

Public Document Pack  
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

**CABINET COMMITTEE**

**Date: Thursday, 21st June, 2018**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

**Place: Committee Room 1 (Jubilee Room) - Civic Suite**

**Contact: Tim Row - Principal Democratic Services Officer**

**Email: [committeesection@southend.gov.uk](mailto:committeesection@southend.gov.uk)**

**AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 8th March, 2018**
- 4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**  
Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
- 5 Requests for Traffic Restrictions**  
Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

**TO: The Chairman & Members of Cabinet Committee:**  
Councillor A Moring (Chair),  
Councillors T Cox (Vice-Chair) and M Flewitt

This page is intentionally left blank

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Cabinet Committee

**Date: Thursday, 8th March, 2018**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

# 3

**Present:** Councillor T Cox (Chair)  
Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chair) and J Lamb\*  
\*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

**In Attendance:** Councillors M Borton, A Bright, M Butler, M Davidson, R Hadley, D Kenyon, D McGlone, G Phillips, M Terry, C Walker, N Ward, J Ware-Lane, P Wexham and R Woodley  
Z Ali, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 p.m. - 10.25 p.m.

### 803 Apologies for Absence

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

### 804 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Borton – Agenda Item No. 5 (Members Requests List – Ref No. 17/31 - Reduce speeds in roads surrounding Earls Hall School) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in Rochester Drive);

(b) Councillor Ware-Lane – Agenda Item No. 5 (Members Requests List – Ref No. 17/36 - Introduce permit parking controls – Area west of North Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(c) Councillor Woodley – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in Tyrone Road; and

(d) Councillor Woodley – Agenda Item No. 5 (Members Requests List – Ref No. 17/43 - Eastwoodbury Lane – Waiting restrictions between Bristol Road and Vickers Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Daughter is a pilot at London Southend Airport.

### 805 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 8th January 2018

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

## 806 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

The Cabinet Committee 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 report sought the Cabinet Committee's approval on the way forward in respect of all of these proposals, after having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party following consideration of all the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting. Large scale plans of the proposals were displayed at the meeting.

With reference to the proposals for Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road, the Cabinet Committee noted the recommendations of the Traffic & Parking Working Party to proceed with the restrictions but felt that, in view of the comments from the doctor's surgery, no further action should be taken in this regard.

Resolved:

1. That no further action be taken in respect of 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 2018.

2. That no further action be taken in respect of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Consolidation of Moving Traffic and Speed Limit) Order 2006 (as amended) (Amendment No 2) Order 2018.

3. 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. 3) Order 2018 as advertised, subject to the following amendments so as to reduce the effect of the Order:

(a) Rayleigh Road – remove proposed waiting restrictions on the north side from its junction with Eastwood Park Drive westwards to approximately the western boundary of No. 274 Rayleigh Road; and

(b) The Rodings – reduce the length of proposed waiting restrictions on the west side from its junction with Rayleigh Road to the entrance of the No 15 The Rodings

4. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Borough of Southend-on-Sea (Off-Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2005 (As amended) (Amendment No. 1) Order 2018 as advertised.

Reason for Decision

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

## Other Options

Each proposal 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.

Note:- This is an Executive Function  
Eligible for call-in to: Place Scrutiny Committee  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox  
**\*Called-in to:- Place Scrutiny Committee**

### 807 **Members Requests List**

The Cabinet Committee 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. Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party it was:-

Resolved:

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

(i) Request Reference No. 17/32 – Provide pedestrian refuge at the junction of Southbourne Grove, Bridgwater Drive and Carlton Avenue;

(ii) Request Reference No. 17/33 – Provide measures to prevent reduced visibility at junction of Shakespeare Drive and West Road;

(iii) Request Reference No. 17/37 – Reposition of pedestrian refuge in Leigh Broadway at junction with Leigh Hill;

(iv) Request Reference No. 17/39 – Provision of ambulance bay at the Health Centre, London Road near junction of Marguerite Drive;

(v) Request Reference No. 17/42 – Introduce alternate month parking restrictions on the bend in North Crescent in the vicinity of No. 168;

(vi) Request Reference No. 17/43 – Introduce waiting restrictions in Eastwoodbury Lane between Bristol Road and Vickers Road (to be incorporated with Request Reference No. 16/01);

(vii) Request Reference No. 17.44 – Introduce waiting restrictions in Warner's Gardens to prevent long term parking close to the entrance of the allotments (to be incorporated with Request Reference No. 16/01);

(viii) Request Reference No. 17/45 – Extension of existing waiting restrictions at the entrance of the allotments on the north side of Manchester Drive westwards;

(ix) Request Reference No. 16/04 – Harden verges in Silversea Drive;

(xi) Request Reference No. 17/06 – Introduce waiting restrictions in Teigngrace to deter residents in neighbouring street parking.

2. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the statutory notices and undertake the necessary consultation for the relevant traffic regulation order(s) in respect of the following requests and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

(i) Request Reference No. 17/30 – Introduction of limited waiting restrictions in Southchurch Boulevard adjacent to the Church, the timing of which to be in consultation with the Ward Councillors;

(ii) Request Reference No. 17/40 – Introduce waiting restrictions for one hour on the newly created bays in Riviera Drive, the timing of which to be determined by officers, in consultation with the Ward Councillors;

(iii) Request Reference No. 17/41 – The reduction of the terminal hour of the operational time of the Queensway East PMS from 9.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m.;

(iv) Request Reference No. 17/47 – Introduce waiting restrictions on the south-east kerbline of Hinguar Street outside Saxon Court;

(v) Request Reference No. 16/04 – Introduce a “clearway” restriction in Campfield Road; and

(vi) Request Reference No. 17/05 – Extend waiting restrictions in Elm Road, Shoeburyness at its junction with Wakering Road;

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

(i) Request Reference No. 17/46 – Introduction of one hour waiting restrictions in Thames Close to deter commuter parking;

(ii) Request Reference No. 16/01 – Introduction of waiting restrictions to deter parking in Rochford Road Service Road; and

(iii) Request Reference No. 17/402 – Harden verges in Mansell Close.

4. That, in respect of Request Reference No. 17/31, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to undertake the necessary consultation for the introduction of a 20mph zone in the area around Earls Hall School comprising Colemans Avenue, Midhurst Avenue and Henleys Crescent, with the exclusion of the use of speed cushions.

5. That, in respect of Request Reference No. 17/34, regarding the introduction of measures to prevent accidents at the junction of Prince Avenue with Westbourne Grove, the performance of the recently installed skid resistant surfacing be monitored.

6. That, in respect of Request Reference No. 17/36, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to commence the formal consultation process for the introduction of permit parking controls in the area west of North Road, Westcliff on Sea.

7. That, in respect of Request Reference No. 17/36, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be requested to investigate the introduction of traffic calming measures in Marine Parade, Leigh on Sea.

8. That consideration of Request Reference No. 17/35 for the introduction of accident prevent measures in Ness Road at its junction with Maya Close be deferred to enable further solutions to be investigated..

#### Reasons for Decision

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 & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.

#### Other Options

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.

Note:- This is an Executive Function  
Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

### **808 Requests for Traffic Restrictions**

The Cabinet Committee 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. Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party it was:

Resolved:

That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order(s) for the following requests and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

- (i) Alexandra Street – relocation of the Ambulance Bay;
  - (ii) Strand Wharf – Introduce prohibition of driving except for authorised access;
- and

(iii) Whittingham Avenue – Extend junction protection by a further 5m in Poynings Avenue from its junction with Whittingham Avenue.

Reason for Decision

To mitigate for likelihood of traffic flows being impeded, to improve safety or increase parking availability.

Other Options

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.

Note:- This is an Executive Function  
Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

**809 Petition requesting Parking Controls in Brighton Avenue**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of a petition comprising 47 signatures from the residents of Brighton Avenue, requesting the introduction of parking controls to provide priority for residents. Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party it was:

Resolved:

1. That the petitioner be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.
2. That no further action at this time.

Reason for Decision

To reflect a previous decision by this Committee.

Other Options

As set out in the submitted report.

Note:- This is an Executive Function  
Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

**Chairman:** \_\_\_\_\_



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

4

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on

21<sup>st</sup> June 2018

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty,  
Director for Planning and Transport

---

## Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

Place Scrutiny Committee - Cabinet Member : Councillor Moring  
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
Amleside Drive	Members	<b>No Waiting at Any Time</b>  <b>Junction protection at various junctions</b>	<b>3 letters of objection received. 1 letter of support</b> Main comment in support would be of great benefit to area Objections include – loss of parking outside properties; not all houses have off-street access; will only push Adult College and Railway Station Parking further along road; some houses have large amount of vehicles that park on the road; non-resident's use the road; would like permit parking; commuter parking near to junctions cause parking problems not the residents.	The proposal is formalising the recommendation within the Highway Code that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. While parking availability will be affected, this is mitigated by the amendments to a number of existing waiting restrictions.  <b>Recommended to proceed with advertised proposals</b>
Windsor & Osborne Roads	Member	<b>proposed One Way Streets &amp; Revocation of Alternate Monthly Parking</b>	<b>3 letters received.</b> <b>1 letter objects to One Way streets proposal and revocation of alternate monthly parking</b> – will increase speeds and make more dangerous for pedestrians. If alternative monthly parking is removed will lead to parking on pavements due to narrow roads further consultation needs to be done.  <b>1 letter objects to the removal of the alternate monthly restrictions</b> – would create problems including gutters not being cleaned; no tree works; problems for refuse collection; problems for emergency vehicles going along the roads; parking would be taken up by visitors and staff of school and medical centre and school minibus would struggle with cars parked on both sides.  <b>1 letter in favour of One Way Street proposals but have concerns regarding the revocation of the alternate monthly parking</b> – main concerns are will block entrance to private parking area in Osborne Rd.	This proposal is a result of a resident petition requesting amendment of the traffic flows to one-way traffic. These streets are subject to a prohibition of waiting on alternate sides of the street each month from 8am to 6pm daily. Parking is therefore permitted on both sides of the streets between 6pm and 8am.  Parking availability in the area is very limited and in conjunction with the proposed amendment to traffic flows, the waiting restriction can be removed without adversely affecting safety.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposals</b>

