

South Chichester County Local Committee

Southbourne- Lumley Road, Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk, Southbourne

Proposed Traffic Regulation Order

12 June 2018

Report by the Director of Highways & Transport

**Ref:
SC01(18/19)**

**Key Decision:
No**

Part I

**Electoral
Division:
Bourne**

Summary

At its meeting of the 31 October 2017 the South Chichester County Local Committee was presented a report detailing a programme of Traffic Regulation Orders. The Committee selected a proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Lumley Road, Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk, Southbourne and include it in its 2018/19 TRO works programme.

Problems had been reported that vehicles park too close to the junctions. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting parking is proposed in the order to relieve the problem of obstructive parking.

During the formal consultation stage, 35 objections together with 9 individual letters of support were received and a petition with 232 signatories in support of the proposals.

Recommendation.

That the South Chichester County Local Committee, having considered that the resulting benefits to the community outweigh the objections raised, authorise the Director of Law, Assurance and Strategy to make the Order as advertised.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 In 13 September 2016, the Committee considered objections to proposals for a previous application for parking restrictions in Lumley Road and adjacent roads. At that time there were nine objections and little or no evidence of local support for parking restrictions. The Committee resolved at that meeting to uphold the objections and not proceed with the proposals.
- 1.2 Subsequently the County Council received representations and a petition signed by forty one local residents in support of the introduction of parking restrictions on these roads. Evidence of support was either received, or provided, from the local MP, Southbourne Parish Council and the local District Councillor.

- 1.3 The applicant refers to the on street parking obstructing deliveries and refuse vehicles. In addition the applicant identifies parking occurring close to road junctions obstructing visibility for drivers exiting side roads and the obstruction dropped kerb pedestrian crossing points, causing access difficulties for those local residents with mobility issues. Photographs of the problems that occur were provided by the applicant (or from Google Streetview) and a sample is included in Appendix A to this report.
- 1.4 On the 31 October 2017, the South Chichester County Local Committee (CLC) was presented a report on Traffic Regulations Orders (TRO) prioritisation. The Committee selected a proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Lumley Road, Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk, Southbourne and include it in its 2018/19 TRO works programme.
- 1.5 A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting parking is proposed in the order to relieve the problem of obstructive parking. Any displaced parking would be able to redistribute along the roads in the immediate vicinity.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal will introduce a prohibition of waiting at all times at the following junctions:
 - Lumley Road at its junction with the A259
 - Lumley Road at and opposite its junction with Pagham Close.
 - Pagham Close at and opposite its junction with Sadlers Walk.
- 2.2 The lengths of road which are the subject of the proposed Order is shown Appendix B to the report with the following drawing number:
 - SU7505NWN
- 2.3 The new Order is proposed to facilitate the passage of traffic and improve the amenities of the area through which the affected lengths of roads run.

3. Resources

- 3.1 The estimated works cost for the lining required for Lumley Road, Pagham Close and Sadlers Walk is £650, which will be met from Infrastructure Plan TRO Budget and ordered through the County Council's term contract thus ensuring value for money.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 **Members** - At the design stage, the local member for Bourne Division was consulted, supported the proposals as outlined, and approved the wider consultation and public advertisement.
- 4.2 **External** - Sussex Police were consulted and raised no objection.

- 4.3 **Public** –The three week formal consultation period for the traffic regulation orders to support the scheme ran between 22 March 2018 and 16 April 2018. This included the Police, Chichester District Council, Southbourne Parish Council 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; the advertisement placed in the local press and on the County Council’s website.
- 4.4 During the consultation period, 35 objections were received to the proposals which have been summarised in Appendix C to this report together with comments from the Director of Highways and Transport.
- 4.5 The general points raised by the objectors were:
- an inappropriate level of restriction for the road.
 - insufficient parking available in the road.
 - no reasonable alternative for residents to use.
 - will lead to increase in speed,
 - will simply relocate and concentrate the problem elsewhere in the road
 - problems have been exaggerated
 - restriction outside Nos 37-41 Pagham Close will cause hardship for those residents
- 4.6 There were also 9 individual letters of support and the County Council received a further petition with 232 signatures in support of the yellow lines “to stop illegal obstructive and dangerous parking on the junctions”. This is the net figure which has been adjusted to remove signatories that have subsequently objected.
- 4.7 The local County Councillor has confirmed his continued support for the proposals.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 Should the proposed TRO not be made, the risk to the County Council is that the concerns raised by the local community through its CLC and local member will not have been addressed.
- 5.2 Should the proposed TRO be made the risk to the County Council is that parked vehicles will create problems in other roads in the locality. The Council will monitor the situation and propose further restrictions if necessary.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 No other options were considered at the time as there is no other means of prohibiting parking other than by the introduction of a TRO.
- 6.2 The proposed restrictions are the minimum lengths defined in the Highway Code required to ensure full access and egress at the junctions and also justification for the section of DYs in Pagham Close, opposite the junction with Sadlers Walk, as this is the source of the majority of objections.

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 Equality Act issues were raised during the statutory consultation process by and on behalf of elderly /disabled residents living at Pagham Close opposite Sadlers Walk.
- 7.3 The Highway Code states "*do not stop or park opposite or within 10m of a junction*". For those with restricted mobility or wheel chair users, they are very likely to have access to a blue disabled badge. Vehicles displaying such a badge can park on double yellow lines for up to three hours, provided it is safe to do so. There is also unrestricted parking in close proximity to the junction

8. Social Value

- 8.1 The proposals aligns with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they are community led, raised through the Committee and demonstrates a considerable level of local support for the proposal with a view to improving the local road environment.

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

Contact: Neil Smith: 033022 25579

Appendices

Appendix A – Photographs of the Street Scene

Appendix B – Plan of existing and advertised proposals

Appendix C - Consultation responses and highways response

Background Papers

None