

Adur County Local Committee

8 November

Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders 2018/19

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

Ref No:
(A04(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 Double Yellow Line Parking Restrictions have a low implementation 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 – Adur CLC TRO Priority List

Background Papers

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

APPENDIX A

Adur

Confirm Enquiry Number	Division	Parish	Dominant Road Name	TRO Type Parking / Speed Limit / Moving	Summary	Selected / Approved / In progress / Rejected	Approx. Cost	Score
M 437852	Shoreham	Shoreham	Brighton Road	Parking Issue	Remove section of DYL for enable more parking - Councillor Support and good Local support demonstrated	Approved 18	700	26
M 33812	Shoreham North	Shoreham	<u>Greenways Crescent</u>	Parking Issue	DYL to stop parking too close to junctions. Councillor and good Resident support	Approved 18	£500	6
430238	Sompting & North Lancing	Sompting	Ullswater Road	Parking Issue	Double yellow lines to stop inconsiderate parking Good consultation - will remove parking on corners which will give better visibility but has low local benefit.	Approved 17	£500	5
430239	Shoreham North	N/A	Rosslyn Road	Parking Issue	Parking bays to remove poor parking. Will remove parking spaces overall. Very local issue to residents only with low level of support shown	Approved 17	£500	2
M 438333	Shoreham South	Shoreham	St Nicolas Lane	Parking Issue	Extension of DYL to remove difficult movements from junction. - Councillor and low level of local support	Approved 18	£500	1
32442	Lancing	Lancing	Grinstead Lane	Parking Issue	DYL request - Incorrect councillor support and no signs of consultation. Request was for DYL	Rejected	N/A	0

					extension on the bridge.			
435310	Shoreham North	Shoreham	The Drive	Parking Issue	DYL at the junctions - Busy road with inconsiderate parking. No support shown	Rejected	N/A	0
436298	Southwick	Southwick	Hawkins Road	Speed Limit	Rejected as no councillor or local support. Also rejected as scheme wouldn't make sense to have one road of 20mph. No collision incidents.	Rejected	N/A	0
436694	Southwick	Southwick	St Richards Road	Parking Issue	Request for parking restrictions throughout road to stop all day parking by parents/shops etc. No Support shown	Rejected	N/A	0
436931	Shoreham South	Shoreham	Beach Road	Parking Issue	Request to change restriction - added on to existing scheme.	Rejected	N/A	0
33957	Shoreham North	Shoreham	<u>Greenways Crescent</u>	Parking Issue	DYL to stop parking too close to junctions. - Rejected due to same application as 33812	Rejected	N/A	0
34018	Lancing	Lancing	<u>Grinstead Avenue</u>	Parking Issue	Coaches parking on footway - currently not approved as no consultation undertaken.	Rejected	N/A	0
437219	Shoreham	Shoreham	<u>Parkside</u>	Speed Limit	Rejected - Private road	Rejected	N/A	0
437881	Shoreham	Shoreham	West Street	Parking Issue	Change of SYL to DYL - rejected as no public consultation	Rejected	N/A	0
437871	Shoreham	Shoreham	Longshore Drive	Parking Issue	Request of DYL - Not part of WSCC maintainable highway - no consultation or support from Councillor	Rejected	N/A	0
438283	Shoreham	Shoreham	West Beach Road	Parking Issue	DYL Throughout sections of West Beach Road - No Councillor or resident support	Rejected	N/A	0

438280	Shoreham	Shoreham	Ship Street hard	Moving	Customer wanted one way, not viable as there is no exit. No support shown	Rejected	N/A	0
435236	Southwick	Southwick	Croft Avenue	Parking Issue	DYL from the development on the bend to allow safe exit. No evidence of support shown	Rejected	N/A	