

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
9th March 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
High Street Shoeburyness Residents Permit Parking Scheme	Members	Introduce Residents Permit Parking to roads around Shoebury Station	<p>25 Letters/emails of objection received</p> <p>13 Letters/emails received from residents at the northern end of the scheme who say that the problem does not occur during the day and is caused by too many resident's vehicles and not commuters.</p> <p>2 Letters/emails mentioned that this scheme will affect the elderly and vulnerable as their ability to receive casual help will be made more difficult.</p> <p>2 Letters/emails were received from residents who are unwilling to pay to park outside their own property.</p> <p>2 Letters/emails are from commuters who travel to the area from Great Wakering and who state that off-street car parking is insufficient to cater for demand.</p> <p>1 letter is from a shift worker who believes that he is discriminated against because he has to park in the area during the restricted hours.</p> <p>4 letters/emails are received from local retailers who think that customers will not be able to park in the area and their businesses will suffer.</p> <p>1 Letter from Longmans in Rampart Street (67 Retirement / Sheltered Housing Units). Concerns have been raised regarding additional parking fees for visitors to the complex and problems of recruiting care staff.</p>	<p>The proposal was subject to an initial informal consultation undertaken by ward Members and the required level of support was evidenced.</p> <p>The level of objections do appear fairly high in comparison to the support received.</p> <p>There is a concern that by implementing the controls in the southern section of the area will displace the parking into the northern section which will worsen the current situation for those residents.</p> <p>The points regarding payment have been considered however the comments relating to this are small in comparison to the number of affected properties.</p> <p>Casual parking can be purchased at a cost of 50p per day utilising the visitors parking system and has not affected residents detrimentally in similar schemes within the borough.</p> <p>Business are well catered for with the current limited waiting areas. There are no proposals to amend these.</p>

<p>High Street Shoeburyness Residents Permit Parking Scheme Cont: /</p>	<p>Members</p>	<p>Introduce Residents Permit Parking to roads around Shoebury Station</p>	<p>13 letters/emails of support received.</p> <p>General support for the type of scheme proposed but think that the hours of operation should be extended to include weekends because there are other influences that cause non-residential parking during the weekend such as the beach and local church.</p>	<p>The hours of operation are proposed as 10am to 2pm Monday to Friday which is sufficient to deter all day parking from commuters. Introducing weekend restrictions is not recommended in this area where the prime attractor is the railway station.</p> <p>It is recommended that Members consider the options;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce the proposal as advertised, or 2. Take no further action <p>While the area could be divided to only implement controls in the southern section, this will displace parking and likely to result in requests for the scheme to be extended. Under the current agreed policy, this would not be possible within two years of the date of the decision.</p>
<p>Belle Vue Road</p>		<p>Introduce No Waiting at Anytime</p> <p>East Side junction with Southchurch Road to o/s No. 4 Belle Vue Road</p>	<p>1 letter of objection received: Impose on Business – customers who visit business are often elderly and have health problems new parking arrangements would impact on their ability to procure their requirements; nature of business requires constant loading and unloading from suppliers and in-house deliveries and customers loading their own vehicles</p> <p>Would suggest proposal to include loading bay or for parking to be restricted to the same as Southchurch Road</p>	<p>The area was subject to a waiting restriction prohibiting parking at all times. This was removed in an attempt to create additional parking and the result is considerable congestion at the junction due to parked vehicles, some of which are parked throughout the day. The area is subject to considerable levels of traffic accessing a number of streets.</p>

				<p>If the at any time waiting prohibition is reinstated, loading will still be permitted for as long as may be necessary.</p> <p>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal.</p>
The Maze		<p>Introduce No Waiting at Anytime</p> <p>North and South Sides east end of The Maze</p>	<p>2 letters of Support and 1 letter of Objection Received</p> <p>Letters of support - main points were generally happy with proposals; positive benefit to the majority of residents of The Maze</p> <p>Letter of Objection - main concerns are with the boundary of property</p>	<p>The proposal covers the area which is not privately owned.</p> <p>Recommend to proceed with proposal</p>
Rayleigh Road	Member	<p>Introduce Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 9am to 5.00pm 2 hours no return in 4 hours</p> <p>West Side - Between Nos 81 & 87 Rayleigh Road</p>	<p>2 letters of objection and a petition including 47 signatures received</p> <p>Letters objections were it is difficult enough to park outside their homes or further down road as it is currently; if scheme went ahead the cars from the shops and customers would park outside the houses; teachers from local school park along this stretch of Rayleigh Road; customers from shops park in Rayleigh Road and Brooklands Avenue making it difficult for residents to park request a permit scheme for houses 89-101</p> <p>Petition – main points raised are shops and customers park in Rayleigh Road making it difficult for residents; a lot of the residents along this stretch of road are elderly and need to park near to their homes; teachers from the school and BMW business on the A127 park along the road making it difficult for residents</p>	<p>While providing parking for local shops is supportive of businesses, the level of objections are considerable and the areas is obviously subject to competition for the available parking.</p> <p>Recommend no further action</p> <p>With regard to permit parking controls, ward Members would be required to consult the wider area and if required, officers can suggest a suitable area and assist with the form layout.</p>