

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

to

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

on

14th June 2012

Report prepared by: Andrew Meddle
Head of Planning & Transport

**Requests for Member's Requests Regarding New or Amended Waiting Restrictions &
Eagle Way Underpass Infilling and Crossings
Executive Councillor – Councillor 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 authorise the advertisement of the amendments and new restrictions in accordance with the statutory processes and procedures.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. **That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:**
- a) **agree the requests to advertise the requisite Traffic Regulation Orders and if approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed. Any objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration; and**
 - b) **consider the report on the cost of the Eagle Way Underpass infilling and subject to further pedestrian and vehicle survey work in September 2012, put this forward for consideration in the Highways Capital Programme for 2013/14.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Requests for new or amendments to existing waiting restrictions are regularly received. The ones set out in Appendix 1 have been considered as part of the recent Hackney Carriage Review and have been agreed by Cabinet as part of this process.
- 3.2 All requests are assessed and investigated against the agreed criteria contained in Appendix 1 to this report and if the request affects more than 30 metres of existing waiting restrictions or more than 30 metres of new waiting restrictions are required, the requests are passed to this committee for consideration.
- 3.3 A list of the requests received to date along with an assessment against the criteria and officers findings is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

3.4 Cllr Assenheim has expressed concerns about the Eagle Way Underpass and has requested that this be infilled. As a result of the infilling at grade crossings will need to be provided. A more detailed report is included in Appendix 2, setting out the position and suggesting because this involves significant costs that the matter needs more evidence to support such work and that if the evidence supports it, that it be considered as part of the Highways Capital Programme for 2013/14.

4. Other Options

4.1 No action. Members may consider taking no further action at this time however the requests will result in increased safety or improved traffic flow or increase parking availability.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

5.1 To reduce likelihood of traffic flow being impeded, improve safety or increase parking availability.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

6.1.1 Ensure the traffic network is effectively and safely managed.

6.2 Financial Implications

6.2.1 All costs will be met through existing budgets.

6.3 Legal Implications

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

6.4 People Implications

6.4.1 Staff time as required to organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals.

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.

6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

6.7.1 Neutral

6.8 Risk Assessment

6.8.1 Neutral

6.9 Value for Money

6.9.1 Neutral

6.10 Community Safety Implications

6.10.1 Neutral

6.11 Environmental Impact

6.11.1 Neutral

7. Background papers

Nil

8. Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of requests and comments

Appendix 2 – Eagle Way Underpass & Crossings

APPENDIX 1 - LIST OF COUNCILLOR / RESIDENT REQUESTS

AGREED CRITERIA FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.

Location	Request Details	Criteria Points	Officer comments
Airborne Close & A127, Eastwood	24 hour restriction at junction to prevent drivers visibility of cyclists on the cycle path being impeded	A - the A127 is a main route	Regular parking of high sided vehicles obscure of cycle path
Belle Vue Road, Southend	Revoke part day restriction and reduce junction protection	NA	Originally provided for deliveries to access service area. No longer required.
Benvenue Avenue, Eastwood	Prevention of driveway obstruction - SYL on west side – no parking between 0800hrs and 1600hrs with 15mph speed limit	Does not meet criteria	Nil
Britannia Gardens junction Britannia Road, Westcliff	24 hour restriction at junction	Does not meet criteria	Suggestion to remove restriction opp. junctions of Ailsa Road & Satanita Road to negate any loss of parking
Chalkwell Avenue, Chalkwell	24 hour restrictions at 3 traffic islands	D - traffic flow impeded by parking	Parked vehicles by islands can delay traffic
Cluny Square, Southend	24 hour restriction outside Connexions	Does not meet criteria	Adverse impact to local shops. We teach crossing between cars as part of safety programme
Herschell Road – approach to traffic lights	Small section of unrestricted parking impedes traffic flow at peak times	D - traffic flow impeded by parking	Busy route, causes driver frustration which may encourage aggressive driving when attempting to get to

