# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place to

# Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee

on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2015

Report prepared by: Cheryl Hindle-Terry
Team Leader, Parking, Traffic Management and Road Safety

Agenda Item No.

10

# Requests for New or Amended Waiting Restrictions Portfolio Holder – Councillor Terry A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

#### 1. Purpose of Report

1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new restrictions in accordance with the statutory processes.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:
  - a) Consider the requests to advertise the requisite Traffic Regulation Orders as shown in appendix 1;
  - b) If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed;
  - c) Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration.

#### 3. Background

- 3.1 Requests for new or amendments to existing waiting restrictions are regularly received from residents and the businesses.
- 3.2 All requests are assessed and investigated against the agreed criteria contained in Appendix 1 to this report which was approved by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee at their meeting in July 2011.

#### 4. Other Options

4.1 Each request needs to be considered on its individual merits and their impact on public safety, traffic flows or parking and wider impact on the surrounding network. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

#### 5. Reasons for Recommendations

5.1 Where recommended the objective is to mitigate for likelihood of traffic flows being impeded, to improve safety or increase parking availability.

#### 6. Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities
- 6.1.1 Ensure the highway network is effectively managed contributing to a Safe and Prosperous Southend.
- 6.2 Financial Implications
- 6.2.1 Where recommended, the source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.
- 6.3 Legal Implications
- 6.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation where applicable.
- 6.4 People Implications
- 6.4.1 Staff time will be prioritised as needed to investigate, organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals based on the committee priorities.
- 6.5 Property Implications
- 6.5.1 None
- 6.6 Consultation
- 6.6.1 Formal consultation will be undertaken including advertisement of the proposal in the local press and on the street as appropriate.
- 6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications
- 6.7.1 The objectives of improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.
- 6.8 Risk Assessment
- 6.8.1 Neutral.
- 6.9 Value for Money
- 6.9.1 All works resulting from the scheme design are to be undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process.
- 6.10 Community Safety Implications
- 6.10.1 All proposals are designed to maximise community safety through design, implementation and monitoring.
- 6.11 Environmental Impact
- 6.11.1 All proposals are designed and implemented to ensure relevant environmental benefits are attained through the use of appropriate materials and electrical

equipment to save energy and contribute towards the Carbon Reduction targets where appropriate.

### 7. Background papers

Nil

# 8. Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of requests and comments

#### **APPENDIX 1 – WAITING RESTRICTIONS REQUESTS**

#### **AGREED CRITERIA FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS (JULY 2011)**

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.
- (e) The location is a junction.

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Riviera Drive	Provide restrictions adjacent to station entrance	Officers	D and E	While this is primarily a residential street and traffic flow should not be a factor, traffic for the station has increased and parking is now occurring directly outside of the station which is also opposite a junction. The parking is impacting on the flows along the street as well as movement around the junction. Recommend advertise proposals.
Western Esplanade	Revise bays adjacent to sun shelter to provide loading bay	Developer	Criteria not applicable – revision of existing layout	Currently an area of waiting restrictions, while loading permissible on the area, disabled drivers may also park which will impede deliveries. Recommend advertise proposals.
Civic Centre East Car Park	Provide pay and display parking weekends and bank holidays	Officers	Criteria not applicable	The area is currently used for staff parking during the working week. The car park is ideal for use during the Seaway development to manage displaced parking and will also be available during the busy summer weekends to accommodate visitors.  Recommend advertise proposals.

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Quantock residents car park	Propose permit only parking	Officers	Criteria not applicable as council land	The Town Centre location of this residents car park is attractive to non-residents and subject to frequent parking including vehicles parked in hatched areas required for fire access.  Recommend proposing permit style parking with costs to be met by South Essex Homes.
East Street Residents car park	Propose permit only parking	Officers	Criteria not applicable as council land	The location is very close to Prittlewell Station and subject to non-resident parking Recommend proposing permit style parking with costs to be met by South Essex Homes.
Various public parks	Propose waiting restrictions to deter parking by non-park users	Officers	Criteria not applicable as Council managed land	Some of the local parks are located near to workplaces or other destinations where insufficient parking is provided and as such, parking areas within the park are being used for long term parking resulting in park visitors not being able to access facilities. Waiting restrictions will deter this practice and ensure the parking areas are available for short term use by park visitors. Recommend advertise proposals with costs to be met by park budgets.
Bunters Avenue cul de sac	Propose waiting restrictions	Estuary housing	Does not meet criteria	Short cul de sac with turning area. Fire service visited during February 2014 and one vehicle was parked opposite to other vehicles restricting the width. Fire service left a leaflet on the vehicle and stated they would re visit and identify if a continuing issue however no further contact. Recommend parking monitored to assess if width is regularly restricted. If this is apparent and regular, the proposal would meet the criteria point (D)
Junctions	Propose waiting restrictions at unprotected junctions	Officers	Junctions only (E)	There are a number of junctions in the borough which are currently unprotected. Officers identify

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
				these are through various inspections/residents calls and can react as and when required or when other works are proposed in the area if a borough wide authority is to propose these restrictions is agreed. This would be an efficient method of addressing perceived hazards.  Recommend that agreement is provided to propose waiting restrictions at unprotected junctions as and when identified.