

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

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

21st 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 | <p>No Waiting at Any Time</p> <p>Junction protection at various junctions</p> | <p>3 letters of objection received. 1 letter of support</p> <p>Main comment in support would be of great benefit to area</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>Recommended to proceed with advertised proposals</p> |
| Windsor & Osborne Roads | Member | <p>proposed One Way Streets & Revocation of Alternate Monthly Parking</p> | <p>3 letters received.</p> <p>1 letter objects to One Way streets proposal and revocation of alternate monthly parking – 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.</p> <p>1 letter objects to the removal of the alternate monthly restrictions – 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.</p> <p>1 letter in favour of One Way Street proposals but have concerns regarding the revocation of the alternate monthly parking – main concerns are will block entrance to private parking area in Osborne Rd.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposals</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>Belfairs Park Drive</p> | <p>Member</p> | <p>No Waiting Mon-Fri 10.00 am to 12.00 noon</p> | <p>33 standard responses of which 17 were from residents of Belfairs Park Drive and 16 from other roads/areas. - points include would have an effect on local shops; prevent people from parking outside their homes; would encourage parking in neighbouring roads.</p> <p>1 petition from 11 houses in Orsett Avenue – 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>19 letters of objection from other areas 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>20 letters of objection from Belfairs Park Drive 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>3 Letters of support received – 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>Recommend no further action</p> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|