

## Worthing County Local Committee

25 November 2019

### 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:**  
**(W03(18/19))**

**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 for 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)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

<b>CLC and Number of Members</b>	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
<b>Total TRO's</b> (Indicative)	<b>38</b>

- 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 officers 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. 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 present the most effective way of meeting community needs and resolving the growing 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 implantation value, so it is currently anticipated that the CLC requests will be managed within the £50,000 budgeted within the Highways Capital Budget.

## **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 be 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](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>

APPENDIX A

Confirm Enquiry Number	Division	Parish	Dominant Road Name	Local Member	TRO Type Parking / Speed Limit / Moving	Summary	Approx Cost (implementation only)	Score
M435167	Tarring	Tarring	Various Roads	Bob Smytherman	Parking Issue	Various Roads throughout Tarring - Rejected as scheme too large for TRO and no clear detail of smaller scheme to take forward.	1500	18
<b>The CLC can only select requests that score 10 or above.</b>								
M438722	Worthing	Worthing	Ashacre Lane	Noel Atkins	Parking Issue	DYL throughout sections of the bend to ease inconsiderate parking close to driveways for residents exiting onto the bend.	700	7
M3006543	Worthing	Worthing	The Waterfront	Paul High	Parking Issue	DYL at the entrance and possible other locations in development	800	6
M3001692	Broadwater	Worthing	Georgia Avenue	Bryan Turner	Parking Issue	Junction protection to clear junctions, busy at school time due to new college and existing school.	700	6
M3007736	Broadwater	Worthing	Forest Road	Bryan Turner	Parking Issue	Junction protection to clear junctions. Busy residential area with lots of parking issues.	700	6

