

**Public Document Pack
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Traffic and Parking Working Party

Date: Thursday, 14th September, 2017

Time: 6.00 pm

Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

Contact: Tim Row - Principal Committee Officer

Email: committeesection@southend.gov.uk

A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 9th March 2017 (Pages 1 - 8)**
- 4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Permit Parking Areas
(Pages 9 - 14)**
- 5 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations
(Pages 15 - 22)**
- 6 Members Requests List
(Pages 23 - 42)**
- 7 Petition Regarding Amending Traffic Flow - Hadleigh Road (southern
section) Leigh on Sea (Pages 43 - 46)**
- 8 Request to Amend Traffic Flows to One-Way - Osborne Road and
Windsor Road (Pages 47 - 50)**
- 9 Petition for 20mph Speed Limit – Southsea Avenue (Pages 51 - 54)**
- 10 Bailey Road Area - Permit Parking Proposal (Pages 55 - 58)**
- 11 Station Avenue Permit Parking Area (Pages 59 - 64)**
- 12 Requests for Waiting Restrictions (Pages 65 - 70)**
- 13 Deployment of Fixed Safety Cameras (Pages 71 - 74)**
- 14 Exclusion of the Public**

To agree that, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**15 Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) - Exceptional Circumstances
Application(s) (Pages 75 - 98)**

To: The Chairman & Members of Traffic & Parking Working Party:

Councillor T Cox (Chairman),
Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chair), M Borton, M Butler, T Callaghan, M Flewitt, J Garston,
D Kenyon and J Ware-Lane

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party

Date: Thursday, 9th March, 2017
Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

3

Present: Councillor T Cox (Chair)
Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chair), M Borton, T Callaghan, J Garston,
J Lamb*, M Terry and J Ware-Lane
*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

In Attendance: Councillors M Assenheim, S Ayles, R Hadley, C Mulroney,
M Stafford, C Walker and N Ward
P Geraghty, Z Ali and C Hindle-Terry

Start/End Time: 6.00 - 9.00 pm

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Flewitt (Substitute: Councillor Lamb).

2 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Borton – Agenda Item No. 9 (Additional Parking Spaces around the Seaway Car Park Area – Non-pecuniary interest: Fellow Councillor lives in Pleasant Road;

(b) Councillor Byford – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations: The Maze) – Non-pecuniary interest: Ward Councillor and has assisted residents in the road;

(c) Councillor Callaghan – Agenda Item No. 5 (Members' Request List: Request Reference No. 16/07 – Waiting Restrictions in Campfield Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Knows the owner of a business in this location;

(d) Councillor Callaghan – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Lucy Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Taxi Driver;

(e) Councillor J Garston – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Southchurch Avenue) – Pecuniary interest: Owns a property at this location (withdrew).

3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders - Various Locations

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the representations that had been received in response to the statutory consultation for proposed Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals within the Borough.

The reports sought sought an appropriate recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on the way forward, after having considered of all the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That, subject to the following amendments, the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (High Street Shoeburyness) (Zone SH) (Prohibition of Waiting & Permit Parking Places) Order 2017 be confirmed as advertised:

(i) The following roads only shall be included in the permit parking area:

Dane Street, George Street, Hinguar Street, High Street Shoeburyness (from East Gate northwards to a point opposite the southern boundary of Grove Lodge only) John Street, Rampart Terrace and, Smith Street.

(ii) The following disabled parking bays shall remain advisory bays only:

Friars Street o/s Nos. 6, 20, & 1C;
Waking Avenue o/s No. 20; and
High Street Shoebury o/s No. 106.

(iii) That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notices for the introduction of limited waiting “pay and display” parking bays in Rampart Street and subject to there being no objections received following statutory notice, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

(iv) That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notices for the introduction of the use of the East Beach Car Park by commuters, the hours of which to accommodate the time of the first train departure from Shoeburyness Station and an appropriate closing time in the evening.

(v) That an appropriate marketing campaign be undertaken to deter commuter parking in the residential streets in the area around Shoeburyness Station (as illustrated in the plan attached to the draft order) and to encourage the use of East Beach Car Park instead.

(vi) That the impact of the traffic regulation order as amended be reviewed during the first six months from the date of implementation to ascertain whether the scheme should be extended to include the roads in the original proposals if necessary.

2. That no further action be taken in respect of the proposals for Belle Vue Road, Southend on Sea and that the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones (Consolidation Order) 2016 (Amendment No. 1) Order 2017 with the exclusion of Belle Vue Road.

3. That no further action be taken in respect of the proposals for Rayleigh Road, Leigh on Sea and that the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones (Consolidation Order) 2016 (Amendment No. 2) Order 2017 with the exclusion of Rayleigh Road.

4. That consideration of the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions in The Maze be deferred.

5 Members' Request List

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the requests received from Members of the Council together with officers' recommendations relating to those requests. The Appendix setting out each request, together with officers' comments and recommendation in respect of each of the requests was circulated at the meeting.

The Council's Team Leader - Traffic Management and Road Safety Team also reported orally on two additional requests that had been received since the publication of the Agenda. These related to the review of the waiting restrictions recently installed in Elm Road, Leigh on Sea and excessive vehicle movements in the Prince Avenue service road during works along this section of the A127.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the update in respect of the following requests as set out in the report be noted:

Request Reference No. 15/07 – Pedestrian Crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive;

Request Reference No. 15/19 – Introduction of a one way system in Saxon Gardens;

Request Reference No. 16/01 – Introduction of waiting restrictions or a parking management scheme to deter airport parking in Rochford Road service road;

Request Reference No. 16/04 – Hardening of verges in Silversea Avenue;

Request Reference No. 16//07 – Introduction of waiting restrictions on the bend in Campfield Road, Shoeburyness by Cumberland Packaging;

Request Reference No. 16/11 – Introduction of waiting restrictions in Colbert Avenue west of church; and

Request Reference No. 17/02 – Hardening of verges in Mansell Close;

2. That, with regard to request reference no. 15/18 regarding the creation of new parking facilities and the review of waiting restrictions in Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order for the amendment of any areas of waiting restrictions suitable for reduction or removal throughout the borough as and when identified during the 17/18 financial year.

3. That no further action be taken in respect of the following requests and that they be removed from the list:

Request Reference No. 17/01 – Introduction of waiting restrictions in Walters Close; and

Request Reference No. 17/03(a) – Introduction of informal horse crossing signage at A127 and Progress Road Junction.

4. That, with regard to request reference no. 17/04, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order for the introduction of a borough-wide prohibition of the offering the sale of vehicles parked in formal parking bays and subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement to arrange for the order to be sealed.

5. That, with regard to the request to review the waiting restrictions recently installed in Elm Road, Leigh on Sea, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order for the removal of the waiting restrictions outside the surgery at 84 Elm Road.

6. That the request to address excessive vehicle movements in the Prince Avenue service road during works at this location, be retained on the list to enable further investigations to undertaken and any appropriate controls to be identified.

7. That consideration of request reference No. 17/03 (b) regarding the introduction of weight restriction signage at A127 and The Fairway Junction be deferred.

6 Requests for Waiting Restrictions

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that sought Members' approval to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new waiting restrictions at the locations indicated in Appendix 1 to the report, in accordance with the statutory processes and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the relevant orders to be sealed and implement the proposals.

With reference to the request to amend the existing hackney carriage stand to shared hackney carriage stand and parking bays, the Working Party was informed that the appointment, removal and amendment to hackney carriage stands were a matter for the Council's Licensing Committee. Any proposals would therefore need to be referred to the Licensing Committee for consideration.

The proposals for the amendment of the existing limited waiting bays on the north side of Marine Parade, Southend on Sea to coach drop off and loading bays and

the amendment of the existing disabled drop off point on the south side of Marine Parade to shared disabled and coach drop off point were considered in conjunction with Agenda Item No. 9 of this meeting entitled “Additional Parking Spaces around the Seaway Car Park Area”.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to amend the existing waiting restrictions in Lucy Road, Southend on Sea to provide parking bays and a loading area and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.
2. That subject to the approval by the Council’s Licensing Committee, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to amend the existing hackney carriage stand in Lucy Road to a shared space to enable then introduction of “pay and display” parking bays from 9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. daily and a hackney carriage stand at all other times and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.
3. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to provide a coach drop-off point south of Woodgrange Drive, and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.
4. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to introduce permit parking controls in the area around Heygate Avenue, Herbert Grove Chancellor Road, and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.
5. That consideration of the proposals in respect of Marine Parade, Southend on Sea be deferred pending a site visit, to which the Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and representatives of the seafront traders be invited to attend and that, subject to the outcome of the site visit, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place), in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Transport, Waste and Cleansing, be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notices and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to introduce, amend or remove restrictions as may be required and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

7 Darlington Grove, Leigh-on-Sea

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of a petition comprising 277 signatures requesting the

provision of a School Crossing Patrol Officer and parking enforcement activity in the area of Darlinghurst School.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted.
2. That the comments set out in paragraph 3.5 of the report be noted and that no further action be taken in respect of the provision of a School Crossing Patrol Officer on the basis that this site does not meet the national criterion set by Road Safety GB for provision of such facilities
- 3 That the comments set out in paragraph 3.6 of the report be noted and that no further action be taken in respect of the provision of a pedestrian crossing facility.
4. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the statutory notices and undertake the necessary consultation for the relevant traffic regulation order for the installation of loading restrictions on Darlinghurst Grove adjacent to the raised crossing point and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed.

