

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

to

**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
The Cabinet Committee**

On

8th March 2012

Agenda
Item No.

5

Report prepared by: Andrew Meddle
Head of Planning & Transport

Southend Hospital Parking Management Scheme – Post Implementation Review

Executive Councillor: Cllr Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For Members to consider the results from an extensive review of the operation of the scheme including the use of parking bays, the impact of displaced parking in the areas surrounding the scheme boundaries and consideration of suggested amendments from residents.

2. Recommendation

That Members of Traffic & Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee consider the report and:-

- a) **Agree to advertise amendments to the scheme to incorporate requisite amendments in accordance with the statutory requirements;**
- b) **Agree that in the event of there being no unresolved objections to the proposals, implement the amendments;**
- c) **Note that any unresolved objections will be reported back to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration; and**
- d) **Consider whether there are grounds to extend parking controls in order to control/deter displaced parking.**

3. Background

- 3.1 A Parking Management Scheme (PMS) was implemented in the area surrounding Southend Hospital in May 2011. The scheme is designed to give residents a priority for the available parking while providing parking for non-residents via a pay and display arrangement.
- 3.2 Part of the process with any PMS is to monitor the operational arrangements, review feedback from residents and other users, assess the levels of displaced parking, the usage of parking bay types and generally consider any amendments to make improvements.

- 3.3 Feedback from residents and other users indicates that overall, the scheme has met its objectives and residents now have a far greater opportunity to park near to their homes. There are some issues which have been identified by residents and these are detailed in Appendix 1 to this report along with comments from officers.
- 3.4 The usage levels of the various bay types in the area has been monitored over a two week period with patrols noting the numbers of occupied spaces in each street during both the morning and afternoon periods. The results of this monitoring are detailed in Appendix 2 to this report and indicate that all bay types are currently underused.
- 3.5 The parking bay positions were designed to ensure residents have access to residents only parking bays near to their homes, in some areas of the scheme this results in lengths of bays allocated to resident very near to bays allocated for pay and display parking (the different bay types are separated by short stretches of double yellow lines and indicated by signage).
- 3.6 Penalty Charge Notice issue has been monitored along with the grounds for any representations against the issue and a small number of representations claim the signage is confusing, especially to those who may not have visited the area regularly since the introduction of the scheme. To resolve any potential confusion it is suggested that in the roads immediately surrounding the hospital, bay types are amended to “shared use”, this would allocate parking to residents with a permit or pay and display parking.
- 3.7 The areas surrounding the parking scheme boundaries have been surveyed to assess the numbers of non residents vehicles in each road compared to surveys undertaken before the scheme implementation. The survey area also includes roads highlighted by the Ward members in Westborough, Prittlewell and Blenheim Park Wards. The results are detailed at Appendix 3 and indicate some high levels of displaced parking. It should be noted however that in the northern section of the area, many of these vehicles are believed to belong to workers from the RBS building. Officers have arranged to meet with representatives of RBS to discuss how this can be jointly approached and resolved.
- 3.8 Separately the Corporate Director for ETE and the Head of Planning and Transport have arranged to meet senior representatives at the hospital to discuss the post-implementation review, but also the parking strategy operated by the hospital and how this may be improved for those who live, work or visit the area.

4 Other Options

- 4.1 Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee may consider that no action is appropriate or suggest other proposals for consideration.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To make improvements to the operation of the scheme, so as to deliver further improvements for those who live, work and visit the hospital.

6. Corporate Implications

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

6.1.1 Ensuring parking is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. Providing residents with priority parking availability is responsive to residents needs and leads to greater public satisfaction. These are consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

6.2.1 Costs would be met from existing budgets with contribution available from income received.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process would be completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 Work required implement any works will be met by existing staff resources.

6.4 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 This would be undertaken as per statutory processes

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 None.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve the current operation of an existing parking management scheme.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 The proposals offer value for money and will be carried out by contractors procured to provide such.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 None.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 Neutral.

