

Adur County Local Committee

11 March 2015

Shoreham-by-Sea, Lower Beach Road and Ferry Road

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)

Report by the Executive Director of Residents' Services and Director of Highways and Transport

Ref:
Key Decision: No
Part I
Electoral Division: Shoreham-by-Sea

Executive Summary

Adur District Council has proposed an enhancement scheme to the South of the Ferry Bridge which includes changes to the parking within Ferry Road lay-by and waiting restrictions in the area. A statutory consultation has been undertaken with regards to proposals to change the layout of the road, the relocation of the zebra crossing and a prohibition of driving.

Appendix A details the response to the consultation – with most objections being to the extent of the proposed loss of parking in Ferry Road lay-by. These responses and other contributions have been considered against other needs of the local community and the TRO and scheme design has been rationalised to significantly reduce the impact to the area that received objections yet still achieve the needs of the proposed scheme.

Recommendation(s)

That the Adur County Local Committee, authorises the Director of Law Assurance and Strategy to make the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised, in part, as described in Section 3.

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 Adur District Council have proposed an enhancement scheme to the South of the Ferry Bridge which include significant changes to the pedestrian realm, District Council car park and the parking and waiting restrictions in the area. Details of this can be found in the public consultation documents.
- 1.2 The proposed enhancement scheme would help improve cycle and pedestrian routes, encourage the use of sustainable transport and

increase public accessibility to the area using quality materials and bringing improvement to the existing pedestrian desired route.

- 1.3 Ferry Road, at the north end has a row of shops with a narrow footway. The lay-by within Ferry Road fronting those shops has 2 junctions and the common practice is to use one as "in" and the other as "out". As part of the enhancement works there is a proposal to remove parking within the lay-by and replace it with aesthetically pleasing pedestrian footway (see Appendix B). The scheme would also involve the relocation of an existing pedestrian crossing to a more appropriate desire line. The current location is approximately 40m west of the proposed location.

The successful relocation of the crossing is dependent on having a reasonable footway for users of the crossing to alight.

- 1.4 The scheme north of Riverside Road has received planning permission and the pedestrian crossing in Riverside Road and the footway area to the south are being constructed under permitted development.
- 1.5 The scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 and Stage 2 Safety Audit which was undertaken by an independent Safety Auditor. Issues with the originally proposed crossing position were raised in the Stage 1 audit. The crossing was relocated to the position currently proposed. The current crossing position received consent from WSCCs Head of Service (Engineering Solutions) and WSCCs Signals Team.
- 1.6 The Stage 2 Safety Audit found no issues with regards to the location of the relocated crossing.
- 1.7 Once the scheme has been implemented there will be a Stage 3 Safety Audit to ensure all users of the highway can interact safely.
- 1.8 The TRO proposal was to be considered at the CLC Meeting of 3 December 2014. The decision was deferred due to unforeseen issues arising with regards to access to the River Adur at the end of Lower Beach Road. Access rights including those to the slipway area for fishing boats and leisure craft are maintained within this proposal. Any further discussion with regards to this area should not affect or be affected by the TRO decision.
- 1.9 There has been some conjecture from some members of the public that misinformation was presented by an unknown third party to many of those who chose to object and send in a standard letter of which over 250 copies were received. The misinformation is believed to be that a greater amount of parking was to be removed in Ferry Road than was actually proposed. There is a large car park and significant on-street parking available. The original proposal was to remove three parking spaces in Ferry Road. The scheme as per the recommendation is to remove one space (4.5m of the existing bay), and replace this with pedestrian footway to allow safe use of the relocated crossing.

- 1.10 Further to the consultation three options have been considered. See sections 3 and 4 below for further details.

2. Consultation

- 2.1 The proposals were subject to a three week statutory consultation period.

- 2.2 **Members** – The local county council member gave consent for the scheme to proceed to formal consultation.

- 2.3 **External** - consultation was undertaken with borough, district & town councils and the police. Sussex police had no objections to the prohibition of driving or waiting restrictions, however they raised concerns from a safety perspective on the zebra crossing relocation (see Appendix A).

- 2.4 **Public** – a statutory three week consultation was undertaken from 11/09/2014 – 2/10/2014. This included erecting notices on site, an advertisement in the Shoreham Herald and details of the proposals made available at the local library as well as at County Hall and on WSCC's website. Adur District Council had undertaken some local consultation and WSCC Local Member and ADC's Cabinet Member for Highways had met with local traders prior to the formal consultation period.

- 2.5 350 responses to the consultation were received, 277 of objection and 73 of support. Full details of the consultation can be found in the background papers. The comments raised and engineer's response can be found in Appendix A. The objections were concerned with the zebra crossing and amendment to parking in Ferry Road. No objections were received to the area currently bounded by Lower Beach Road.

- 2.6 An e-petition has been organised and signed by 411 members of the public. This is currently in the submission process. Further details can be found in Appendix E.

- 2.7 **Internal** – the Traffic Engineer for the area and Team Leader for WSCC's Signals Team were consulted and raised no objections.

