

Crawley County Local Committee

DATE

Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Order Requests Received between July 2018 and July 2019

Report by Director of Highways and Transport and Head of Highways Operations

Ref No:
C03(19/20)

Key Decision:
No

Part I

Electoral Divisions:
All in CLC area

Executive Summary

Community requests for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that cost under £3,000 to implement are considered annually by County Local Committees (CLCs). More complex TROs are considered for progression as a Community Highways Scheme and so fall outside the process.

The TRO Requests received between July 2018 and July 2019 have been assessed and scored and the results are attached for the CLC to consider and prioritise in line with the Cabinet Member Report for Traffic Regulation Orders – Assessment and Implementation Process for progression in the 2019/20 works programme.

Recommendation

That the Committee reviews the proposals and agrees to progress up to the allocated resource as detailed in 2.4 below. To avoid any conflicts with the potential implementation of the Crawley Parking Management Plan (PMP) the Crawley CLC are recommended to select the TRO's that are considered to address safety concerns (highlighted yellow) rather than the highest scoring TROs from the list attached at Appendix A, subject to any adjustments made at the meeting.

Proposals

1. Background and Context

1.1 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are legal orders that support enforceable restrictions and movements on the public highway. For the purposes of this report the term TRO includes speed limits, parking controls, and moving offences such as width restrictions and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) restrictions.

1.2 TROs are generated from four sources including:

- County Local Committees (requests from members of the public)

- 3rd party / developer schemes
- Highway improvement schemes through the Integrated Works Programme (IWP) – traffic calming, school safety, etc.)
- Parking schemes in partnership with District & Borough Councils.

This report deals with County Local Committee TROs only.

- 1.3 The framework for assessing TROs was approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in March 2016. In summary, the framework assesses TROs against four criteria: Safety, Traffic Conditions, Environment & Economy and People which give the acronym STEP. A new assessment framework was considered necessary to align with the County Council’s corporate priorities and the increasing demand for TROs across the county. Full details of the criteria can be found in the Cabinet Member Decision report (see background reading for further details).
- 1.4 Following a review of County Local Committees (CLC) in 2016/17 the number of CLCs reduced from 14 to 11. Therefore the TROs have been reallocated as detailed in the table below. There has been no reduction in the number of TROs.

CLC and Number of Members	No of TRO’s
Adur (6 Members)	2
Worthing (9 Members)	3
Joint Eastern Arun Area (6 Members)	2
Joint Western Arun Area (7 Members)	2
North Chichester (4 Members)	1
South Chichester (7 Members)	2
Crawley (9 Members)	3
Chanctonbury (4 Members)	1
North Horsham (8 Members)	3
North Mid Sussex (5 Members)	1
Central & South Mid Sussex (8 Members)	3
 NEXT TOP Scoring TRO County Wide	 15
Total TRO’s (Indicative)	38

- 1.5 Appendix A lists the TROs identified as being viable for progression, and from which the CLC will prioritise up to the above allocation for progression.
2. **Proposal**
- 2.1 The Committee is asked to consider the list of TRO requests and, subject to any desired changes, to approve the applicable quota as a programme of work to be initiated over the coming year and delivered in the 2020/21 works programme.
- 2.2 The CLC is requested to progress the highest scoring TRO within the CLC area. Whilst there is scope to progress a lower scoring TRO as a preference, sound justification should be provided for doing so as this will be at the

expense of a request that is considered by application of the approved framework to be a higher priority.

- 2.3 Any TROs not selected as the highest priorities for CLCs may be considered on a priority basis for progression on a county-wide basis at the Cabinet Members discretion.
- 2.4 In accordance with the report detailed in the background papers, the list in Appendix A details all the CLC requests that have been received in the last year (July 2018 – July 2019) as well as those that were available to be selected, but were not, in the 2017-2018 round of TROs.
- 2.5 To get best value from officer and member resources the Cabinet Member has confirmed that TROs that score 9 or under offer little wider community value or have not demonstrated suitable community support, and will not progress to the CLC to be considered. A link to the report can be found in the background reading.
- 2.6 In subsequent years Traffic Officers will reject any requests that score 9 or below following application of the approved framework. Due to the timing of the Cabinet Member decision, for transparency all requests made that were not rejected in 2018-19, that have scored 9 or below have been detailed in Appendix A, however the CLC may not select these.
- 2.7 County Wide Summary of requests
- **Adur** – 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **Worthing**– 5 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **Joint East Arun**– 3 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **Joint West Arun**– 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2
 - **North Chichester**– 2 requests made, both scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of 1
 - **South Chichester**– 2 new requests. 1 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 2.
 - **Crawley**– 14 new requests. 9 of these scored over 9. 1 request (437397) carries over from the previous year. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **Chanctonbury**– 5 new requests. 2 of these scored over 9. 1 request (438363) carries over from the previous year. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 1
 - **North Horsham**– 12 new requests. 7 of these scored over 9. The CLC has a resource allocation of up to 3
 - **North Mid Sussex**– 0 requests made and can select up to 2
 - **Central and South Mid Sussex**– 0 requests made and can select up to 2

