

Brighton & Hove City Council

Cabinet Member Decision

Subject: Fonthill & Newtown Road Safer, Better streets TRO

Date of Decision: 17th July 2025

Report of: Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure

Contact Officer: Name: Russell McMillan – Senior Project Manager

Email: russell.mcmillan@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: Central Hove; Westbourne & Poets' Corner;

Key Decision: No

For general release

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1. The Safer Better Streets Programme aims to enhance street safety across the city through a range of measures, including improved junction design, safer pedestrian crossings, and other community-focused initiatives. The programme prioritises area-based highway improvements based on risk and community need, with Fonthill/Newtown Road identified as a high-risk using data held and following several vehicle collisions in recent years.

2. Recommendations

The Cabinet Member for Transport & City Infrastructure:

- 2.1 Agrees that the two Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO-5-2025 and TRO-5b-2025) be sealed, and that the project proceeds to the construction phase under delegated authority.
- 2.2 Agrees and delegates authority to the Interim Corporate Director – City Operations to oversee the sealing of the TROs and progression to construction.

3. Context and background information

- 3.1 Following extensive engagement with residents and stakeholders held on the council's Your Voice platform from 21st October to 6th December 2024, two Traffic Regulation orders (TRO - 5- 2025 & TRO -5b- 2025) have been advertised and were open for comments to be made on the proposals. The TRO was advertised in The Argus, emailed to stakeholders and notices erected on street. It was also published on the council's TRO website.
- 3.2 The TROs proposed to make changes to waiting restrictions in Fonthill and Newtown Road, introduce new loading at any time restrictions and to close the Western arm of Newtown Road to all vehicles, except pedal cycles. It also gave notice to install a raised table at the junction of Fonthill/ Newtown Road.

- 3.3 Detailed analysis of the comments received has outlined the that proposals are generally supported - Common themes of the objections received were around increased traffic congestion/ noise/ pollution, increased journey times in Fonthill Road and requesting the Eastern arm of Newtown Rd also to be closed to all traffic. Themes for support included improved road safety for all, reduction of rat running of HGVs and speeding vehicles following recent collisions.

4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

- 4.1 Approve and seal the associated Traffic Regulation Orders and progress the scheme though to construction phase. This option would allow the proposed safety improvements to be implemented, addressing the identified issues and potentially reducing the risk of future collisions. It supports the council's commitment to road safety and aligns with strategic transport objectives.
- 4.2 Do nothing and withdraw the proposals. Choosing not to proceed with the scheme would avoid the immediate costs and disruption of construction. However, it would also mean that the known safety concerns remain unaddressed, potentially leading to further incidents, injuries, or fatalities. This could also expose the authority to reputational risk and public criticism for failing to act on identified hazards.

5. Community engagement and consultation

- 5.1 Following extensive engagement with residents and stakeholders held on the council's Your Voice platform between 21st October to 6th December 2024, the proposed scheme progressed to Traffic Regulation Order stage.
- 5.2 Two Traffic Regulation orders (TRO - 5- 2025 & TRO -5b- 2025) were advertised (7th to 28th March 2025) and were open for comments to be made on the proposals. The TROs were advertised in The Argus, emailed to stakeholders and notices erected on street. It was also published on the council's TRO website.
- 5.3 The Council received 58 items of correspondence to the proposals from residents, businesses, and stakeholders. This included 33 comments of support (57%) and 25 objections (43%) to the proposals.

6. Financial implications

- 6.1. The Fonthill & Newtown Road site is one of the priority sites identified on the Safer Better Streets priority list. These determined sites are to be delivered using the Safer Better Streets allocated budget, which was awarded as part councils Local Transport Plan (LTP). As a grant funded programme, it doesn't have an impact on the council's borrowing profile, but maintenance of the asset will be funded from the councils existing revenue budgets.

Name of finance officer consulted: David Wilder. Date consulted 12/06/25

7. Legal implications

- 7.1. In accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated regulations, the Council can decide to confirm a traffic regulation order if, as in this instance, it needs to prevent (further) likelihood of danger to person or other traffic using the road/s in question. Consultation is required and has been undertaken. Any such decision must take into account all relevant considerations including but not limited to the impact on amenities and comments from those affected.

Name of lawyer consulted: Katie Kam Date consulted 12/06/25)

8. Risk implications

- 8.1 There is a continued risk of vehicle collisions if no highway safety improvements are implemented.

9. Equalities implications

- 9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out for all highway improvements carried out under the delivery of the Safer, Better Streets programme.

10. Sustainability implications

- 10.1 The scheme does not directly impact on environmental sustainability.

11. Health and Wellbeing Implications:

- 11.1 The Safer Better Streets programme feeds into the council's priorities and vision for Brighton & Hove - Make it easier for people to move around the city, by continuing to invest in maintaining and upgrading our highways network.

Other Implications

12. Procurement implications

- 12.1 If the scheme does not progress through to construction, this may lead to increased cost or changes to project scope in the future.

13. Crime & disorder implications:

- 13.1 Not applicable

14. Conclusion

- 14.1 After careful consideration of the comments and concerns raised, officers have concluded that the issues presented do not warrant withdrawal of the proposals. It is therefore recommended that the TROs be sealed, and the project proceed to the construction phase under delegated authority.