3. Proposal

- 3.1 West Sussex County Council proposes to make a permanent Traffic Regulation Order that will prohibit vehicles driving on the existing Lower Beach Road, the section adjacent to The Waterside Inn pub (see Appendix G).

- 3.2 Access to the existing Adur District Council car park will be from the western entrance and vehicular access to the River Adur will be achieved along new public highway located on the northern edge of the car park

- 3.3 The Order also proposes to relocate a zebra crossing further to the east by approximately 40m, this would connect and improve the desire line for

pedestrians coming from Shoreham Town towards the seafront (see Appendix H).

- 3.4 The Order also includes the layout of the lay-by within Ferry Road to change, the lay-by would be removed and would create a suitable footway for pedestrians to have easier access to the local shops and to alight the relocated crossing.
- 3.5 The drawings, numbered TQ2104NEN and TQ2104NES (see Appendix B1 & D) show the lengths of roads affected by the proposed Order.
- 3.6 The proposal will create a safer area for pedestrians and vulnerable road users and potentially both road safety and localised congestion will be improved.
- 3.7 This includes the partial changing to the layout of the lay-by within Ferry Road. The lay-by would be partially removed as shown in Appendix D and would create a reasonable footway for pedestrians to have easier access to the local shops and to accommodate the relocated crossing. This solution would result in the loss of one parking space, rather than the three spaces that would be lost as proposed in the order published for consultation. In addition this layout would improve visibility for drivers emerging from Ferry Road.
- 3.8 The recommended solution (Option 2) is as per:
 - Appendix B1- TQ2104NEN (21.07.14) – Waiting Restrictions.
 - Appendix D - TQ2104NES (18.02.15) – Waiting Restrictions.
 - Appendix G – Prohibition of Driving.
 - Appendix H – Relocated Crossing.

4. **Other options considered**

4.1 Three options have been considered;

Option 1 – Implement as Advertised - Not recommended due to the extent and nature of public objection.

Option 2 - Partial implementation (Recommended).

Option 3 - Implementation of part to the north of Riverside Road only, with further future works - Not recommended due to the difficulty in committing funds for relatively little additional benefit compared with Option 2.

This last option was detailed in the report taken to the 12 December CLC meeting. This proposal was to not implement the crossing or any changes to Ferry Road, with the need to find funds pave the service road and to extend the existing on the east side to create an additional three parking spaces (see Appendix E) . The further works were anticipated to be in the region of £37,000. This is due to utilities services in the current footway that would require lowering to the necessary depth, to bear the significantly additional loading of vehicles, when creating the new carriageway lay-by. It is not feasible at the present time to plan that

either the district or county councils would find this funding, especially as the cost may be considered disproportionate to the benefit.

4.2 Option 2 is the recommended solution and is based on:

- Addressing the specific objections to the Ferry Road element of Option 1 whilst retaining some improvements to that element.
- Achieving best value for available public funds.
- It removes only 4.5m of parking. This allows pedestrians to safely cross Riverside Road using the Zebra Crossings to an enhanced area whilst retaining a majority of the parking.
- Option 2 also has the benefit of contributing additional footway to the Ferry Road element which will assist the future delivery of either Option 1 or Option 3 should this be proposed at a later date.

The advertised proposed Order would be made in part to achieve the above. See WSCC Formal Consultation Documentation for all advertised documentation

5. **Resource Implications and Value for Money**

- 5.1 The cost of implementing the scheme north of Lower Beach Road would be borne by Adur District Council. There would be no further costs to WSCC associated with this part of the scheme.

6. **Impact of the proposal**

- 6.1 Option 2 would ensure there was only a minor impact on local traders, whilst allowing the majority of the scheme to be implemented.
- 6.2 An Equality Impact Report (EIR) has been undertaken and is attached as appendix C to this report.
- 6.3 If the proposal is not implemented the aspirations of the district council to enhance the public realm would not be met and the benefits to the members of the public would not be realised.
- 7.2 **Social Value** – implementation of the Option 2 will provide a more amenable environment. The option to compromise by amending the parking restrictions to a bay in Ferry Road would allow the pedestrian crossing and desire line to be implemented and also retain parking near to the shops to assist local shops in continuing to trade.

8. **Risk Management Implications**

- 8.1 Option 1 – Implement as Advertised.

The positives of implementing as advertised would be a new pedestrian area which improves the look of the local area and a more suitable zebra

crossing location, which is the desire line for pedestrians coming from the bridge. Safety would be improved within the pedestrianised area for vulnerable users. Three businesses have indicated they would struggle to remain trading with the lack of parking and will lose customers, furthermore the traders may have to reduce staff numbers.

8.2 Option 2 - Partial implementation (Recommended). – Partial Implementation (modest change to service road).

274 members of the public objected to changes in the Ferry Road waiting restrictions. Shops will still benefit from the access road and be able to unload and park. This option allows the most suitable way for the rest of the scheme to be successfully implemented.