8 Station Road Pedestrian Crossing

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the results of an investigation to assess requests for pedestrian crossing facility in Station Road, Thorpe Bay.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the results of the investigations be noted and that no further action be taken in respect of the formal pedestrian crossing facility at this location.
2. That officers be requested to investigate the possibility of alternative engineering solutions to assist pedestrians crossing in this area such as an "island" or "pedestrian refuge" and the possibility of introducing a formal pedestrian crossing facility at an alternative location in the street.

9 Additional Parking Spaces around the Seaway Car Park Area

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of a request from the Seafront Traders Association for additional parking places along streets adjacent to the seafront and surrounding Seaway Car Park. This item was considered in conjunction with the request to amend the existing limited waiting bays on the north side of Marine Parade, Southend on Sea to coach drop off and loading bays and the amendment of the existing disabled drop off point on the south side of Marine Parade to shared disabled and coach drop off point as set out in Agenda Item No. 6 of this meeting entitled "Requests for Waiting Restrictions". It was noted that the Seaway Car Park would not be included as part of the review.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended that consideration of the request be deferred pending a site visit, to which the Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and representatives of the seafront traders be invited to attend and that, subject to the outcome of the site visit, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place), in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Transport, Waste and Cleansing, be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notices and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order to introduce, amend or remove restrictions as may be required and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

Chairman: _____

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

4

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
14th September 2017

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Permit Parking Areas

Executive Councillor: Cllr Tony Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider details of the objections to advertised Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of a number of proposals to introduce Permit Parking Areas in various areas as detailed in the appendices to this report .

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the objections and comments to the proposed Orders and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:**

- (a) Implement the proposals without amendment; or,**
- (b) Implement the proposals with amendment; or,**
- (c) Take no further action**
- (d) Agree to a variation of the current Parking Compliance Contract to increase existing patrol resources by one FTE to ensure adequate resources are available to patrol the new areas detailed in this report along with other recently introduced Permit Parking Areas.**

- 2.2 **That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party, following consideration of the representations received and agree the appropriate course of action.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Following informal consultations to introduce Permit Parking Areas in the areas detailed in the appendices to this report, the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee agreed to advertise the formal proposals to introduce the schemes.
- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached appendices were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make representations in respect of the proposals. Letters were also sent to any affected properties. This process has resulted in the objections and comments detailed in the appendices to this report.

- 3.3 Officers have considered these objections/comments and where possible tried to resolve them. Observations are provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.
- 3.4 Members will be aware that since July 2016, 8 new Parking Permit Areas have been agreed for implementation or implemented and this creates a pressure to ensure Permit Parking Areas are robustly enforced. The income generated from permit sales should be sufficient to cover the costs of one additional FTE employee (Civil Enforcement Officer) to monitor and enforce any parking contravention within these areas.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The proposals aim to improve parking availability on areas subject to high levels of parking pressures. Formalising parking controls maximises parking while maintaining highway safety and reduce congestion.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking and traffic is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 Costs for confirmation of the Order, any amendments and implementation of controls if approved, can be met from existing budgets.

The revenue from Permit Parking Areas will be used to cover the costs of additional enforcement requirements; this will be an addition of one Civil Enforcement Officer to the existing contract.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 Works required to implement the agreed schemes will be undertaken by existing staff resources. The additional enforcement resource will be funded through the sale of permits within the additional areas.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

- 5.6.1 This report provides details of the outcome of the statutory consultation process.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

5.7.1 Any implications are taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve the operation parking while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

5.9.1 Works associated with the schemes will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

5.10.1 The proposals if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

5.11 Environmental Impact

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing the Traffic Regulation Orders.

6. Background Papers

6.1 None

7. Appendices

7.1 **Appendix 1** – Cliffs Pavilion Area
Appendix 2 - Town Centre Area

Appendix 1 Details of representations received and Officer Observations Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Scheme (Amendment 2)

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Scheme (Amendment 2)	Members	Extension to the Cliffs Pavilion Area Residents Permit Scheme as per plan shown at Appendix A	<p>15 objections have been received, 8 of which are from Hotels and Guest Houses in the area who are concerned that their businesses will suffer if charging for parking for guests and employees is introduced.</p> <p>1 objection is from a Chiropractor who employs 30 staff and treats up to 350 patients a week. He believes the scheme will seriously affect the viability of the clinic in the area.</p> <p>1 comment states the Order should not extend into the afternoon as parking isn't a problem during this time.</p> <p>1 objection is regarding the inclusion of Tower Court Mews in the scheme.</p> <p>3 letters mention general comments such as the possible detrimental effect on the numbers of patrons visiting the cliffs and the possibility of Non – residential parking occurring in the Tower Court private car park which isn't barriered.</p> <p>1 objection states that restricting parking will increase pressure on adjoining non-regulated parking.</p> <p>20 comments have been received in support of the scheme.</p>	<p>The proposal is designed to extend an existing parking permit area. While the impact on local businesses is acknowledged, those located in primarily residential areas and without off street parking provision create additional parking pressures in an area with a high density of properties and the related parking issues. Hotel permits are being made available which provides parking at 50% of the daily charge and limited time parking could be made available to accommodate short term parking.</p> <p>The permit eligibility should extend to all premises in the area and the possession of off-street parking cannot be a reason to exclude some properties for being able to purchase permits.</p> <p>The authority is not responsible for the management of private car parks and those responsible should take adequate measures to protect their property.</p> <p>The Cliffs Pavilion have been involved with the implementation of the original area and have not reported any impact during several meetings held with the Management Team. Those affected were consulted upon informally and the level of support was Additional comments as to inclusion of the remaining area</p>

				<p>between this and the existing town centre CPZ are also being consulted by ward Members and it is suggested that any works are not progressed until this is completed.</p> <p>Recommend to proceed with proposal and further agree that if the level of responses from the additional area between this and the town centre CPZ meet the required criteria, the additional area be formally advertised and any resulting works undertaken at one time. Any objections received will be referred to a future meeting for consideration.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Appendix 2 Details of representations received and Officer Observations Town Centre Permit Parking Area

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Heygate Avenue; Quebec Avenue; Portland Avenue; York Road (Queensway to Baltic Ave); Herbert Grove	Members following consultation of residents	Introduction of Permit parking places between the hours of 9.00 am to 6pm daily; reduce lengths of double yellow lines; remove alternate monthly parking & limited waiting orders	<p>4 letters received comments include: Would like space opposite drive to be kept clear; does not want parking on both sides of road and will cause difficulty accessing driveway;</p> <p>Will Seaway Car park be valid for new scheme; happy with the proposal but has concerns that kerb space will be reduced.</p>	<p>The parking will be maximised to ensure all available space is utilised, as there are no bay markings provided in these schemes, all areas will be available including those opposite driveways.</p> <p>The road is currently subject to alternate month parking arrangements where parking opposite the drive will be occurring now on alternate months. Private access for an individual property cannot be protected resulting in less parking availability for all other residents.</p> <p>The road width is adequate for two side parking and this has been confirmed by the Fire Service.</p> <p>Permits are only valid for parking on street and not in any car parks.</p>

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

5

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee
on
14th September 2017

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations

Executive Councillor: Cllr Tony Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider details of the objections to advertised Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals across the borough.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the objections to the proposed Orders and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:

- (a) Implement the proposals without amendment; or,
(b) Implement the proposals with amendment; or,
(c) Take no further action

- 2.2 That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party, following consideration of the representations received and agree the appropriate course of action.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Cabinet Committee periodically agrees to advertise proposals to implement waiting restrictions in various areas as a result of requests from Councillors and members of the public based upon an assessment against the Council's current policies.
- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached **Appendix 1** were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make representations in respect of the proposals. This process has resulted in the objections detailed in **Appendix 1** of this report. Officers have considered these objections and where possible tried to resolve them. Observations are provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The proposals aim to improve the operation of the existing parking controls to contribute to highway safety and to reduce congestion.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking and traffic is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 Costs for confirmation of the Order and amendments, in **Appendix 1**, if approved, can be met from existing budgets.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 Works required to implement the agreed schemes will be undertaken by existing staff resources.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

- 5.6.1 This report provides details of the outcome of the statutory consultation process.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.7.1 Any implications will be taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve the operation of the parking scheme while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

- 5.9.1 Works associated with the schemes listed in **Appendix 1** will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

- 5.10.1 The proposals in **Appendix 1** if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

5.11 Environmental Impact

- 5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing the Traffic Regulation Orders.