Location	Request Details	Criteria Points	Officer comments
			junction for green light
High Street, Shoebury	Introduction of limited waiting bays to remove commuter parking	A & D	This work will enable bays to be used by those visiting shops. 1 hour free parking and no return in 4 hours (Monday to Saturday).
Hurst Way, Westcliff	Remove part day waiting restriction	NA - removal of restrictions	Restrictions originally provided to maintain clearance for bus route. Route now 2 x weekly
Marine Close, Leigh-on-Sea	Introduction of 1 hour restriction between 1400-1500hrs on Monday to Friday on all of the road not covered by junction protection measures	D	The area is subject to commuter parking pressure that will be eased with this restriction, which matches the area nearby
Marine Parade, Leigh-on-Sea	Introduction of 1 hour restriction between 1400-1500hrs on Monday to Friday between Thames Drive and Tattersall Gardens on all of the road not covered by junction protection measures	A	The area is subject to commuter parking pressure that will be eased with this restriction, which matches the area nearby
Moor Park Close, Leigh-on-Sea	Introduction of restriction between 0800-0900hrs and 1430-1530hrs Monday to Friday and full restriction for turning area.	B	This area is subject to significant parking by school parents, which causes problems for residents.
Norwich Avenue and Royston Avenue, Southend	Provide part day restriction to prevent delay to local buses caused by parent parking for Temple Sutton	D - traffic flow impeded by parking	Any delays to buses disrupt timetable
Saxon Gardens, Shoebury	Double yellow lines requested by South Essex Homes	Does not meet criteria	Suggest junction protection measures only at this stage.
School Way, Leigh-on-Sea	Provide school drop off/pick up time restriction	Does not meet criteria	One side subject to restrictions enabling clear path for children
Southchurch Road near Hamstel Road,	Revoke peak hours loading restriction – creates confusion as affects parking bays.	NA	Parking bays in whole road operate to 6pm - small stretch of bays near to lights operate to 4.30pm only due

Location	Request Details	Criteria Points	Officer comments
Southend			to loading restriction. Confusing to drivers
Stephenson Road, Eastwood	DYL to prevent parked cars from obstructing lorries using this road	D	Suggest creating parking bays where roadspace is sufficient and introducing DYL where there is not.

VERGE PARKING RESTRICTIONS

Location	Request Details	Recommendation
Mannering Gardens, Southend (Cllr Cox)	Installation of measures to prevent parking on the verge / footway	Support
Bramble Close, Eastwood (Cllrs Flewitt & Lewin)	Installation of measures to prevent parking on the verge / footway	Support
Denton Close, Eastwood (Cllrs Flewitt & Lewin)	Installation of measures to prevent parking on the verge / footway	Support

Location	Request Details	Recommendation
Fernleigh Drive & Lansdowne Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea (Cllr Brown)	Introducing one way traffic flows in each road, one northbound, one southbound to ease parking issues	Suggest waiting until PMS & Significant Changes to TROs policy is in place and consider in light of this
Cambridge Road, Southend (Cllr Ware-Lane)	Request for resident's parking in this street. [Note – this was considered in 2007 and residents were against].	Suggesting waiting as per above recommendation

APPENDIX 2 – EAGLE WAY UNDERPASS

- A2.1 Cllr Assenheim states that he put forward this request before the list was cleared down in September 2010. However, the cost of the scheme at that time was £200,000, which is a significant capital project. It was considered to be too expensive for the Council to be able to justify the scheme.
- A2.2 Since that date, the Council cleared down the list of Member's Requests at Traffic & Parking Working Party to reflect a work programme that had schemes which could be delivered within the resources available. A report was drafted for consideration at the Traffic and Parking Working Party on 8th March 2012, but was not included on the agenda in order to allow for a full debate of the Hospital Parking Management Scheme Post-Implementation Review.
- A2.3 For the Eagle Way Underpass Infilling proposal, it is clear that there is no evidence to justify it from a highways perspective. Nationally the Department for Transport and highways authorities use a standard approach to calculating the need for crossings, which relates to a calculation involving crossing and vehicle movements. The so-called PV² figure, is recorded as being at 0.005 (at best) for this area and crossings are not normally put in where this figure is less than 1.0. The figures used to calculate this are included in table 1, which follows. However, it is accepted that there are more than just highways considerations which are of concern here.
- A2.4 Officers have been value engineering this scheme to reduce the overall cost and have been seeking appropriate fill material for the underpass, but the scheme is still likely to cost significantly in excess of £100,000 to create safe crossings, footways and to backfill the underpass and gate it off securely. Even at this reduced price this is a scheme that should be considered as part of the Council's highways capital programme and not as a Member's Request. However, at a time when resources for maintaining and improving the network are stretched, this scheme does not represent good value for the Council.
- A2.5 The Member's Request system is for minor changes to Traffic Regulation Orders and other minor works to improve highway safety and the works you request at this location are outside this scope. This is reflected in the small budget made available in these areas. It is proposed that as the evidence does not currently justify a scheme from a highways perspective that:
- Pedestrian and vehicle flow surveys be commissioned for September, once the schools have returned and hopefully the weather is good to provided updated evidence;
 - The matter be reconsidered for inclusion in the Highways Capital Programme for 2013/14 in light of the updated evidence.

