# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place

# Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee

on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015

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

## Agenda Item No.

# Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders 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.

#### **Background papers 7**.

None

### 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 comme	nts
West Road	Propose pedestrian crossing near to Westborough Road	Members and Officers	Pedestrian crossing criteria met	An assessment of the location meets the agreed criteria. The highest volume of vehicles and pedestrians is shown below and will be explained at the meeting.	
				13:00	1.000
				13:30	1.080
				14:00	1.160
				14:30	1.240
				15:00	1.320
				15:30	1.400
				16:00	1.480
				16:30	1.560
				17:00	1.640
				17:30	1.720
				18:00	1.800
				18:30	1.880
				19:00	1.960
				19:30	2.040
				Recommend proposals.	advertise

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Harp House Roundabout	Installation of 2 no. Toucan crossings and carriageway widening the airport access road. Propose pedestrian crossings as part of airport improvement works. vide pay and display parking weekends and bank holidays	Officers	Pedestrian crossing criteria met	To improve pedestrian movements around roundabouts and decrease congestion at Harp House Roundabout associated with the Retail Park.  Recommend advertise proposals.