Belfairs Park Drive	Member	No Waiting Mon-Fri 10.00 am to 12.00 noon	<p><b>33 standard responses of which 17 were from residents of Belfairs Park Drive and 16 from other roads/areas.</b> - points include would have an effect on local shops; prevent people from parking outside their homes; would encourage parking in neighbouring roads.</p> <p><b>1 petition from 11 houses in Orsett Avenue</b> – main points raised were their road would be affected by the restrictions; Orsett Ave is a small road and will end up with a bigger problem with parking; would be a great disadvantage to the residents; not a problem in Belfairs Park Drive but would create one in Orsett Avenue.</p> <p><b>19 letters of objection from other areas</b> points raised include would redirect residents into other side roads; would make a difficult junction more dangerous; why is this being done; will encourage speeding; bad impact on Woodside; proposed restrictions inappropriate; road layout is good and does not need dyl; would stop visitors from parking outside properties; need to park at anytime; would encourage parking in side roads causing parking problems on narrow roads; a comprehensive assessment of the effect of restrictions on residents in the surrounding area needs to be taken into account; would have an effect on local shops; and visitors/carers going to residents properties; rarely congested; restrictions only needed near The Fairway junction; no reason for proposal</p> <p><b>20 letters of objection from Belfairs Park Drive</b> points raised include does not warrant restrictions; inconvenient; problem only at 1 end; prevent visitors and contractors parking; will move problems to other streets; need to include all roads in area; road should be restricted to stop caravan homes parking; not a parking issue; restrictions only needed at The Fairway end; would only be partially effective; where are motorists supposed to park; unfair to motorists and restrictions; would impact on residents living in the road; proposals are overkill; would have an effect on local shops; and visitors/carers going to residents properties; was not the original request – no need for whole road to be restricted.</p> <p><b>3 Letters of support received</b> – comments include – fair and reasonable; will ease parking problems at eastern end of road; excellent decision; agrees with the proposals</p>	<p>Proposals dealing with parking issues in isolated streets will invariably displace the parking elsewhere.</p> <p>The majority of properties have off street parking provision and do not rely on the ability to park on the street.</p> <p>The proposal does not meet the agreed criteria and is not supported by residents within the area.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
---------------------	--------	---	--	---

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
21<sup>st</sup> June 2018

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty,  
Director for Planning and Transport

---

## Requests for Traffic Restrictions

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring**  
**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 or traffic restrictions are regularly received from residents and the businesses as well as officer and Member suggestions.
- 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.

### *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
Gunnery Road Shoebury	Amend waiting time to 1 hour no return in 4 hours	Members and Officers	NA	Changes to time permitted to park will assist the local businesses.  <b>Recommend to advertise proposals.</b>
Eastwoodbury Crescent Service Road	Propose Permit Parking Area	Members		<p>The area surrounding the airport has been consulted as to views on parking controls . The wider area were not supportive however, after further analysis, a smaller area immediately around the airport expressed support for parking restrictions to deter all day parking by airport users and authorization to advertise proposals to deter all day parking was given by this Committee in March 2018 pending further discussion with ward Members as to detail.</p> <p>Eastwoodbury Crescent Service Road comprising of approximately 30 properties is the closest area to the airport and the majority of residents have no off street parking provision and as such, a waiting restriction will be detrimental to these residents. The ward Members have requested that given the location of the service road being the closest to the airport and featuring a single entry and exit point, the service road would suit the implementation of a permit parking controls in isolation.</p> <p>While the policy states permit controls should only implemented on an area basis, The service road could be considered as exceptional due to the location and the ability to adequately sign a permit parking area in this one section of the street.</p> <p>The majority of the remaining section of Eastwoodbury Crescent features waiting restrictions preventing parking at any time and with the contemporaneous proposal to provide waiting restrictions to deter all day parking in neighbouring streets, displaced parking is highly unlikely to occur.</p> <p><b>Recommend that proposals be advertised.</b></p>

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Chancellor Road	Propose removal of right turn prohibition into Church Road.	Officers	NA	<p>A right turn prohibition is in place to prohibit vehicles from turning right into Church Road from Chancellor Road. This was originally introduced to prevent delays to buses wishing to enter the Travel Centre due to queuing vehicles. Traffic patterns have changed and, it would be an advantage to allow this movement to alleviate queues, especially on busy days.</p> <p>The bus company will be consulted on the proposals.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposal</b></p>