6. Background Papers

- 6.1 None

7. Appendices

- 7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of representations received and Officer Observations.

Appendix 1 Details of representations received and Officer Observations relating to the Report on Traffic Regulation Orders

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Lonsdale Road junction with Cumberland Avenue	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received Would not be able to park outside property as corner house cars that park there are from neighbouring roads making the area congested. Unable to afford cost of a PVX	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Merilies Gardens junction with Merilies Close	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received. Lines would be outside property as corner house. Do not want double yellow lines but suggest SYL (Mon-Fri 10.00 to 11.00 hours and 14.00 to 15.00 hours) with no restrictions at weekends and Bank Holidays	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. As this is a junction, waiting should be prohibited at any time. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Merilies Gardens junction with Seldon Close	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received. Lines would be outside property. Do not want double yellow lines but suggest SYL (Mon-Fri 10.00 to 11.00 hours and 14.00 to 15.00 hours) with no restrictions at weekends and Bank Holidays	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. As this is a junction, waiting should be prohibited at any time. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Mannerings Gardens junction with Merilies Gardens	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received Concerns that would prevent parking outside their property as they do not have off street parking. Are the line necessary as they are not aware of a problem at the junction	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Boston Avenue	Officer	To introduce Residents/ Business permit parking bays o/s Nos 103-107	3 letters of objection received Concerns include loss of visual amenity; increase in signage; restricted access from driveways; road will become a double parked road; no need for more parking as often not used during day; concerns that they will be used by new properties being built in Victoria Avenue; already bays opposite the proposal; bay will be directly opposite shared drive which will make difficult to enter/exit	As a residential street, traffic flows are not a major concern and slight delays will likely reduce speeds. Accesses are maintained as bays are not provided immediately adjacent to any driveway. Resident permits are not available to the new properties and only residents of existing properties may purchase these. Recommend to proceed with proposal as advertised

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Harcourt Avenue	Officer	To introduce 2 Limited Waiting Bays Mon-Sat 8.30 am -6.30pm 1 Hour No Return in 4 Hours	Bays are proposed opposite homes where cars are permitted to park across driveways with a resident permit; new bays will mean parking both sides leaving only room for 1 car to pass at a time; potential to cause accidents; busy road; would cause congestion and traffic jams as cars try to negotiate round the parked cars on both sides of the road	As a residential street, traffic flows are not a major concern and slight delays will likely reduce speeds. The bays are proposed to provide short term parking provision and can be used by local businesses and residents/visitors. Recommend to proceed with proposal as advertised
Bellhouse Road	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received. Cannot understand why being proposed; having lived in the road for many years never experienced any problems; some properties do not have driveways and park outside their houses so would mean parking further away – many of these residents are elderly; no genuine reason for proposing this; Council spending money unnecessary there are far more important things to spend the money on.	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Leslie Drive junction with Leslie Close	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received. Parking already at a premium especially at weekends and evening; Not all properties have off-street parking and will be affected by proposals; would like PVX extended so can get 2 cars on driveway as driveway is very narrow; if approved would have no objection to proposal.	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Bishopsteignton	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received No body on the estate wants the proposals; will make life more uncomfortable for residents; will lead to more gardens being concreted over	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised
Bishopsteignton junction with Shillingstone	Member	No Waiting at Any Time - 10m junction protection	1 letter of objection received corner property so would have dyl all round; would cause problems for parking for visitors/family as driveway is a shared; consider single yellow lines in Bishopsteignton and double yellow lines in Shillingstone	The proposal formalises the guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction and this is to maintain visibility for pedestrians and vehicles. As this is a junction, waiting should be prohibited at any time. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Salisbury Avenue, access roads to new developments	Officer	No Waiting at Any Time	<p>5 letters of objection and 56 standard letters of objection from 42 individual addresses</p> <p>Loss of parking in area where parking is very difficult; would like residents parking; promised no parking restrictions with new properties; would make parking very awkward</p>	<p>The access to the development has been constructed in accordance with our own guidance however; the presence of parked vehicles impedes access for larger vehicles.</p> <p>Given the level of valid objections related to the loss of parking in an already pressured area, it is recommended that Members agree to implement the proposal to a lesser effect. This would involve discussion with Veolia to determine a short time period on a nominated day when they will collect waste and recycling. This could then enable waiting restrictions to be provided for this short period only. In addition, Officers will meet with the developer/managing agent to discuss potential resolutions which will minimise any adverse impact to the residents of Salisbury Avenue.</p>
Rosary Gardens	Officer	No Waiting Mon-Fri 9.30am–4.30pm	<p>5 letters of objection and 1 letter of support received of which 3 are from residents of the road and 3 from adjoining road</p> <p>Residents of the road</p> <p>Restrictions not required; there is no longer a problem with vehicles entering the road; stopping parking at hammerhead unnecessary as does impede on traffic; where would tradesman and visitors park if restrictions come in; in favour of more restrictions but should not have dyl opposite Nos 15 & 16 just on remainder of road to ensure emergency vehicles have access</p> <p>Residents of the adjoining road comments are that they park in Rosary Gdns due to restrictions on their road; will cause chaos to residents of the area; access to rear of property is in Rosary Gdns and also park in the road; not aware of problems of parking in the road; would affect the limited availability of parking for visitors and traders; restrictions would encroach on to their freehold land; if proceeds only put on straight parts of road</p>	<p>No apparent support for the proposal.</p> <p>Recommend no further action</p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Elm Road Leigh-on-Sea	Member	Reduction of double yellow line	1 letter of objection received Objects to the removal of the line outside No. 84 (business/flat) as it causes vision problems entering/exiting driveway of No. 82; restrictions that are there currently solves this problem; in the past before the lines went in there had been 3 minor accidents due to loss of vision due to parked cars; no need for removal as there is a public car park and parking bays opposite which is ample for visitors to the business at No. 84	This proposal was advertised very shortly after implementing the current restrictions. Historically, the area was subject to a limited waiting time of 1 hour with parking bays provided. Over time, driveways were created resulting in the parking availability being significantly reduced and driveways being partially obstructed by parked vehicles. The remaining areas of parking bays were too short to full accommodate a vehicle and often misleading motorists that parking in the area was acceptable. Proposals to remove the parking bays were advertised which included letters being hand delivered to all affected properties. No objections were received. Following implementation of the works, one property occupier lobbied the local ward Member to remove the recently introduced waiting restrictions. Recommend no further action as no comments of support have been received and parking is available in the nearby car park.

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
14th September 2017

Agenda
Item No.

6

Report prepared by: Zulfiqar Ali, Group Manager, Highways
and Traffic Group

Members Requests List

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony Cox
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee to receive, note and consider new “Member’s Requests” and Officers’ recommendations as detailed in Appendix 1 of this report.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking and the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Working Party and Officer recommendations on each of the proposals as detailed in Appendix 1 to this report, and agree:

- a) To proceed with Officers’ recommendations ; or,
- b) To proceed with Officers’ recommendations, ; or,
- c) To take no further action.
- d) That all agreed actions will be added to the existing work programme and progressed in order of approval unless members have indicated higher priority.

3. Background

- 3.1 Members may formally request highway and traffic improvement works to be considered. These requests vary from minor traffic, road safety and parking initiatives and may include new pedestrian crossing facilities, traffic speed, road safety and residents parking schemes.
- 3.2 Officers receive and add all such requests to the “Members list” and report these back to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee. Any recommendations agreed will then become part of the work programme. Officers’ initial recommendations are based on limited findings of the investigation and/or the outcome of surveys/consultations where possible. If the Working Party/Cabinet Committee agree for items to be further investigated, updates will be presented to future Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee meetings for consideration and decision, as and when they become available.

- 3.3 The Committee is aware of the increasing workload resulting from “Members Requests”. This is a small team with limited financial and staffing resources to address all requests which require extensive investigations in most cases. As such there is a need to prioritise these on the basis of impact on safety, accessibility and traffic flows and programmed against the limited budget and staffing available to undertake necessary investigations to deliver these in the most efficient way.
- 3.4 It needs to be noted that once a formal conclusion has been reached on the individual items, to the agreement of the Traffic and Parking Working Group & the Cabinet Committee, these will be removed from the list and where appropriate, added to the work programme. In such cases, the Working Party and the Cabinet Committee is asked to agree future prioritisation of each of the items on the basis of impact on safety and accessibility.
- 3.5 Officers will update Members of the progress of their individual requests and will inform them of the findings, investigations, the recommendations and reasons thereof, as well as the decisions made by this Committee.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 To provide a rationalised and consistent management and decision-making process for all formal requests for highways and traffic management improvements by Ward Councillors via the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee.

6. Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Contribution to Council’s Vision & Corporate Priorities.

The Members Requests List is a mechanism for Ward Councillors to request issues within their wards which they believe may be a safety hazard and improving traffic flow contributes to a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

6.2 Financial Implications

Requests which are recommended for any action will be funded via existing budgetary resources. However, the resources are limited and the Working Party and the Cabinet Committee has an ongoing agreed priority programme based on its earlier decisions. Unless the Committee agrees to allocate a priority for the new requests, these will be added to the bottom of the list and undertaken subject to availability of financial and staffing resources.

6.3 Legal Implications

Where requests involve any requirement for a Traffic Regulation Order, the relevant statutory procedures will be followed including the requirement for formal consultation with affected frontagers’ and advertisement in the local press.

6.4 People Implications

There are limitations in staff time and an increase in Members' requests can place additional strain on limited resources which may lead to delays in investigations and reporting back to the Working Party and the Cabinet Sub Committee.

6.5 Property Implications

None

6.6 Consultation

Formal and informal consultation will be carried out, as required and directed by this Committee. In addition all ward councillors are to be informed of the consultation process prior to its commencement.

7. Background Papers

None

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1.

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS REQUESTS LIST FOR HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING SCHEMES

Note: Cabinet Committee in January 2016 agreed the following criterion for dealing with requests of waiting restrictions:-

Waiting Restrictions

These will only be considered if one of the following criteria is met;

- 1) Where a road safety problem has been identified by collision studies (3 Personal injury accidents in 3 years) and it is clear that an actual reduction in collisions may follow the introduction of such an Order.
- 2) Where evidence of the obstruction of the highway or visibility at junctions occurs on a frequent and severe basis, causing particular difficulties for emergency service vehicles and/or public transport.
- 3) Where commerce and industry are seriously affected by presence of parked vehicles.
- ≈ 4) Where the installation of TROs is essential to provide maximum benefit from capital investment.
- 5) On strategic routes and major distributors appropriate waiting and loading restrictions can be used to ensure that adequate road space is available for moving traffic waiting restrictions will not be provided for individual private accesses in isolation.
- 6) Cost of schemes and likely savings through accident reduction need to be part of priority consideration.
- 7) Waiting restrictions are not to be provided for protecting private accesses or in isolated areas where resulting displaced parking is likely

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/07	June 15	Cllr Salter	Consider pedestrian crossing Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive.	<p>To be investigated when resources allow during financial year 2016/17.</p> <p>Member concern at suggested location due to loss of parking, Ward Members to identify alternative location. Officers to arrange when current work programme allows.</p> <p>Further Member contact requesting pedestrian refuges be considered.</p> <p>Area surveyed July 2017. Due to the presence of numerous driveways and the width of carriageway, pedestrian refuges are not considered a viable option.</p>

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
16/01	Feb 16	Cllr Buckley	Rochford Road Service Road. Propose restrictions to deter parking.	<p>Parking is believed to be related to the airport and preventing parking in an isolated area will merely displace these vehicles.</p> <p>Agreed as below.</p> <p>That request reference 16/01 for the introduction of waiting restrictions or a parking management scheme to deter airport parking in Rochford Road service road, be retained on the list and that officers arrange a meeting with Ward Councillors and appropriate representatives of the airport to discuss the wider issue of airport parking.</p> <p>Update: there is no provision within the Airport Surface Access Strategy for funding towards parking controls as the Airport regularly monitor passenger transport modes and report 29% of passengers arrive by public transport.</p> <p>Officers are aware of increased residents parking issues. Suggest ward Members consult the wider area as to parking issues with a view to considering permit parking controls. Officers can assist with defining an appropriate area and analysing results.</p>

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
16/04	May 16	Cllr Courtney	Harden verges Silversea Drive	<p>Agreed as below</p> <p>Ward Councillors be requested to undertake consultation with residents in accordance with the verge hardening policy.</p> <p>Cllr Courtenay is undertaking a consultation with residents and the results will be reported to a future meeting. The estimated costs for this work are £40,000. Members are requested to note that this work would require a number of verge areas to be maintained due to trees and, lamp columns and driveways therefore minimal additional parking will be created. No further update received.</p>
16/07 30	May 16	Cllr Hadley	Campfield Road. Propose waiting restrictions on bend by Cumberland Packaging	<p>Agreed to maintain on the list.</p> <p>Officers advise that waiting restrictions will not prevent the practice of vehicles waiting to enter the businesses.</p> <p>A Ward Member has offered to informally discuss the issue with the associated businesses to attempt a resolution.</p> <p>No feedback from Councillor prior to report being finalised</p>
17/02	Cllr Walker	Oct 16	Harden verges, Mansell Close	<p>Estimated costs of works £12,000.</p> <p>Pending outcome of consultation with residents by Ward members. No further information received prior to report being finalised.</p>

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/03	Cllr Byford	March 17	Introduce parking restrictions, Benvenue Avenue on the west side at peak school times.	Does not meet criteria. Narrow road and parking is present during the busy school times however restrictions will move parking to adjacent streets which have footpath access to the school. Suggest no action at this time and ward Members consider the impact on the wider area.
17/04 31	Cllrs Davison and Garston	June 2017	Request verge hardening in Bridgwater Drive between Mannering Gardens and Southbourne Grove	Does not meet criteria as the large majority of the properties have off-street parking provision. There is a concern that by moving vehicles partially onto the verge, excessive speeds may result due to wider carriageway. Works being undertaken on design and estimate. To be updated.
17/05	Cllr Hadley	July 2017	Wakering Avenue junction with Elm Road, extend existing waiting restrictions	Does not meet criteria. Junction currently protected with 10 metres of waiting restrictions. No accident history. Recommend no action.
17/06	Cllr Jarvis	July 2017	Provide waiting restrictions in Teigngrace to deter residents from neighbouring street parking	Does not meet criteria. No traffic flow or safety issues identified. Officers have also received comments from neighbours expressing concern at rumour of parking controls therefore any proposal would attract objections. Recommend no action.

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/07	Cllr Van Looy	July 2017	Provide disabled parking bay near to doctors surgery, Southchurch Boulevard	Private car park available to sides of surgery. Recommend no action to prevent numerous requests from other local GP/Clinics.
17/08	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Shaftesbury Avenue southern kerblin junction with Warwick Road – extend junction protection by 40m to cover bend	Does not meet criteria. Parking restrictions removed in February 2017 following a petition signed by the majority of residents. No safety or traffic flow issues evidenced and significant objections likely from those residents who successfully petitioned removal of the restrictions to accommodate their parking needs. Recommend no action.
17/09 32	Cllr Aylen	July 2017	Remove buildouts on London Road between Eastwood Road and Station Road and remove centre line to increase road width	The build outs were constructed to narrow the road for the dual purpose of providing crossing points for pedestrians and to narrow the road to reduce speeds and high levels of accidents. Build outs provide additional visibility for drivers exiting junctions. Recommend no action due to no benefit likely to be provided for considerable costs and potential increase in accidents.

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/10	Cllr Aylen	July 2017	Convert the crossing point in Eastwood Road at junction with Greenway to zebra crossing	Would require assessment = 2 officers for 12 hours to measure traffic and pedestrians at next assessment in March 2018. Recommend no further action at this time
17/11	Cllr Walker	July 2017	The Rodings to extend yellow lines around the bend	Does not meet criteria. This request was rejected by this Committee in September 2015. The road is a small residential cul de sac with no accident history. Recommend no action.
17/12 CS	Cllr Walker	July 2017	Eastwood Park Drive – Provide double yellow lines at junction with Rayleigh Road	Does not meet criteria. Junction currently protected with 12 metres of restrictions in Eastwood Park Drive and 15 metres at the western junction of Rayleigh Road. The eastern junction is subject to a continuous length of waiting restrictions. Recommend no action
17/13	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Colbert Avenue – extend double yellow lines at junctions of Warwick Rd, Clieveden Rd, Walton Rd, Lynton Rd and Burges Terrace.	Does not meet criteria. Junctions currently protected for a distance of 10 metres in accordance with the highway code and the practice of this Committee. Standard junction designs with no particular features which would require additional restrictions. 1 accident recorded at junction with Warwick Road with vehicle failing to give way to a cyclist. Recommend no action

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/14	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Tyrone Road – amend restrictions between Fermoy Rd and Johnstone Rd which currently prohibit parking between 2pm and 3pm – proposed no waiting 11-Midday Mon-Fri	Resubmission of previous request considered with the preceding two years. The proposal was advertised and following consideration of significant levels of objections on 9 th January 2017, the Committee decided to not progress the proposal. The doctors surgery have also presented a petition signed by 3000 patients and supporters of the surgery to retain the existing restrictions and times. Recommend no action.
17/15 34	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Tyrone Road western side between 91 to junction with Fermoy Road. Fermoy Road - Thorpe Hall Ave junct to 51 Fermoy Rd – proposed 9am – 5pm 1 hr no return in 4 hrs Mon-Fri and no waiting of double yellow lines at junction with Fermoy road and no loading at any time Tyrone Road at junction with Fermoy road	Request to accommodate request 17/21 recommended for no further action.
17/16	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	The Broadway extension of single yellow line both sides of road from Johnstone Rd to Burges Rd – 11am to 12 midday	Does not meet criteria. The Committee has agreed to not consider waiting restrictions in isolated areas to prevent a piecemeal approach to parking controls. No traffic flow or safety issues. Recommend no further action.

