

Central and South Mid Sussex County Local Committee	Ref: CSMS02 (19/20)
12 June 2019	Key Decision: No
Burgess Hill – Crescent Road Proposed Traffic Regulation Order	Part I
Director of Highways, Transport and Planning & Head of Highway Operations	Electoral Division: Burgess Hill East

Summary

Based on resident concerns surrounding parking congestion, obstruction, footway parking, out of date timing restrictions and lack of junction protection, the County Local Committee (CLC) supported a Traffic Regulations Order (TRO) investigation, by which a proposal has been submitted for public consultation and received both resident support and objection.

The scheme includes;

- New lengths of various waiting restrictions on lengths of Church Close, Church Road, Crescent Road, Grove Road, Lower Church Road, Meeds Road, Middle Way and Mill Road in Burgess Hill.
- Prohibit waiting at any time at the junctions of Mill Road/Midfields Walk, Mill Road/Millbank, Mill Road/Millers Way, Mill Road/St Wilfreds Way.
- Remove lengths of existing waiting restrictions in Crescent Way, Crescent Road, Mill Road and Slimbridge Road. New disabled bay facility outside St Johns Church.

A new Order is therefore proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the affected lengths of road and to facilitate the safe passage of pedestrians and traffic.

The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 19 July 2018 – 9 Aug 2018, which resulted in 9 comments of support received and 7 objections received which have been summarised in Appendix B associated with this Report.

A petition was also received with 12 signatures specific to Meeds Road. Further engagement was carried out by the respective local member.

At the Central and South Mid Sussex CLC meeting on 30 October 2018 members agreed and supported the introduction of this TRO proposal.

Recommendation

That the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning authorises the Director of Law and Assurance to make the Order as advertised.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 **Crescent Road** is situated close to local amenities, and with this convenience, staff, customers and general public alike utilise this road for long term parking. Some properties have access to private drives and others have limited to no access, despite this, inconsiderate and obstructive parking is experienced and is concentrated to the remaining part of the road without restrictions thus contributing to forward visibility and access difficulties.
- 1.2 **Mill Road** runs north / south linking Station Road with Leylands Road. Some of the junctions already have junction protection, however others remain without protection, therefore to maintain consistency all junctions will benefit from double yellow lines reinforcing rule 243 of the Highway Code. Also at the most southern end of Mill Road, out of date limited waiting times will be altered to improve customer times and to encourage economy for businesses.
- 1.3 **Grove Road** has experienced several historical improvements to protect the northern bend under a previous TRO. Over time it has been identified further minor improvements would benefit safe access to Knyveton Court and the southern section of the bend, therefore double yellow lines will marginally be extended.
- 1.4 **Crescent Way** is situated between Church Walk shopping parade and Cyprus Road car park. A wide pedestrian build aids people crossing, however vehicles abuse this location by mounting and parking on this area. Further to this, a frozen foods company has recently established itself operating a home delivery service from the rear of its premises, as such whilst still addressing the business needs minor restriction improvements have been proposed to aid pedestrian access to the town and car park. (Please note contact has been made with Iceland Health and Safety Officer regarding their parking, storage and delivery practices).
- 1.5 **Lower Church Road** is situated west of St Johns Church. On the bend there is a convenient pharmacy, however those picking up prescriptions tend to park on or near the bend, creating a visual and physical obstruction for other road users. Therefore, it is proposed to upgrade existing restrictions to avoid all parking on this bend. Also, fronting St Johns Church is a service road, due to negative parking on the access, this will benefit further from double yellow lines and the provision of a disabled bay facility assisting vulnerable users.
- 1.6 **Church Road** bend adjacent to Barclays Bank currently has double yellow lines and dedicated shared disabled and loading bay facilities. However, when full blue badge holders taken it upon themselves to park on bend with double yellow lines for 2-3 hours which is permitted, however not in the event it creates a hazard for other road users. In these situations bus drivers attempting a manoeuvre into Church Road are confronted with vehicle obstruction, preventing safe passage into road. Therefore, no loading / unloading restrictions are proposed to prohibit all parking on bend.

