

Joint Eastern Arun Area County Local Committee

6 November

Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders 2018/19

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

**Ref No:
JE04(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 since July 2017 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 2019/20 works programme.

Recommendation

That the Committee reviews the proposals and agrees to progress the two 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:

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.

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 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 2019/20 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 Should a CLC not select their full allocation (see 1.4 above), any outstanding requests can be considered at the subsequent CLC meeting
- 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.
- 2.5 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 2017 – July 2018) as well as those that were available to be selected in the 2017 round of TROs. The seventh column in Appendix A has five options:
 - 2.5.1 **Selected** – This option is allocated by officers once a TRO has been selected by the CLC for processing / implementation.
 - 2.5.2 **Approved 18** – This means the TRO has been received this year and is available to be selected by the CLC. If not selected this will be available for selection next year.
 - 2.5.3 **Approved 17** - This means the TRO has been received last year and is available to be selected by the CLC. This option will not be available for selection next year.
 - 2.5.4 **In progress** – Officers have received a request. The request has not been rejected but has not yet demonstrated all the necessary criteria to allow it to be selected and work is being undertaken to achieve this. This option is not available to be selected by the CLC
 - 2.5.5 **Rejected** – Officers have received a request, however it has not achieved all the necessary criteria to allow it to be selected and no further work is being undertaken to achieve this. This option is not available to be selected by the CLC.

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 dDouble Yellow Line Parking Restrictions have a low implantation value - £600 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. 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

Michele Hulme

Director of Highways & Transport

Assistant Head of Highway
Operations

Contact: Area Highway Manager

Appendices

Appendix A – CLC TRO Priority List

Background Papers

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

APPENDIX A

Joint East Arun

Confirm Enquiry Number	Division	Parish	Dominant Road Name	TRO Type Parking / Speed Limit / Moving	Summary	Selected / Approved / In progress / Rejected	Approx. Cost	Score
M 34097	Littlehampton East & Littlehampton Town	Littlehampton	Selborne Road	Parking Issue	Revocation of seasonal waiting restriction	Approved 18	£400	21
M 433519	Rustington	Rustington	Angmering Way	Parking Issue	DYL requested to prevent parking in narrow road opposite private accesses	Approved 18	£300	16
M 436232	Arundel & Courtwick	Littlehampton	Courtwick Lane	Parking Issue	Request for single yellow line Mon - Fri prohibition on the north side of Courtwick Lane between Seaton Park and the entrance to Martello Enterprise Centre. There are often cars parked on the north side of the road and this prevents lorries from being able to turn into the estate. This can cause disruption to traffic and there is significant risk of damage to the parked cars. This is a school route between Lyminster School and the Kingfisher Drive development. In addition to the considerable business disruption that this is	Approved 18	£350	16

					causing, concern has been expressed about the safety of people and property along this part of Courtwick Lane.			
M 437544, 438625 & 438306	East Preston & Ferring	East Preston	Sea Road	Parking Issue	Waiting restrictions at the junction of Manor Road and Sea Road to address the issue of limited visibility when driving out of Manor Road	Approved 18	£220	13
M 2082486	Rustington	Rustington	Broadmark Lane	Waiting Restriction	Double yellow lines at Knightscroft Close and Cudlow Avenue junctions, to improve visibility for drivers entering highway from private roads	Approved 17	£100	12
M 428196	Littlehampton East	Rustington	Worthing Road	Waiting Restriction	Junction protection (double yellow lines) to improve visibility at junction with Wallace Road	Approved 17	£100	10
M 432261	Arundel & Courtwick	Arundel	Mill Road	Parking Issue	Overnight camper van parking prohibition in Mill Road, Fitzalan Road and London Road to deter camping and long-term parking of vans at these locations	Approved 17	£2,100	6
M 430099	Rustington	Rustington	The Street	Parking Issue	Weekday limited waiting restriction in layby outside 14-16 to allow visitors to the adjacent medical centre, residents, visitors and carers ample time but stop the long-term parking of vehicles for sale	Approved 17	£150	6

M 431413	Rustington	Rustington	B2140 Sea Lane	Parking Issue	Double yellow lines at junctions with Cudlow Garden, to improve visibility for drivers exiting private road	Approved 17	£150	6
M 30847	Arundel & Courtwick	Littlehampton	A259 Worthing Road	Parking Issue	Limited waiting restriction in layby adjacent to Wick Recreation Ground to prevent long-term parking of vehicles for sale	Approved 17	£300	3
433290	Angmering & Findon	Findon	High Street	Parking Issue	DYL opposite the Gun Inn rear of Greypoint House as the road is very narrow and the bus frequently has difficulty passing when vehicles are parked there	Rejected	£100	0
433483	Angmering & Findon	Angmering	Nursery Road	Parking Issue	DYL extension requested in advance of road narrowing to improve visibility when exiting from private access	In progress	£100	0
433736	Littlehampton East	Littlehampton	Western Road	Speed Limit	Request for 20mph speed limit along full length of road	Rejected	£2,400	0
434295	Arundel & Courtwick	Arundel	Brewery Hill	Waiting restriction	DYL requested to prevent parking adjacent to private access	Rejected		0
33802	Angmering & Findon	Findon	A280 Long Furlong	Speed Limit	Request for 30mph speed limit on A280, from A24 west and southwestwards for three quarters of a mile because it is difficult to pull out and into Findon Cricket Club	Rejected	£1,600	0
33817	East Preston & Ferring	East Preston	Clarence Drive	Parking Issue	Junction protection requested to improve visibility	Rejected	£200	0
437287	East Preston & Ferring	East Preston	Sea Lane	Parking Issue	Request for introduction of seasonal limited waiting restriction to deter obstructive parking adjacent to private accesses.	Rejected	N/A	0

M 424705	Littlehampton East	Littlehampton	Norfolk Gardens	Waiting Restriction	DYL extension on south side to prevent obstructive parking adjacent to junction	Approved 17	£100	0
----------	--------------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------------	---	-------------	------	---