7. **Background Papers**

7.1 None.

8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Issues identified by residents

Appendix 2 – Results of Monitoring in this area

Appendix 3 – Changes between surveys

APPENDIX 1 - ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY RESIDENTS

- N.b. SYL means single yellow line
 DYL means double yellow line
 Res means resident's
 Boxes shaded on table indicate no action proposed

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
1.		Her children go to Earls Hall School. She says that the scheme doesn't allow her to drop off & pick up her kids. I advised her it didn't start until 9.30 so she accepted that the dropping off wasn't affected. Sometimes she can walk but it's not always convenient. She has been informed there were some half hour restriction bays to stop and pick up children, but she would still like a call as she doesn't think enough has been done for parents. I didn't know what the thinking or considerations had been regarding this or if there was a standard response so I kept away from responding to the direct questions.	??	Only aware of single complaint relating to this issue- no action
2.		The p and d bays on the end of Northville Drive need to be changed to residents as there is not enough resident's spaces for the houses this end of the road.	Northville Drive. most no. of res bays used is 11 out of 17	Review
3.		Advertise change to opposite junction of Queen Anne's Mews to dyl to include in order		Implement
4.		Bridgewater Drive, opposite the entrance to the doctors surgery, cars park on the north side of the road, busses have a big problem particularly if there is one coming in the other direction.	All in previous column	Extend dyl for a further length on the northern side.
5.	Carlingford drive	There is an issue with disabled drivers parking on the lines meaning people cant park in the bays opposite as the road is too narrow – we don't have powers to enforce	Add kerb ticks	Loading restriction required

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
		this		
6.	Carlingford Drive	Requesting kerb ticks along Carlingford Drive opposite the junction of Lavender Grove.	Requested due to the disabled drivers parking here causing a parking issue which is dangerous.	Disabled drivers regularly parking which results in formal bays being unusable. Loading restriction required
7.	Carlton Avenue	Requested once the resurfacing of her drive has been finished whether it would be possible for a single yellow line to be placed down rather than double yellow lines? Please call her back to confirm whether this will be possible.	Would need to consult 250 Carlton as may need to reduce over their drive and all the other houses may ask for same, this will cause difficulty as is a bus route	No change
8.	Coleman's Avenue	Advises me they have now had the two business bays outside their property turned into residents bays. Now as herself and her neighbour have 2 permits each they are after getting the three bay one changed as well.	Most no. of res bays used is 9 out of 16	No action
9.	Coleman's Avenue	Requests two bays at the top end of Coleman's avenue bays become resident bays instead of business.	Most no. of res bays used is 9 out of 16	No action
10.	Coleman's Avenue	Change the bay at the junction of Coleman's and Carlton on the east side of the junction so it is shortened for safety reasons	Most no. of res bays used is 9 out of 16	No action
11.	Coleman's Avenue	Change businesses bays into resident bays.	Most no. of res bays used is 9 out of 16	No action
12.	Coleman's Avenue	Change the business bays in Coleman's avenue at the end with the 127 into residents	There is not enough room for residents to park.	No action
13.	Commercial Road	Further junction protection at the junction of Commercial Road & Carlton Avenue due to poor sight lines. The parking bays on the bottom of Queen Anne's Drive are too close to the junction	Investigate sight lines	No problem identified. Standard junction protection provided

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
14.	Fairfax Drive	Add the address into eligible residents for permits.	All residents of this end of Fairfax park in Westbourne and Southbourne	Addresses now included
15.	Fairfax Drive	Add the address into eligible residents for permits.	All residents of this end of Fairfax park in Westbourne and Southbourne previously	Addresses now included
16.	Fairfax Drive	Add the address into eligible residents for permits.	All residents of this end of Fairfax park in Westbourne and Southbourne previously,	Addresses now included
17.	Highfield Close	Highfield Close has cars parking and blocking driveways. There needs to be some sort of dyl to have one side parking or some sort of restriction, see pictures.	Very narrow street, cul de sac has driveways which are frequently blocked.	Consider restriction
18.	Hobleythick Lane	1 hour restriction in the morning and afternoon to remove the displaced parking from the pms in Hobleythick		Consider restriction
19.	Hobleythick Lane	We would like to request yellow line or alternate month parking. Or request residents parking in Hobleythick due to its success in Carlton Avenue. The bus stop near 86 is nor marked and people park their cars here. We can not rid our bicycles due to the visibility and obstructive parking.		Bus clearways to be marked. Possible inclusion in scheme considering residents letters via Cllr Morgan
20.	Hobleythick Lane	a number of letters have been received by the Ward Councillor from residents requesting parking controls		No further action other than specified above
21.	Midhurst Avenue	Would like this road to be part of the scheme.		Include in PMS
22.	Northville Drive	Review Business bays as there is not enough parking for residents	Sent from Councillor Morgan. most no. of res bays used is 11 out of 17	Review
23.	Prince Avenue	request for the council to allow a short stay parking bay within the 3 bay area which is nearest to prince avenue in 'Rochester drive' this request is due to the 2 businesses here, ourselves and 'paws and claws' having seen the	Change 3 resident bays opposite 82 Rochester Ave. resident maximum bay usage 6 out of 15. However bays were originally changed to res because of resident	Consider provision

