

## Central and South Mid Sussex Committee

26 June 2018

### Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders 2017/18

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

<b>Ref No:</b> <b>CMS05(18/19)</b>
<b>Key Decision:</b> <b>No</b>
<b>Part I</b>
<b>Electoral Divisions:</b> <b>All in CLC area</b>

#### 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 since July 2016 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 (see link in Background Reading) for progression in the 2018/19 works programme.

#### Recommendation

That the Committee agrees to progress the top three highest scoring TRO 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:

[http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14\\_15-16.pdf](http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14_15-16.pdf)

- 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 (Indicative)</b>	<b>38</b>

- 1.5 Appendix A lists the TROs identified as being viable for progression, and from which the CLC will prioritise its 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 2017/18 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 Where a particular CLC does not currently meet their full allocation, any outstanding incomplete requests will be considered at the following years round of CLC's and then discarded if not selected.

2.4 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.

### 3. **Resources**

3.1 The costs of implementing the proposed number of TROs will be met from the Highways Capital budget. The proposals contribute to the County Council's objectives for transport and present the most efficient way of meeting community needs and dealing with the growing demands for TROs.

## **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. 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 Members of the public must engage the local council member with regards to the suitability of their proposals and gain their support. The member of the public must also demonstrate local support for any proposals which must also pass a feasibility test undertaken by WSCC Officers. Given this it is accepted, as this is prior to any statutory consultation, the option proposed is the most suitable to solution to ease or resolve the issues in the area. Hence no further options are considered.

### 7. **Equality Duty**

7.1 Highways Officers will consider the outcome intentions on an individual basis for those TROs that are prioritised. The outcomes to test would be:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

**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 this proposal. The approved assessment framework takes into account factors that could address crime and disorder associated with traffic and driver behaviour. Crime and disorder implications will be considered in each TRO proposal as it is assessed and the police are statutory consultees in this process.

**10. Human Rights Act Implications**

- 10.1 The rights of those living within the CLC area of the county have been considered. Vulnerable users form an integral part of the assessment criteria.

**Matt Davey**

Director of Highways & Transport

**Michele Hulme**

Assistant Head of Highway Operations

**Contact:** Area Highway Manager

**Appendices**

**Appendix A** – CLC TRO Priority List – [to follow](#)

**Background Papers**

[http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14\\_15-16.pdf](http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/edd/ht/ht14_15-16.pdf)