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/17	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Fermoy/St James Avenue junction extend yellow lines to extend over pvx of 125 St James Avenue (pvx is in Fermoy	Does not meet criteria. Purpose of request is to protect a private access contrary to the agreed policy and practice adopted by this Committee. An officer met with the resident and advised this was the case. The driveway is of an adequate width to allow for safe entry and exit with required due care. Recommend no action
17/18 35	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	Colbert Avenue – extend double yellow lines at junctions of Warwick Rd, Clieveden Rd, Walton Rd, Lynton Rd and Burges Terrace	Does not meet criteria. Junctions currently protected for a distance of 10 metres in accordance with the highway code. Standard junction designs with no particular features which would require additional restrictions. 1 accident recorded at junction with Warwick Road with vehicle failing to give way to a cyclist. Recommend no action
17/23	Cllr Woodley	July 2017	The Broadway extension of single yellow line both sides of road from Johnstone Rd to Burges Rd – 11am to 12 midday	Does not meet criteria. The Committee has agreed to not consider waiting restrictions in isolated areas to prevent a piecemeal approach to parking controls. No traffic flow or safety issues. Recommend no further action.

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/24	Cllr Jarvis	July 2017	Teigngrace - introduction of waiting restrictions	Does not meet criteria. No traffic flow or safety issues as, this is residential street with no external parking pressures. The complaint appears to be regarding residents from a neighbouring street parking in the road. Proposing restrictions would merely concentrate parking in adjacent streets. The Committee has agreed to not consider waiting restrictions in isolated areas to prevent a piecemeal approach to parking controls. Recommend no action.
17/25 36	Cllr Bright	July 2017	Provide pedestrian crossing, Liftsan Way near to Apollo Drive.	The site was assessed on 18 th July 2017 from 7am to 7pm. For a crossing to be justified, the levels of pedestrian crossing at, and within, 50 metres of the requested location is monitored along with traffic flows. The final measure consists of an average figure from the busiest four hours of the survey. The pedestrian figures are multiplied by the traffic flow figures and any location which totals 1 is considered as appropriate for a crossing facility. The average figure achieved at this location is 0.15 which is well below the recommended threshold. Pedestrians crossing at the location were not waiting to cross for overly long periods as the signalised junction at Southchurch Road provides sufficient breaks in traffic flow to enable crossing.

				Recommend no further action.
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/26 38	Cllr Woodley	August 2017	Colbert Avenue north side. Provide waiting restriction 9am to 6pm April to October.	<p>Residents were consulted in February 2016 as to waiting restrictions prohibiting parking at any time and no consensus was reached with objections not being submitted to this Committee. Concerns that by advertising restrictions, residents may be unclear as to complete proposals. The statutory requirements would require all unresolved objections to previously advertised restrictions being considered by this Committee and a formal decision taken with residents being appropriately informed. Any subsequent proposals, if agreed by this committee could then be progressed.</p> <p>There is however, serious concerns that residents have no majority view as to any parking controls and further resources and advertising will result in further annoyance to residents. The request does not meet the recommended criteria with no safety or traffic issues evidenced.</p> <p>Recommend no further action.</p>

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
16/11 39	August 2016	Cllr Woodley	Colbert Avenue. Propose waiting restrictions on west of church.	<i>Agreed to maintain on list</i> Does not meet criteria. No accidents recorded at or near to the location. It is considered that parking at the location is likely acting as a speed reduction feature. However concerns have been expressed by ward Councillors, the church and residents to deal with parking at the bend which is perceived to be dangerous. If agreed to consult, it is proposed ward councillors consult local residents for a consensus approach as previous efforts in this regard have been inconclusive. Meeting held with Members and residents on 16/3/17. No consensus from residents. Please see request 17/26 above as this is related to the same street. Recommend no further action.
17/27	Cllr Arscott	August 2017	Amend traffic flows in Chalkwell Park Drive to one-way	Survey of residents indicates support for the proposal – figures to be added with estimated costs.

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/28	Cllr Stafford	UPDATE OF PREVIOUS REQUEST	Propose alternative pedestrian facility following assessment for pedestrian crossing, Station Road.	<p>Original request rejected due to low levels of activity at the proposed location. Officers have investigated the provision of a pedestrian refuge to enable crossing the road in two stages however due to the limited width of carriageway and the high probability that pedestrians using the refuge would be using mobility aids, the refuge is not viable.</p> <p>The refuge would be of inadequate width to fully accommodate these pedestrians without increasing the likelihood of being struck by passing vehicles and any refuge would require road widening.</p> <p>Further concerns of vehicle movements being affected at nearby junction.</p> <p>Findings supported by independent Road Safety Audit</p> <p>Recommend no further action.</p>

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/29	Cllr Aylen	UPDATE OF PREVIOUS REQUEST	Belfairs Park Drive, propose waiting restrictions.	Members considered the request in March 2017 and following lengthy debate relating to the Councillors request to propose waiting restrictions in certain sections of the street, The Committee decided that the whole street should be included in any proposal to avoid displaced parking and potential future requests to deal with the unrestricted areas. The decision included the requirement that ward Members be consulted prior to the proposal being advertised. In accordance with the decision, officers contacted ward Members and in response, Councillor Aylen again requested that only parts of the street were included in the proposal. Officers reminded the Member of the Committee decision however no agreement was reached and no further action was taken. Officers have recently attempted to resolve the issue and in August 2017, ward Members were contacted and agreement reached to proceed with an advertisement for waiting restrictions in the entire road.
17/30	Cllrs Bright and Holland	August 2017	Provide limited waiting parking restrictions Southchurch Boulevard adjacent to church to deter all day parking by coaches.	There has not been sufficient time to monitor the parking prior to this report being finalised. Recommend officers monitor the parking and if action is required, progress proposals.

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

7

Report of Corporate of Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**
On
14th September 2017

Report prepared by:
Peter Geraghty- Director of Planning and Transport

**Petition Regarding Amending Traffic Flow
Hadleigh Road (southern section) Leigh on Sea
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received from residents of Hadleigh Road with 24 signatories requesting the current two-way traffic flow in the section between Leigh Park Road to New Road be amended to one-way in a southerly direction.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- (i) **Note the petition and thank the residents for taking the time to compile the petition ; and,**
- (ii) **Note officer's comments in paragraph 3.5 and agree to take no further action at this time.**

3. Background

- 3.1 This request was considered by this Committee on 2nd January 2014 and rejected by Members. The minute below refers to the decision;

That no further action be taken in respect of the introduction of the one-way traffic flow at this time but that residents be requested to identify the problems being experienced in this section of road and that Officers, in consultation with Ward Councillors, explore possible options and any appropriate measures to address their concerns.

- 3.2 No further information was received by ward Councillors and the petition presented provides no information as the rationale for the change since it was considered back in 2014. A ny benefit resulting from the change is not readily apparent.
- 3.3 The section of Hadleigh Road between Leigh Park Road and New Road (southern section) is mainly for residential traffic as this is currently subject to a through traffic vehicle prohibition. This type of restriction is generally designed to only allow access to premises such as residents, their visitors and service

vehicles. As it is a moving traffic restriction, the prohibition is currently only enforceable by the Police.