3. **Resources**

- 3.1 The proposals contribute to the County Council's objectives for transport and meet the community needs and the ongoing demand for TROs within the resources available
- 3.2 Section 1.4 of this report confirms the CLCs can choose up to a maximum of 23 TROs. The maximum allowable cost of a TRO requested through this community process is £3,000. Hence the proposals by the CLCs could potentially cost £69,000. However, many of the requests such as Double Yellow Line Parking Restrictions have a low implementation value, so it is currently anticipated that the CLC requests will be managed within the £50,000 budgeted within the Highways Capital Budget for TRO's which is part of the Integrated Forward Works and Annual Delivery Programme budget approved in April 2019 decision ref HI03 (19/20)
- 3.3 Administrative work associated with the TRO's will be carried out internally by the TRO Team.
- 3.4 Due to the ongoing challenges to the Revenue budget it should be noted that Highway Operations currently only maintains / refreshes safety related road markings.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 Individual member support has been gained for each proposal and reasonable local community support has been demonstrated for those that can be selected. As with any TRO, wider consultation will be carried out in the usual way as each of the TRO requests is processed.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 The higher the priority score, the greater the potential benefit to the communities who use West Sussex Highways. Should the CLC not select the top scoring TROs consideration should be given if this could expose the county council to any risk if challenged.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 The proposals must also pass a feasibility test and STEP assessment undertaken by WSCC Officers and reasonably supported by the public as well as the local member. Given this, the attached list of schemes represents the most viable options for consideration for prioritisation. Hence no further options are considered.

7. Equality Duty

- 7.1 This report is seeking the consideration of schemes for prioritisation and does not have direct implications under the Equality Act, though it should be noted that it is unlawful to prioritise a scheme which discriminates

against people with protected characteristics. The schemes chosen by the CLC for progression will be individually assessed under the Equality Act as they are developed further.

8. **Social Value**

- 8.1 The proposed approach allows for the community via the CLC to progress and deliver their concerns through a consistent route to enable social, economic or environmental benefits to the County.

9. **Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 9.1 There are no identifiable Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with the process of choosing the forthcoming CLC TRO priorities. Any schemes formally proposed will have further appropriate considerations with regards to crime and disorder, which will include consultation with the police and other key stakeholders.

10. **Human Rights Act Implications**

- 10.1 There are no Human Rights Act implications associated with the process of choosing the forthcoming CLC TRO priorities.

Matt Davey
Director of Highways & Transport

Michele Hulme
Head of Highway Operations

Contact: Area Highway Manager

Appendices

Appendix A – CLC TRO Priority List

Background Papers

Cabinet Member Report – TRO Assessment

http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14_15-16.pdf

Cabinet Member Report – TRO Prioritisation

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=717>

CRAWLEY

Confirm Enquiry Number	Division	Parish	Dominant Road Name	Local Member	TRO Type Parking / Speed Limit / Moving	Summary	Approx Cost (implementation only)	Score
M3007997	Langley Green & Ifield East	Crawley	Dobson Road	Brenda Smith	Parking Issue	DYL protection. Busy residential area with lots of parking issues near Manor Royal. – This is a safety issue therefore recommend that this is progressed as CLC Priority	£1,000	20
M3003043	Langley Green & Ifield East	Crawley	131 Martyrs Avenue	Brenda Smith	Parking Issue	Request to formalise a disabled bay due to obstructive parking near Manor Royal.- due to the layout of this area other measures will be needed, therefore recommend that this not progressed as a CLC Priority but progressed as part of the Crawley PMP	£300	19
M3000397	Langley Green & Ifield East	Crawley	Langley Drive	Brenda Smith	Parking Issue	DYL protection. Busy residential area with lots of parking issues near Manor Royal. As this is a safety issue it is recommend that this is progressed as CLC Priority	£500	17
M3000639	Langley Green & Ifield East	Crawley	16 Leveret Lane	Brenda Smith	Parking Issue	Request to formalise 2 disabled bays due to obstructive parking. This could be included in the Langley Drive TRO (above)	£300	14
M3006453	Langley Green &	Crawley	Martyrs Avenue	Brenda Smith	Parking Issue	DYL protection. Busy residential area with lots of parking issues	£500	14

	Ifield East					near Manor Royal.- A Small scale TRO at this location would just move the issue, Recommend that this is not progressed as a CLC Priority but progressed as part of the Crawley PMP		
M111026	Pound Hill	Crawley	Peeks Brook Lane	Richard Burrett	Speed Limit	Reduction in speed limit to 40mph This has now been included in 2019 programme	£1,500	13
M433697	Northgate & West Green	Crawley	Tushmore Avenue	Karen Sudan	Parking Issue	DYL & SYL protection. Busy residential area with lots of parking issues near Manor Royal.- This area is included in the Manor Royal PMP, recommend that is not progressed as a CLC priority- will be progressed as of part of Manor Royal PMP	£1,500	13
M3004929	Broadfield	Crawley	Sandringham Road	Brian Quinn	Parking Issue	DYL protection. Busy residential area near school with lots of parking issues. – Safety issue regarding school parking, not part of the Crawley PMP area so recommend that this is progressed as a CLC Priority	£500	12
M3002201	Bewbush & Ifield West	Crawley	Tangmere Road	Chris Oxlade	Parking Issue	SYL protection. Busy residential area near school & station with lots of parking issues.- Recommend that this is progressed as part of the Crawley PMP	£1,500	10