Time Beginning	Pedestrians per Period	Pedestrian per Hour	Vehicles per Period	Vehicles per Hour	Vehicles²	PV² per hour	PV² Hourly
07:50		0		0	0	0	0.000
08:00	13	13	39	39	1521	19773	0.000
08:10	11	24	29	68	4624	110976	0.001
08:20	14	25	61	90	8100	202500	0.002
08:30	9	23	72	133	17689	406847	0.004
08:40	5	14	53	125	15625	218750	0.002
08:50	4	9	39	92	8464	76176	0.001
09:00	4	8	26	65	4225	33800	0.000
09:10	7	11	39	65	4225	46475	0.000
09:20	2	9	37	76	5776	51984	0.001
09:30	10	12	31	68	4624	55488	0.001
09:40	13	23	21	52	2704	62192	0.001
09:50	11	24	23	44	1936	46464	0.000
10:00	8	19	36	59	3481	66139	0.001
10:10	2	10	35	71	5041	50410	0.001
10:20	3	5	28	63	3969	19845	0.000
10:30		3	34	62	3844	11532	0.000
10:40	2	2	33	67	4489	8978	0.000
10:50	5	7	24	57	3249	22743	0.000
11:00	2	7	25	49	2401	16807	0.000
11:10	1	3	36	61	3721	11163	0.000
11:20	9	10	37	73	5329	53290	0.001
11:30	6	15	42	79	6241	93615	0.001
11:40	2	8	39	81	6561	52488	0.001
11:50	4	6	47	86	7396	44376	0.000

Time Beginning	Pedestrians per Period	Pedestrian per Hour	Vehicles per Period	Vehicles per Hour	Vehicles²	PV² per hour	PV² Hourly
12:00	4	8	41	88	7744	61952	0.001
12:10	7	11	38	79	6241	68651	0.001
12:20	3	10	27	65	4225	42250	0.000
12:30	10	13	28	55	3025	39325	0.000
12:40	9	19	33	61	3721	70699	0.001
12:50	3	12	29	62	3844	46128	0.000
13:00	6	9	44	73	5329	47961	0.000
13:10	5	11	32	76	5776	63536	0.001
13:20	6	11	20	52	2704	29744	0.000
13:30	7	13	39	59	3481	45253	0.000
13:40	5	12	34	73	5329	63948	0.001
13:50	2	7	30	64	4096	28672	0.000
14:00	2	4	28	58	3364	13456	0.000
14:10	1	3	32	60	3600	10800	0.000
14:20	3	4	47	79	6241	24964	0.000
14:30	1	4	36	83	6889	27556	0.000
14:40	3	4	40	76	5776	23104	0.000
14:50	7	10	49	89	7921	79210	0.001
15:00	9	16	55	104	10816	173056	0.002
15:10	20	29	77	132	17424	505296	0.005
15:20	6	26	55	132	17424	453024	0.005
15:30	8	14	41	96	9216	129024	0.001
15:40	12	20	43	84	7056	141120	0.001
15:50	13	25	36	79	6241	156025	0.002
16:00	9	22	57	93	8649	190278	0.002

Time Beginning	Pedestrians per Period	Pedestrian per Hour	Vehicles per Period	Vehicles per Hour	Vehicles²	PV² per hour	PV² Hourly
16:10	15	24	49	106	11236	269664	0.003
16:20	30	45	37	86	7396	332820	0.003
16:30	11	41	42	79	6241	255881	0.003
16:40	5	16	43	85	7225	115600	0.001
16:50	13	18	48	91	8281	149058	0.001
17:00	5	18	51	99	9801	176418	0.002
17:10		5	43	94	8836	44180	0.000
17:20	4	4	51	94	8836	35344	0.000
17:30	3	7	47	98	9604	67228	0.001
17:40	6	9	55	102	10404	93636	0.001
17:50	2	8	42	97	9409	75272	0.001
18:00		2		42	1764	3528	0.000