- 1.7 **Church Close (cul-de-sac)** situated rear of St Johns Church grounds experiences similar parking trends to Crescent Road due to its close proximity to town. Although not a through route, the congested parking inhibits forward visibility and restrictions access for blue light services, refuse collection as well as home deliveries. It will also aim to protect footways from being parked on.
- 1.8 **Middle Way (cul-de-sac)** comes off Mill Road situated between Crescent Road and Cyprus Road. It is located just east of Cyprus Road car park and Church Walk, attracting a healthy volume of pedestrian movement, however also negative parking. Restrictions proposed aimed to alleviate the western end of the road and pedestrian drop crossing points from being obstructed and discourage footways parking.
- 1.9 **Meeds Road** is a dog leg cul-de-sac located just off Station Road, south of Queen Elizabeth Avenue. During a Fire & Rescue emergency attendance, crews struggled to gain access to property during a house fire, due to parked cars on bend. As a result, double yellow lines are proposed to extend to include the bend and consolidate any anomalies to maintain accuracy with the legal order.
- 1.10 **Slimbridge Road** is a minor consolidation change from a previous TRO, which includes the removal of several metres of double yellow lines.
- 1.11 Concluding the public consultation the scheme received 9 in support and 7 objections including the organiser of a 12 signature petition.
- 1.12 The 12 signature petition was specific to changes in Meeds Road cul-de-sac. Concerns included displacement parking and lack of parking capacity, other concerns raised but these were found to be a misinterpretation of the advertised plans, therefore beyond the scope of this scheme. Hassocks & Burgess Hill South division member Ms Kirsty Lord and the County Council Area Highway Manager wrote to residents on 31 January 2019 to resolve any related confusion.
- 1.13 After resident feedback and deliberation on site, Burgess Hill North division member Mr Andrew Barratt-Miles agreed to maintain original small sections of restrictions, where the scheme suggested removing them. Location in particular in Mill Road between Midfields Drive and Firtoft Close junctions.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal was to alleviate congestion primarily in Crescent Road, however in light of several other pressing issues relating to the same or similar parking and visibility difficulties, the opportunity was taken to address these as part of this one scheme.
- 2.2 The original scheme advertised included minor consolidation changes to meet current demands. The original advertised plans are in Appendix A.
- 2.3 The Order is proposed to avoid danger to persons or traffic using the road or for preventing such danger from arising, to facilitate the safe passage of traffic and improve the amenity of the area through which the road runs.

3. Resources

- 3.1 The cost to the Council for the installation of the TRO should be in the region of £1800.00 to be met from the Community Traffic Order Regulation budget which was approved in April 2019 as part of the Highways and Infrastructure 2019/20 Forward Works Programmes and Annual Delivery Programme decision ref HI03 (19/20).

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

- 4.1 **Members** - At the design stage, the local members for Burgess Hill were consulted and supported the proposals.
- 4.2 **External** –Sussex Police were consulted at design stage and raised no objection.
- 4.3 **Public** - The three week statutory consultation for the TRO ran between 19 July 2018 to 9 August 2018. Notification of this was sent directly to a range of stakeholders including the Police and emergency services, District and Parish Councils. During this consultation period, notices were erected on site, a copy of plans and a statement of reasons were placed at the local library, and the advertisement placed in the local press and on the County Council's website.
- 4.4 During the consultation period, 9 comments of support were submitted and 7 comments of objection were received, including a 12 signature petition. They have been summarised in Appendix B to this report.
- 4.5 The local County Councillors have confirmed their support for the original proposals whilst still considering public feedback received.

5. Risk Management Implications

- 5.1 Should the TRO not be made, the risk to the County Council would be continued obstructive and footway parking at junctions and bends, affecting access for general highway users including refuse / delivery vehicles and emergency services.
- 5.2 Should the TRO be made, the risk to the County Council is that some car users will need to find alternative parking provisions and may migrate further into other neighbouring roads.
- 5.3 Implementing the scheme as per CLC decision, may also encourage long term users to utilise the existing car parking facilities. A future re-visit may be required if there is evidence that the scheme had not adequately addressed the facts discovered during the original investigations, possibly promoting a more strategic view of the area considering natural future development and growth in this area.

6. Other Options Considered

- 6.1 The proposed restrictions are considered the best option to ensure that the road junctions are kept clear of obstruction and to discourage parking where it is not safe to do so. Updating and reconfiguring existing restriction to be robust enough to manage current trends.
- 6.2 There are future plans to strategically study Burgess Hill parking situation, in light of continual growth and change.

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. As such officers have identified no issues that conflict with the councils Local Authority Equality Duty.
- 7.2 The comments and objections received about the proposals did not raise Equality Act issues but were assessed in relation to the protected characteristics and no relevant impact emerged.

8. Social Value

- 8.1 The proposals to deter obstructive parking at junctions, on pavements and on bends, align with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they aim to improve the local road environment for existing and future users.
- 8.2 It is acknowledged that loss of parking may be regarded as having an adverse impact on residential amenity but the primary concern of the Council must be to discharge its statutory duty to manage the highway network and ensure the safety of all road users.

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 and Planning

Michele Hulme
Head of Highway Operations

Contact: Nick De Sousa, Traffic Officer – 033 022 26366

Appendices

Appendix A – plans of existing restrictions and advertised proposals
Appendix B – summary of objections

Background Papers

None