

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Corporate Director for Place  
to  
Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee  
on  
**14<sup>th</sup> 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><b>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.</b></p>
--	--	--	--	---

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

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
<p><b>Heygate Avenue; Quebec Avenue; Portland Avenue; York Road (Queensway to Baltic Ave); Herbert Grove</b></p>	<p><b>Members following consultation of residents</b></p>	<p><b>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 &amp; limited waiting orders</b></p>	<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>