8.3 Option 3 - Part implementation, with further future works - Not recommended due to the need for additional funding.

Everything north of Ferry Road would be delivered. This would mainly include the regeneration of the car park. The zebra crossing would remain in its current location. There would be no parking changes to the lay-by in Ferry Road. Adur District Council would need to consider allocating the money for the pedestrianised area and the zebra crossing and seek to fund the movement of utility services to allow the creation of a new lay-by allow parking (Approximately £37,000).

The dis-benefits of dropping the scheme would be no new crossing to aid pedestrians across the road at the desire line. There would be no regeneration of the pedestrianised area. The dis-benefits would be a need for a new TRO for changes to the parking arrangements, the new TRO would be subject to the democratic process and may receive objections. The proposal would be, at a later date, to pedestrianise the footway and create a 2/3 space lay-by to allow parking/unloading/loading for the shops by customers.

8.4 It should be noted there is a significant risk that WSCC may not be able to identify and secure the additional funding if Option 3 is selected. In the event of this, the existing crossing and pedestrian area would remain unchanged.

8.5 The delivery of the whole scheme is reliant on the TRO and has been subject to delays. Any further delay would therefore be likely to put the scheme at risk of losing funding.

Executive Director
Residents' Services

Director of Highways and Transport

Contact: Mike Thomas 03302226341

Appendices

- [Appendix A](#) – Objection, comments and responses
- [Appendix B](#) – Formal consultation documents – Waiting Restrictions – 2 Files - B1TQ2104NEN & B2 TQ2104NES - 2 plans per file (Plan 1 is existing, Plan 2 is proposed)
- Appendix C – Equality Impact Report
- [Appendix D](#) – Recommended TRO Proposal Ferry Road (Option 1) – 2 plans per file (Plan 1 is existing, Plan 2 is proposed)
- [Appendix E](#) – Option 3 (not recommended) 2 plans per file (Plan 1 is existing, Plan 2 is proposed)
- [Appendix F](#) – Petition (Awaiting submission)
- [Appendix G](#) – Prohibition of Driving
- [Appendix H](#) – Relocation of Crossing

Background Papers

WSCC Formal Consultation Documentation

http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/living/roads_and_transport/roads_and_footways/traffic_management/traffic_regulation_orders_tro/closed_tro_consultations/adur_county_local_committee.aspx

Adur District Pedestrian Realm Proposals

<http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk/media/media,105064,en.pdf>

Equality Impact Report

Title of proposal	Shoreham-by-Sea, Sussex Wharf Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)
Date of implementation	Spring / Summer 2015
EIR completed by:	Name: Mike Thomas Tel: 0330 222 6341

1. Decide whether this report is needed and, if so, describe how you have assessed the impact of the proposal.

Adur District Council are proposing an enhancement scheme to the South of the Ferry Bridge which include significant changes to the pedestrian realm, local District Council car park and the parking and waiting restrictions in the area. The proposals are funded by Adur District Council.

Following public advertisement 350 responses to the consultation were received, 277 of objection and 73 of support to Option 1.

In assessing the impact of the proposal, representations to the Local Member have been considered to establish the community need and there is a modestly different proposal recommended – Option 2.

2. Describe any negative impact for customers or residents.

There may be some displacement of vehicles to other areas of Lower Beach Road. It is believe the road has the capacity to absorb this with minimum impact. One parking space will be lost near to the shops, this will be offset by the benefit of increased footfall in the area due to the enhanced pedestrian environment and desire line.

The initial proposal included removing three parking spaces. Some comments were received by elderly members of the public with mobility issues who wished to park very close to the shops in Ferry Road. The proposed scheme now only removes one space, with the other two spaces remaining.

3. Describe any positive effects which may offset any negative impact.

The proposal will create a safer area for pedestrians and vulnerable road users and potentially both road safety and localised congestion will be improved. The area will be enhanced with quality materials and more appealing pedestrian routes that should increase footfall and provide additional shoppers to local traders.

A new crossing will be provided to help pedestrians cross the road at the most appropriate and convenient location. This will be of particular benefit for the mobility impaired who wish to park in the nearby car park or travel over the bridge to access the shops in Ferry Road, who will no longer have to wait for a gap in the traffic to cross.

4. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to eliminate

discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
The proposals do not significantly help to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
5. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
The proposals will provide a benefit to disabled motorists who can park on double yellow lines for up to three hours provided it is safe to do so.
6. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
The proposal does not directly help to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
7. What changes were made to the proposal as a result? If none, explain why.
None. The proposals represent a measured response to the problems identified in the area and it is for these reasons that no changes were made to the proposals with regards to those with a protected characteristic.
8. Explain how the impact will be monitored to make sure it continues to meet the equality duty owed to customers and say who will be responsible for this.
<p>The true effect of the proposal will only be known once it is implemented. It will be monitored by feedback from customers and the District Council which is responsible for enforcement of parking restrictions.</p> <p>West Sussex County Council's Highways Team will be responsible for the monitoring.</p>

To be signed by a Director or Head of Service to confirm that they have read and approved the content.			
Name	Jonathan Ulmer		Date
			18 February 2015
Your position	Highways Management and Maintenance Manager		