- 3.4 Officers have undertaken a number of investigations to examine the residents' requests and to see if there are any technical and justifiable reasons for changing the existing arrangements. The summary of our investigations is as follows:-
- a) The accident history of this section of road shows no personal injury accidents occurring in the preceding 10 years.
 - b) Surveys have been undertaken to monitor vehicle movement over an 8 day period. These show a total of 1754 vehicles comprising of 6 trucks, 27 cycles/motorcycles and 1715. This equates to an average vehicle flow of 219 vehicles per day, equating to approximately 9 vehicles per hour.
 - c) The current average speed travelled in both directions is 13mph with no vehicles exceeding the speed limit of 30mph.
 - d) There is currently junction protection marking.
 - e) The layout of the road particularly at the north end at its junction with Leigh Park Road is quite narrow and acts as a visible deterrent for any through traffic. This is reflected in the low level of traffic movements along this road.
 - f) Unrestricted parking is available on both sides of the street
- 3.5 Members are asked to note that Hadleigh Road is a residential street and based on the current level of traffic movements, (9 vehicles per hour), it can be said that this is substantially used for local access. Whilst a one-way system is an option, based on the outcome of investigations there is limited justification for any change particularly on road safety and traffic grounds.
- 3.6 A one way system may lead to inconvenience for residents travelling north who will have to negotiate New Road which will add to their journey. Members are also aware of the budgetary resources available for the work programme and due these limited resources, our focus is primarily on projects which have justifiable need based on statistical evidence in terms of impact on reducing accidents or improve the traffic network.
- 3.7 Although the petitioners have not given any details of their reasons for seeking this change, reports from Ward Councillors in relation to the petition presented relate to commuter parking concerns. Making a road one-way for this reason is only beneficial if, for example, the road is too narrow to accommodate vehicles while providing parking on both sides of the street.
- 3.8. As the road is not subject to parking restrictions, this rationale is not justified and given the low level of vehicle movements, very low average speeds and lack of accidents, no further action is recommended.
- 3.9 It is further recommended that if residents feel commuter parking is an issue, the local ward Councillors discuss a way forward in accordance with the agreed policy related to the introduction of parking controls on an area wide basis, noting the criteria that parking controls should not be introduced into isolated streets.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Other options that may be considered are to agree to the petitioners' request. However as this report sets out, the benefits resulting from this proposal are minimal due to very limited traffic flows. There is no justification or rationale on road safety or traffic flow grounds for any change. The limited resources are prioritised on projects that reduce accidents, manage parking to maximise availability and improve traffic flow on the highway network.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To reflect the outcome of the investigations and ensuring best use of limited resources on justifiable projects that lead to better return on investment.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 Local Transport and Implementation Plan, Safe and Prosperous.

6.2 Financial Implications

- 6.2.1 There are no financial implications if the recommendation is agreed.

6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 None.

6.4 People Implications

- 6.4.1 None.

6.5 Property Implications

- 6.5.1 None.

6.6 Consultation

- 6.6.1 None.

6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 6.7.1 The prioritisation of the Councils' Working Party's programme is on the basis of reducing accidents or improving traffic flows. 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 None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 N/A

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 The prioritisation of the Councils' Working Party's programme is on the basis of reducing accidents or improving traffic flows and takes into account the implications for community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None

7. Background Papers

None

8. Appendices

None

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
14th September 2017

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director of Planning and Transport

Agenda
Item No.

8

**Osborne Road and Windsor Road
Request to Mend Traffic Flows to One-Way
Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony Cox
*A Part 1- Agenda Item***

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee to consider a petition presented by Councillor David Norman M.B.E. on behalf of residents in Osborne Road and Windsor Road requesting the traffic flow be amended to one-way traffic. The petition contains 30 signatories.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:-
- i) **Note the contents of the report and Officers observations.**
 - ii) **Agree to advertise proposals to amend the traffic flow to one-way.**
 - iii) **Agree to advertise the revocation of any waiting restrictions which can be removed.**
 - iv) **Agree that the Orders be confirmed if no objections are received in response to the advertised proposals.**
 - v) **Note that any unresolved objections will be referred to a future meeting for consideration.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Osborne Road and Windsor Road are subject to a waiting restrictions which prohibits parking from 9am to 6pm alternating between each side of the road on alternate months.
- 3.2 The roads are small residential streets running east/west between Hamlet Court Road and Balmoral Road with the majority of traffic being local residential.
- 3.3 There are very limited numbers of properties with adequate frontage to accommodate off street parking and residents rely on being able to park on the street.

- 3.4 Amending the traffic flow to one-way will allow for parking to be available at any time on both sides of the roads.
- 3.4 While it is evidenced that streets with one-way traffic flow tend to encourage higher speeds, the length of each road is under 150 metres and with parking present on both sides of each road visually limiting the road width, it is not considered that increased speeds will be encouraged.
- 3.5 Amending the traffic flow to one-way traffic works well when adjacent roads are treated similarly creating complementary one-way streets.
- 3.6 The accident history of both roads during the past three years has been investigated and one personal injury accident has been recorded in Windsor Road at the junction of Hamlet Court Road. The accident is attributed to a failure for a vehicle to give way to oncoming traffic and therefore unrelated to the existing traffic flow.
- 3.7. The request meets the agreed criteria for considering one-way streets as set out in the policy as agreed by this Committee on 4th January 2016.
- 3.8 Members are therefore requested to agree to the recommendation to advertise the required proposals to amend the traffic flows and revoke existing waiting restrictions.
- 3.9 If approved, the work will be added to the work programme and progressed in date of approval order.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 To reflect residents views and create additional on street parking capacity.

5. Corporate Implications

- 5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

Any parking controls are designed to address road safety, traffic flows and unnecessary repeated vehicle movements which contributes to a safer and healthier Southend.

5.2 Financial Implications

All costs for progressing the proposals are to be met through the existing budgets allocated to Network management and Parking.

5.3 Legal Implications

Any request to introduce or amend a Traffic Regulation Order requires the relevant statutory procedures to be followed including the requirement for formal consultation with affected frontagers' and advertisement in the local press.

5.4 People Implications

The proposals will be progressed by existing resources within the Traffic Management Team.

5.5 Property Implications

None

5.6 Consultation

Formal consultation is required to be undertaken as part of the Traffic regulation Order process however a number of residents are supportive of the proposals as demonstrated in the petition.

6. Background Papers

Policies, Process and Procedures for Traffic and Parking Investigations 4th January 2016.

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – plan of the affected roads.

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

9

Report of Corporate of Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**

On
14th September 2017

Report prepared by:
Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

Petition for 20mph speed limit – Southsea Avenue
Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition from residents of Southsea Avenue requesting a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- a) **Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**
- b) **Agree to take no further action at this time on the basis in accordance with the findings of the In-depth Place Scrutiny Report 2016, the low average speeds of vehicles using the road and the agreed process for the consideration of speed reduction measures as set out in the Traffic and Parking Working Party Recommendations, January 2016.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Ward Councillors have leafleted the road and 41 forms expressing support for reduction in the speed limit have been submitted. There are 140 properties in the road representing a 30% response.
- 3.2 Southsea Avenue is a residential street running north/south between London Road and Rectory Grove, the road is approximately 630 metres in length and subject to two way traffic.
- 3.3 Speed monitoring equipment was installed in the road and continually monitored vehicles speeds between 8th and 17th August 2017.
- 3.4 The results indicate the average speed of vehicles was 26 mph. Two percent of vehicles were travelling in excess of the 30mph speed limit and 0.68% were travelling at speeds enforceable by the Police (35mph or above).

- 3.5 The accident history for the road has been inspected and 1 accident is recorded from in 2016, sadly resulting in fatalities and involving an underage driver with no licence or insurance believed to be trying to evade the Police in the early hours of the morning.
- 3.6 Members may recall the In-Depth Scrutiny Project for 2016 focussed on researching the potential to introduce a 20mph speed limit in residential streets. The report recommended;
- 19.1 *That Cabinet be recommended:*
(i) To note the outcome of the study;
(ii) To wait until the results of the study by the DfT are published before considering undertaking any consultation on the introduction of a Borough wide 20mph speed restriction in all residential streets;
(iii) To work with SERP and other agencies to reduce death and serious injury on roads in Southend;
(iv) To consider the introduction and prioritisation of 20mph schemes, including the use of variable speed limits within the Borough where and when necessary, particularly around local schools and other appropriate locations; and
(v) To write to the Secretary of State for Transport to suggest that they consider the merits of reducing the default urban speed limit in roads with street lighting be reduced from 30mph to 20mph.
- 3.7 The recommendation to take no further action at this time is based on the low average speeds, the lack of data to indicate speeding is a factor in the cause of 3 or more accidents and the outcome of the In-depth scrutiny project.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 To proceed with implementing a 20mph speed limit the costs of which, would need to be met through existing budgets. It should be noted that introducing a speed limit of 20mph is not generally supported by the Police who would be responsible for any enforcement activity.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To reflect the low incidence of excessive speeds evidenced and general lack of support indicated.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

- 6.1.1 While no action is recommended in this street, the monitoring of speed and accident information contributes to a Safe and Healthy Southend.

6.2 Financial Implications

- 6.2.1 None.

6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 None.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 None.

6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None.

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 None.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 None.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 None.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 None as no safety issues are evident.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None.

7. **Background Papers**

7.1 None.

8. **Appendices**

8.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

10

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
14th September 2017

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

Bailey Road Area - Permit Parking Proposal

Executive Councillor: Cllr Tony Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider the results of a consultation led by residents in the Baily Road area.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the results presented and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:**

(a) Agree to a proposal for a Permit Parking Area to be introduced in the Bailey Road area as based on the streets consulted with the addition of Barnard Road and Eaton Road.

(b) Authorise the advertisement of the proposals and further authorise that in the event of there being no unresolved objections, confirm the Order as necessary and undertake the works.

(c) Note that any unresolved objections will be referred to a future meeting for consideration.