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
		initial reduction of available parking by way of double yellow lines being painted outside our shop and later the parking restrictions, which only allow residents to get a permit for spaces in the immediate vicinity, please reconsider the parking allocation.	at 82 complaining.	
24.	Prince Avenue	Request for the council to allow a short stay parking bay within the 3 bay area which is nearest to prince avenue in 'Rochester drive' this request is due to the 2 businesses here, ourselves and 'paws and claws' having seen the initial reduction of available parking by way of double yellow lines being painted outside our shop and later the parking restrictions, which only allow residents to get a permit for spaces in the immediate vicinity, please reconsider the parking allocation.	Change 3 resident bays opposite 82 Rochester Ave. resident maximum bay usage 6 out of 15. However bays were originally changed to resident because of resident at 82 complaining.	Consider provision
25.	Prince Avenue	Add Prince Avenue into residents parking scheme due to displaced parking from Hospital and RBS		Implement
26.	Prittlewell Chase	Would be possible to change the double yellow lines outside my drive and that of my neighbour at 162 and 164 Prittlewell Chase, to single yellow lines so that I can purchase a residents permit to park outside my own drive as this would be a great help	Would have to change stretch from 160-168 to syl	Possible, but may encourage further requests from other residents.
27.	Prittlewell Chase	The residents bay on the west side to be reduced away from it junction with Prittlewell chase due to near collisions with parked cars.	Can reduce bays this junction has 13.5m JP	Review
28.	Prittlewell Chase	would like a parking bay outside his property	Space between driveways 6.1m check on site	Check on site and, if sufficient space, provide

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
29.	Queen Anne's Drive	Bay opposite their property (no. 8) to be changed from business to resident	Maximum resident bays used in Queen Anne's Road 12 out 19, maximum business bays used 2 out of the 4	Few business permits sold – possible to implement
30.	Queen Anne's Drive	Change bays opposite 12 Queen Anne's Drive to Resident instead of business	Maximum resident bays used in Queen Anne's Road 12 out 19, maximum business bays used 2 out of the 4	Few business permits sold – possible to implement
31.	Queen Anne's Drive	There are 4-5 business bays in Queens Anne Drive which he states do not appear to be used at all. He suggests they would be better used as residential bays.	Maximum resident bays used in Queen Anne's Road 12 out 19, maximum business bays used 2 out of the 4	Few business permits sold – possible to implement
32.	Queen Anne's Drive	Residents bays on one side of the entrance to the Queen Anne's Mews close after junction protection to the turning area.	Residents bays on one side of the entrance to the close after junction protection to the turning area. Check loading restrictions	Carriageway width is 5.5m in cul-de-sac - investigate footway parking
33.	Richmond Drive	Change SYL across drive of 31 Richmond Drive to DYL	Inconsiderate car parking over driveway.	Double driveway would have to consult 33 Richmond, enforcement possible regardless of lines if resident can advise us when parking is occurring
34.	Richmond Drive	My drive now has a single yellow line across it and one night last week and yesterday evening I got home to find someone parked across the drive (visiting the vets). I am registered disabled through War Pensions and although I can walk reasonably comfortable most days there is the odd day (YESTERDAY) when I experience extreme pain in my lower limbs and walking is very difficult. For this reason I requested the double yellow lines.	Enforcement	As for 33, driveway enforcement is possible by contacting enforcement team when cars park over a driveway.
35.	Richmond Drive	More enforcement on dyl outside 30/32 Richmond Drive due to verge parking.	vehicles destroying verge and overhanging driveways	Signage to be erected advising of verge parking prohibition

