

Report to South Chichester County Local Committee

October 2020

Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders – received 2019/20

Report by Director of Highways, Transport and Planning / Highways Operations

Electoral division(s): All in South Chichester CLC area

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 2019 and July 2020 have been assessed and scored and the results are attached for the CLC to consider and prioritise in line with the Cabinet Member Decision Report for Traffic Regulation Orders, Assessment and Implementation Process (see link in Background Reading), for progression in the 2021/22 works programme.

Recommendation

That the Committee reviews the proposals and agrees to progress the highest scoring TROs from the list attached in Appendix A, against the allocated numbers specified in the table in section 1.3 of this report.

Proposal

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 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).

- 1.3 The number of TROs each County Local Committee (CLC) is able to take forward is detailed in the first column, 'TRO allocation', of the table below. The second column, 'Available for Selection', indicates the number of TRO applications that have been received by the Local Area Highway Operations Team for 2019/20, meet the criteria, and that the CLC can consider for progression.

CLC	TRO Allocation	Total 'Available for Selection'
Adur	2	2
Worthing	3	1
Joint Eastern Arun Area	2	2
Joint Western Arun Area	2	2
North Chichester	1	3
South Chichester	2	4
Crawley	3	8
Chanctonbury	1	3
North Horsham	3	7
North Mid Sussex	1	0
Central & South Mid Sussex	3	0
Total TRO's	23	32

- 1.4 Appendix A lists the TROs identified as being viable for progression and from which the CLC can prioritise up to the above allocation for progression.
- 1.5 As a result of COVID-19, and additional work to support capital improvement projects and temporary COVID-19 sustainable transport measures, there hasn't been sufficient officer resource to support delivery of any discretionary TROs following the CLC selection year 2019. However, the TROs which weren't selected last year, that scored more than 10, have been carried forward for selection this year and are shown appendix A.
- 1.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning has the ability to prioritise up to 15 additional discretionary TROs (County Wide), from those shown in Appendix A that are 'Available for Selection' but not selected by the CLC in this round.

2 Proposal details

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to consider the list of TRO requests and to approve the applicable quota to be developed as a programme of work to be initiated over the remainder of 2019/20 and delivered in the 2021/22 works programme.
- 2.2 The CLC is requested to progress the highest scoring TROs up to the number allocated in section 1.3 above, within the relevant CLC area. Whilst there is scope to progress a lower scoring TRO as a preference, a robust 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, as set out in 1.5 and 1.6.
- 2.4 To get best value from officer and member resources the Cabinet Member has agreed and confirmed that TROs that score 9 or less offer little wider community value, or have not demonstrated suitable community support, and will not progress to the CLC for consideration.

3 Other options considered

- 3.1 As alluded to in 1.2 the proposals must pass a feasibility test and STEP assessment which is undertaken by WSCC Officers, as well as providing evidence that the proposals have wider community support, in addition to support from the local member. Given this, the attached list of schemes in Appendix A represents the most viable options for consideration and prioritisation.

4 Consultation, engagement and advice

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 proposal a formal public consultation will be undertaken once each of the TROs is selected by the committee for progression.

5 Finance

- 5.1 Capital consequences

If the proposed TROs are selected by all CLCs, the estimated total build cost is approximately £33k and these will be managed within the £50k capital funding for Traffic Regulation Orders in the Highways and Transport Delivery Programme 2020/21.

- 5.2 The effect of the proposal:

(a) **How the cost represents good value**

The proposal represents good value as they have been scored in accordance with the STEP scoring system.

(b) **Future savings/efficiencies being delivered**

None

(c) **Human Resources, IT and Assets Impact**

The proposals will be processed within existing staff resources.

6 Risk implications and mitigations

Risk	Mitigating Action (in place or planned)
A low scoring proposal could be selected by the CLC.	The higher the priority score, the greater the potential benefit to the communities who use the public highway network. 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. The CLC must provide robust justification if they do not select the higher scoring proposals.

7 Policy alignment and compliance

- 7.1 These proposals align with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport Report for Traffic Regulation Orders – Assessment and Implementation Process
- 7.2 There are no equality, human rights, climate change, crime and disorder, public health or social value implications in addition to those that have been addressed in the STEP Assessments or will be considered in specific Traffic Regulation Order procedures as appropriate.

Matt Davey

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Contact Officer: Mike Thomas – Area Highway Manager

t. 03302226431 e. mike.thomas@westsussex.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix A – List of TRO Requests

Background papers

[Cabinet Member Report – TRO Assessment](#)

[Cabinet Member Report – TRO Prioritisation](#)

Agreed



Katharine Eberhart

Director of Finance and Support
Services

See attached email

Cllr Simon Oakley

Chairman

South Chichester County Local
Committee



Tony Kershaw

Director of Law and Assurance

Date 09/11/2020

From: Simon Oakley <simon.oakley@westsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 October 2020 17:23
To: Natalie Jones-Punch <Natalie.Jones-Punch@westsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Rachel Allan <Rachel.Allan@westsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: FOR APPROVAL: South Chichester - Urgent Actions

Good afternoon Natalie.

I agree to the CIF allocations and TRO approval as detailed in the letter from Mr Kershaw. I assume this statement acts as a "signature".

Regards

Simon Oakley

Member for Chichester East Division, West Sussex County Council,

Member for North Mundham and Tangmere Ward, Chichester District Council.

WSCC No. 033022 24535.

e-mail: simon.oakley@westsussex.gov.uk ; soakley@chichester.gov.uk .

From: Natalie Jones-Punch <Natalie.Jones-Punch@westsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 October 2020 12:22
To: Simon Oakley <simon.oakley@westsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Rachel Allan <Rachel.Allan@westsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: FOR APPROVAL: South Chichester - Urgent Actions
Importance: High

Dear Simon

Please see the attached letter and reports with recommendations for your consideration following the informal meeting of the members of the CLC on 26 October.

Please can you let me have any comments on this as soon as possible. The proposals will then be concluded and the decision published.

In order to ensure that the matter proceeds in a timely way we will need to proceed on the assumption that any member who does not respond will be considered to have agreed with the recommendations in the report. If you wish to reject or change the recommendations please let me know by 12pm on Thursday 29th October.

Once you confirm you approve the recommendations as recorded in the attached, I will seek the necessary approvals for the Urgent Actions to be published.

Kind regards

Natalie

Natalie Jones-Punch
Democratic Services Officer

West Sussex County Council, Room 102, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ
Phone: 033 022 25098
Email: natalie.jones-punch@westsussex.gov.uk | Web:
www.westsussex.gov.uk