2. Background

- 3.1 Local residents and the ward Councillors expressed concerns over an increased level of parking around the streets detailed in **Appendix 1** to this report and sought advice as to how parking controls could be progressed.
- 3.2 Officers provided information on the level of support required and questions residents should be asked and offered to analyse all results received.
- 3.3 Residents have delivered a questionnaire within the affected area and received responses equating to 46% of those asked. After analysis, the results show 75% of residents responding are in support of parking controls.
- 3.4 As the level of support has reached the set criteria, officers recommend the proposals be formally advertised, but to include Barnard Road and Eaton Road to contain controls within a discreet geographic area. Officers recommend this approach as advertising proposals to include potential

additional streets at this stage allows for flexibility. In the event the additional streets are not in support of proposals, it is simple and cost effective to exclude these from the final proposed areas rather than add them at a later stage.

- 3.5 If agreed, any works will be added to the work programme and progressed in date order according to the date of approval.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The proposals aim to improve the parking opportunity for residents of the local area leading to improved management of parking.

5 Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities.

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking is managed to the maximum benefit while also providing areas of waiting restrictions to maintain clear areas at junctions is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 Costs for progression of the works if approved can be met from existing budgets.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 Works required to progress the proposals and any resulting works will be undertaken by existing staff resources.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

- 5.6.1 This report provides details of the outcome of the informal consultation process and seeks approval to undertake the statutory consultation.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.7.1 Any implications will be taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The proposals will be designed to improve the operation of the parking scheme while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

- 5.9.1 Works associated with the proposal will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

- 5.10.1 The proposals if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

5.11 Environmental Impact

- 5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing the Traffic Regulation Orders.

6. Background Papers

- 6.1 None

7. Appendices

- 7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of affected streets and results of the informal consultation.

Appendix 1

Details of streets consulted and responses

Road	No of Properties	No. returned	Percentage returned	No in support	No. opposed	Percentage in support
Bailey Road *	33	18	55	13	5 opposed	72
Gordon Road	29	9	31	8	1 said don't know	89
Henry Drive	16	9	56	3	4 opposed + 2 said don't know	33
Olive Avenue	18	7	39	4	3 opposed	57
Stirling Avenue	33	22	68	18	3 opposed + 1 said don't know	82
Sydney Road	41	13	32	13	0	100
Total	170	78	46%	59	19 opposed	75%

*not including Musset House

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

11

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
14th September 2017

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director of Planning and Transport

Station Avenue Permit Parking Area
Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony Cox
A Part 1- Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee to consider objections relating to the implementation of a Permit Parking Area in Station Avenue and East Street Southend on Sea.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:-

- i) **Note the contents of the report and Officers observations.**
- ii) **Agree to take no further action.**
- iii) **Further agree that in accordance with the adopted policy and practice of the Traffic and Parking Working Party, no further consideration as to permit parking controls are considered in the area within two years.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Following the advertisement of a proposal to introduce a Permit Parking Area in Station Avenue Southend on Sea, on 3rd November 2016, Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee considered a number of objections received from residents.
- 3.2 The majority of objections related to the eligibility criteria for the purchase of parking permits. Residents of Priory Mews objected on the basis that they should be entitled to purchase parking permits as bona-fide residents of Station Avenue. Further objections from residents of East Street were also received and related to the desire to have a section of East Street included within the proposals.
- 3.3 Officers advised that as Priory Mews was not a new development and had an allocated address and postcode in Station Avenue, resident of this property

could not be excluded from purchasing parking permits to park on the public highway.

- 3.4 Local ward Members raised the fact that Priory Mews had off street parking provision and as such, residents should not be able to purchase any parking permits.
- 3.5 Further debate relating to the issue resulted in the recommendation as minuted below

The Cabinet Committee noted the recommendation of the Traffic & Parking Working Party regarding the proposed introduction of a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions in Station Avenue to proceed as advertised. It also noted that the postal address of Priory Mews was registered in Station Avenue and that the property provided one off-street parking space per apartment with no availability for visitor parking or to accommodate additional vehicles. The Cabinet Committee therefore concluded that, on the basis that there was currently no policy in place to exclude existing premises from purchasing resident permits or visitor vouchers where off-street parking was available to them, it could not justify the Working Party's recommendation. Consideration should be given to consulting the residents of Priory Mews on its inclusion in the proposed scheme and their eligibility to purchase permits. Re-advertisement would also enable the residents of East Street to be consulted to ensure that the scheme addressed all the parking issues in the area.

Resolved:

- 1. That the report be noted.*
- 2. That the recommendation of the Traffic & Parking Working Party regarding the introduction of a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions in Station Avenue be noted but not progressed and the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order for the introduction of a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions in Station Avenue to include the residents of Priory Mews and East Street.*
- 3.6 A revised Permit Parking Area proposal including the ability of Priory Mews residents to purchase permits was subsequently advertised on 24th May 2017 and resulted in the objections detailed in **Appendix 1** to this report being received.
- 3.7 The objections are related to the eligibility criteria which allows residents of Priory Mews to purchase permits. (ie the opposite reason for the previous objections).
- 3.8 Due to the nature of the objections, the situation is now impossible to resolve. The revised proposal reflected the objections previously received to the original proposal therefore, further amendment to reflect the views expressed to the revised proposal will merely result in the original objections being received again therefore the recommendation is for no further action to be taken in relation to permit parking proposals in the area.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 To reflect the previous decision taken by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee related to the exclusion of established properties within a street from eligibility to purchase parking permits and reflect the outcome of the consultation on the revised proposals.

5. Other Options

- 5.1 Re-advertise the proposal excluding any property with off-street parking availability whether flats, houses in multiple occupation or individual houses. This would however create additional costs and resources to amend the Traffic Regulation Order on every occasion that an individual property created off-street parking provision.

6. Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

Any parking controls are designed to consider road safety, traffic flows and unnecessary repeated vehicle movements which contributes to a safer and healthier Southend.

6.2 Financial Implications

None if the recommendation is agreed. Considerable costs have resulted from completing the required consultations which consists of;

Officer time to progress the proposal and related advertising costs. Officer time to progress the further proposal and related advertising costs.

6.3 Legal Implications

Any request to introduce or amend a Traffic Regulation Order requires the relevant statutory procedures to be followed including the requirement for formal consultation with affected frontagers' and advertisement in the local press.

6.4 People Implications

None if the recommendation is agreed however considerable staff time has been utilised in managing this project since 2015.

6.5 Property Implications

None

6.6 Consultation

Formal and informal consultation has been undertaken resulting in the recommendation.

7. Background Papers

Minutes of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee meeting 3rd November 2016.

8. Appendices

Appendix 1 – details of objections and officer comments.

Appendix 1 Details of representations received and Officer Observations Station Avenue Area Residents Permit Parking Scheme

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Station Avenue Residents Permit Parking Scheme	Members	Introduce residents permit parking Monday to Saturday 10am to 6pm in Station Avenue and East Street	<p>56 letters have been received but duplicated from 32 individual addresses in Station Avenue, mostly in the form of a standard photocopied letter, objecting to the inclusion of Priory Mews on the grounds that it is undemocratic, it already has its own parking area and if included will continue to cause parking difficulties for residents.</p> <p>1 letter has objected on the grounds that if implemented there will not be enough spaces for residents.</p> <p>4 comments have been received from Priory Mews questioning whether their private car park area is included in the scheme.</p>	<p>Please see main report for comments relating to permit eligibility.</p> <p>Parking permit controls are generally implemented in areas where parking is limited and are designed to give residents priority over the available parking. The issue of insufficient parking for residents vehicles is not possible to resolve unless permits are limited to 1 or two per property which is an option.</p> <p>Private car parks are not included in the scheme area as the local authority can only introduce parking controls on public highway, council owned land or private land with the permission of the landowner.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

**Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
Traffic & Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee
on
14th September 2017**

Agenda
Item No.

12

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

**Requests for Waiting Restrictions
Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony Cox
*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/traffic Regulation Orders 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 proposal will be added to the existing work programme and 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 policy criterion agreed criteria by the Cabinet Committee in January 2016.

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. If agreed, the proposals for parking controls in managed housing areas will be funded by South Essex Homes.