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
36.	Rochester Drive (No. 82)	Further to our telephone conversation this morning. From looking at the original scheme, there was due to be a Residents parking bay outside 79/81 Rochester Drive. I believe this bay was put there to create a chicane to slow the traffic down, however, since the original scheme was designed the resident at 79 has had a drive in put in which has left insufficient space for the bay. This means that there is no Chicane effect and traffic is now travelling faster down the road than before. I am very concerned about this as we had several accidents in the road during the snow at the end of last year and I believe that the junction of Rochester Drive and Prince Avenue is marked as an accident black spot.		Driveway prevents original design - no space for parking on the opposite side.
37.	Rosary Gardens	To be included Rosary Gardens within the parking scheme. To Junction protection on the entrance and some resident parking bays only		Implement
38.	Rosary Gardens	Look at the parking as the road is to narrow and needs restrictions for safety.		Implement
39.	Southbourne Grove	Residents bay to be added in the gap between 307 & 305 Westbourne Grove on West side.	Additional space to park vehicle without obstruction	Distance between drives only 5.3 which could result in vehicles overhanging driveway
40.	Southbourne Grove	Included Rosary Gardens within the scheme to stop the bad parking of the area. Or add restrictions to stop inconsiderate parking		possible to extend restriction in Southbourne - too far from scheme boundary to include as part of PMS
41.	Southbourne Grove	Obstructive parking down Bridgewater Drive causing obstructions for traffic and buses. Car also blocking his driveway. Wants yellow lines introduced down at		This section of Bridgewater has always had parking which generally restricts traffic to one lane. Seek view from bus operator

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
		least one side of road to avoid this happening again		
42.	Westbourne Grove	<p>I would like to suggest the following options for an amended scheme; 1. Residents are allowed to park on the yellow lines all the times. 2. Yellow line time restraints should be reduced as per the lower part of Westbourne Grove. 3. Abolish the yellow line scheme completely. 4. The bushes/shrubs are removed & replaced by grass or paving slabs. 5. More parking bays are given in the area of the flats. 6. Residents with drive ways are only allowed visitor permits. 7. The residents without driveways should receive the first 2 parking permits free as it is not fair that we have to pay to park our cars when potentially the residents with driveways would not have to pay at all. I pay the same road tax & council tax as the rest of them</p>	<p>Review Westbourne and Southbourne with a site visit to lengthen bays</p>	<p>Issues should have been raised at consultation stage, cannot change permit allocation methods, permits must be paid for as residents are receiving an additional benefit.</p>
43.	Westbourne Grove cul de sac	<p>It would be most useful if parking bays could be installed, say, on one side of the run-in to the cul-de-sac. I know that the other households would welcome this change for use by their frequent visitors.</p>	<p>Carriageway width id 5.8m in cul-de-sac</p>	<p>Would require partial footway parking, will assess footway strength to determine if possible</p>
44.	Westbourne Grove cul de sac	<p>I live in the close off Westbourne Grove in the block between Carlton Avenue and Prittlewell Chase and cannot understand why we now have double yellow lines on both sides of the close. Could one side be made available for parking, either with parking bays or a single yellow line?</p>	<p>Carriageway width id 5.8m in cul-de-sac</p>	<p>Would require partial footway parking, will assess footway strength to determine if possible</p>

ID	Address Line 1	Requested Change	Findings for change	Proposed Change/Comments
45.	Westbourne Grove cul de sac	Wants Westbourne close to only have dyl down one side of the entrance and not anywhere else, no marking in the rest of the close.	As residents have to park on the main part of Westbourne and we did not have a parking problem before scheme anyway. Residents bays on one side of the entrance to the close after junction protection to the turning area.	Carriageway width is 5.8m in cul-de-sac