drive on the wrong side of the road where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p>
--	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>It is noticed the proposed lengths of double lines on both sides of Calluna Drive still leave a section for vehicles to park on the north side of Calluna Drive.</p> <p>Should high vehicles such as large SUV's or commercial van's continue to park in that section, as they do today, they will continue to present a danger to persons or traffic using the affected length of road and to facilitate the passage of traffic.</p> <p>Accordingly, I request the TRO be amended in order to prohibit any vehicles waiting at any time on the full lengths of both sides of Calluna Drive, between its junctions with Brookhill Road and Kitsmead.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Some accommodation for resident & visitor parking is necessary. The presence of parking in suitable locations also provides a form of traffic calming and reduces speed in residential areas. The proposal will provide gaps in parking to help avoid conflict for two way traffic.</p>
--	---	--

Consultation Response Summary

	<p><u>Resident of Calluna Drive</u></p> <p>I support the proposal, however on the drawing it shows a white area. What does this mean, is parking still to be allowed in this area. If so then this negates any safety gain as the problem is caused by vehicles waiting to exit with cars entering. If any parking is allowed this risk will remain. I suggest the order covers the entire stretch of road from Brookhill Road to Kitsmead.</p>	<p>Local residents have reported inconsiderate and obstructive parking at various locations. The statutory consultation process has been followed.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that some parking displacement may result, the proposed restrictions aim to reinforce Highway Code Rule 243 on appropriate parking. Parking capacity will still exist in the area and there is reasonable alternative parking in safer locations.</p> <p>Some accommodation for resident & visitor parking is necessary. The presence of parking in suitable locations also provides a form of traffic calming and reduces speed in residential areas. The proposal will provide gaps in parking to help avoid conflict for two way traffic.</p>
--	---	--



TILE REF NO:
TQ3139SWS

SHEET ISSUE NO 2_NMS1701
SHEET ACTIVE FROM - DD/MM/YYYY

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT: WORTH
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS (09.08.2018)

West Sussex County Council
Highways & Transport
The Grange
Tower Street
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RH

Reproduced from or based upon 2015 Ordnance Survey mapping with permission of the Controller of HMSO (c) Crown Copyright reserved. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. West Sussex County Council Licence No. 100018483



*Appendix - C
revised final
proposal*

This page is intentionally left blank

North Mid Sussex CLC – Authority Governor Vacancy List

School	Division	Division Member	Vacant From	Chairman	Head
Fairway Infant School	Worth Forest	Bill Acraman	July 2017	Ashleigh Hamilton-Gillings	Bridget Davison

This page is intentionally left blank