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**

None

8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – List of requests and comments

APPENDIX 1 – TRO CHANGES/WAITING RESTRICTIONS REQUESTS

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Coleman Street car park	Introduce permit controls to prevent non-resident parking	SE Homes	NA	This car park provides resident parking for residents in Pennine, Malvern and Grampian blocks and suffers from non-resident parking which prevents residents and their visitors from using the area. Recommend to advertise the proposal
North Road Car Park	Introduce permit controls to prevent non-resident parking	SE Homes	NA	This car park provides resident parking for residents in Balmoral, Brecon and Blackdown blocks and suffers from non-resident parking which prevents residents and their visitors from using the area. Recommend to advertise the proposal.
Shoebury Road	Install waiting restrictions on the bend	Resident	Does not meet criteria	The issue appears to be an attempt to control pavement parking as vehicles park partially on the footway. Impeding the resident's mobility scooter. The request does not meet the criteria and several options are currently under investigation with regard to enforcement controls for pavement parking. No accidents have been recorded and parking at the location does appear to reduce the speeds of traffic negotiating the bend therefore it is possible that removing parking could increase the potential for vehicles to drive at inappropriate speeds on the bend and accidents could occur. Recommend no further action pending borough wide solution to pavement parking.
Cliffs Pavilion car park	Amend current parking arrangements to pay and display	Cliffs Pavilion Management	Not applicable	The Theatre is experiencing non-customer parking in the car park with some vehicles being left for extended periods. The parking provision is limited and this is affecting customers ability to use the car park. Following discussions with the management company, the preferred option is to introduce pay and display parking with customers being able to receive a refund of any parking fee over £1.50 when dining or using the theatre. This will be managed by the Theatre. Recommend to advertise proposals.

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Western Esplanade near to Pier Lift	Provide part time loading bay	Businesses	NA	The area is adjacent to a signal controlled crossing sited near to the Pier Lift. The zig zag area was temporarily reduced on the leaving side of the crossing (ie where no visibility is required) to accommodate development of a vacant unit however loading provision near to the new unit would also assist nearby businesses. Recommend to advertise proposals to provide a loading only facility from 7am to 9am reverting to pay and display parking from 10am to 6pm.
Percy Road	Provide permit parking controls	Residents	Meets the criteria adopted January 2016 excluding the criteria that restrictions be provided on an area wide basis	Residents of Percy Road have undertaken a consultation to assess support for permit parking controls. The required levels of responses and support has been evidenced however the request is to deal with this road in isolation which is contrary to the adopted criteria. The location is near to school (see plan at Appendix 2) and it may be advisable to consider controls in the adjacent roads which are subject to parking pressures at times. Recommend officers discuss a way forward with ward Members to assess the level of issues in the area.
Civic Centre Service Road	Provide parking bay for fleet vehicles	Officers	NA	The area to the rear of the Civic Centre is heavily used for deliveries, taxi inspections, short term parking and disabled parking. The remaining area is subject to a prohibition of parking at any time however loading and unloading is permitted. A number of services use our internal delivery service meaning fleet vehicles are often visiting the Civic Centre to collect and deliver documents to and from schools and satellite offices. The fleet vehicles can be parked for up to one hour while visiting the various departments. In order to accommodate this, an area of waiting restriction requires removal and replacing with a dedicated fleet vehicle parking bay. Recommend advertise the proposal.

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Ness Road, from existing pay and display parking bays to Freemantle	Provide limited waiting parking controls	Members	NA	A number of these bays are shortly to be converted to pay and display parking, the remainder are currently unrestricted and vehicles are parked long term displayed for sale. Providing limited waiting restrictions will prevent this practice. Recommend to advertise the proposals.
High Street Southend	Introduce appropriate prohibitions on vehicles to enable enforcement by our contractor	Officers	NA	While the High Street is a pedestrian zone, vehicles do require entry to the area for servicing the businesses, installing market stall etc. Rising bollards protect the main access points however, if these fail to rise, the area is open for vehicles. A number of solutions are being explored however, a Traffic Regulation Order would allow for action if vehicles gain access. This would be timed to allow adequate servicing provision for the businesses while ensuring no vehicles are using the area during the main shopping hours when pedestrian activity is very high. Recommend to advertise proposals.

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place) To Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee

On
14 September 2017

Report prepared by Peter Geraghty
Director of Planning & Transport

Agenda
Item No

13

Deployment of Fixed Safety Cameras Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To seek Members' views on the approach to the deployment of safety cameras in the Borough.

2. Recommendation

That Members consider the report and decide whether to install a fixed safety camera.

3. Background

- 3.1 A request has been made for a safety camera on the west bound carriageway of Eastern Avenue (A1159) close to the roundabout at Sutton Road (outside No. 38 Eastern Avenue). This request was made by Ward Councillors Van Looy and Ayling on behalf of a local resident who claimed there was anti-social behaviour from drivers.
- 3.2 Officers investigated the matter and found that the proposed location did not meet the criteria set out by the Safer Essex Roads Partnership (of which Southend is a member). The criteria are as follows:
- Site length: Between 400m and 1500m – This is the length of road that can be used for criteria 2 & 3 below.
 - Collisions: A collision severity score is calculated by the formula = 5 x [number of fatal or serious collisions] + [number of slight-injury collisions]. The score for the 36 month baseline period must be 20 points or more per kilometre for built up areas. None built up 16 points per kilometre.
 - Traffic speed: Speed survey data showing that the free-flow 85th percentile speed is at or above the enforcement threshold in built-up areas, or 5mph over the maximum speed limit in non-built up areas (35mph). In other words, at least 15% of vehicles at the site are going fast enough above the speed limit to be prosecuted for a speeding offence.

- 3.3 The police did not support the installation of a permanent camera as it did not meet the criteria. Mobile speed cameras were deployed in July 2016 by the Police for several months. They also installed with the support of the Council fixed ANPR cameras in Eastern Avenue. The ANPR cameras were installed to enable the Police to record footage of vehicles to support where best to deploy the mobile speed cameras. These cameras build a picture of driver behaviour; for example, a vehicle that is having multiple hits during a short period of time is probably demonstrating anti-social or illegal behaviour. The system allows the Police to check the registration details against a database which also checks insurance MOT and Car Tax. They are in addition to mobile speed enforcement.
- 3.4 Officers advised the Ward Members that the suggested location outside No 38 Easter Avenue did not meet the criteria. Following a meeting on site officers suggested an alternative solution by installing rumble strips to influence driver behaviour and reduce speed. This was rejected by the ward Members.
- 3.5 A safety audit was then carried out of alternative locations and one at Bournemouth Park Road was assessed. Whilst this met two of the criteria by staggering the speed check markings which of itself is unusual (see details of the audit attached). This location still does not meet the speed criteria for intervention.
- 3.6 Whilst the Safer Essex Roads Partnership would progress with an order to install the camera it would be at the expense of the Council. The estimated cost of installing the camera would be almost £28,000. There is no budget for installing safety cameras.
- 3.7 This throws up a number of issues on which Traffic and Parking Working Party views are invited. These are set out below;
- 3.8 Firstly, there is no identified budget for installing safety cameras (outside the Safety Partnership) and if this proposal proceeds it will have to be funded from existing budgets such as the Members' requests budget. Members may recall that one of the benefits in joining the safety partnership was that it allowed the reduction in budgets for this area of work and delivered substantial savings to the Council. The running and maintenance costs for cameras are borne by the partnership.
- 3.9 Secondly, if the Council agree to install a safety camera in a location that does not meet the criteria of the Safer Essex Roads Partnership (of which it is a member) it may lead to further requests from Members and the public for cameras in locations that similarly do not meet the criteria and may not be supported by the Partnership. In such cases, the Council will be under pressure to follow precedents set which will lead to inconsistent decision-making and a financial pressure where budgets have previously been reduced.
- 3.10 Finally, the Council has no policy of its own in respect of safety cameras and has up to now followed the guidance of the Safer Essex Roads Partnership. This proposal is not supported by the police.

4. Legal Requirements

The Council has general duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the camera needs to meet the requirements of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

5. Other Options

Not to proceed with a safety camera installation.

6. Reason for Recommendation

To seek views on the Council's approach to installing safety cameras and the impact this would have on the Council's budget.

7. Corporate Implications

The relevant aims of the Council's vision include:

- Clean, ensuring a well maintained and attractive street scene, parks and open spaces
- Safe, ensure that works are carried out safely and are safe for highway users.

7.1 Financial Implications

The proposed new safety camera will have to be funded by the Council as it does not meet the necessary installation criteria. There will be implications in respect of the additional impact on staff and resources arising from helping with the design and installation of the camera.

7.2 Legal Implications

The Council has general duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the camera needs to meet the requirements of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

7.3. People Implications

There will be additional impact on staff and resources arising from helping with the design and installation of the camera.

7.4 Property Implications

Not relevant to this particular matter

7.5 Consultation

Not relevant to this particular matter.

7.6 Equalities and Diversity Implications

None relevant to this particular matter.

7.7 Risk Assessment

This issue is dealt with in the main body of the report.

7.8 Value for Money

The proposed new safety camera will have to be funded by the Council as it does not meet the necessary installation criteria.

7.9 Community Safety Implications

This is dealt with in the main body of the report.

7.10 Environmental Impact

The camera will be noticeable in the street scene and will require trees to be pruned back.

8. Background Papers

Safer Essex Roads Partnership Guidance for safety cameras

Southend Design & Townscape Guide

Southend Streetscape Manual

Highways Act 1980

The Road Traffic Act 1988

9. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Safety Audit for Eastern Avenue

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank