

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and  
the Environment

to

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

on

**7<sup>th</sup> March 2013**

Report prepared by: Cheryl Hindle-Terry  
Team Leader Parking, Traffic Management and Road Safety

---

**Hospital Parking Management Scheme – Representations to Proposed Amendments**

**Executive Councillor: Cllr Cox**

***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

## **1. Purpose of Report**

For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider details of the objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders for proposed amendments to the Hospital Parking Management Scheme and decide on the way forward.

## **2. Recommendation**

**2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party is asked to consider the representations received referred to in paragraph 3.4 of the report and recommend to the Cabinet Committee:**

**(i) Not to implement proposal 1 – Extending the existing scheme into Holeythick Lane, Henley Crescent, Chase Gardens, Midhurst Avenue and Prince Avenue (part).**

**(ii) Not to implement proposal 2 – amending the bays in the existing area to allow shared use by either permit holders or by “ Pay and Display” users**

**(iii) Agree to implement proposal 3 to Increase / extend existing bays where practical as shown on Appendix 2.**

**2.2 That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and approve the recommendations as set out above.**

## **3. Background**

**3.1 Following implementation of the Hospital Parking Management Scheme in 2011, officers monitored the usage, collated comments from residents and other users and considered potential improvements including extension of the scheme into adjacent roads, amending some parking bays to allow shared use**

*Report No:*

by either permit holders or by payment and increasing existing bay allocation in some areas.

- 3.2 The results of this work were reported to this Committee in March 2012 and agreement was given to create designs, liaise with Ward Councillors and advertise amendments.
- 3.3 The outline proposals were advertised during December 2012 and have resulted in a significant number of comments, details of the comments are shown in Appendix 1 to this report and copies of the comments have been made available to Members of the committee.
- 3.4 The advertisement process resulted in comments from within and outside the area. Each proposal is outlined along with the number of comments received, the number supporting the proposals and the number against the proposals. Please note the tables for proposals 1, 2 and 3 below only include comments received by residents who would be directly affected by the amendments.

**Table 1: Proposal 1 – Extend the existing scheme into Hogleythick Lane, Henley Crescent, Chase Gardens, Midhurst Avenue and Prince Avenue (part).**

Comments Received	Support	Opposed
116	54	62
Percentage	46.5%	53.5%

**Table 2: Proposal 2 – Amend bays in existing area to allow shared use by either permit holders or by pay and display use**

Comments Received	Support	Opposed
53	2	51
Percentage	4%	96%

**Table 3: Proposal 3 – Increase / extend existing bays**

Comments Received	Support	Opposed
1	0	1( 1 specific bay only)
Percentage	0%	100%

- 3.5 The proposals have also attracted comment from residents and non residents outside of the affected area.

Comments Received	Support	Opposed
191	58	133
262 (petition)	0	262
Percentage	13%	87%

3.6 The petition is also calling for a reduction in the operational hours of the scheme to allow for parents parking to pick up children from Earls hall School however as this is not part of the formal consultation process, a separate report is for discussion at this meeting.

3.7 On analysis of the comments received there is no support for Proposals 1 or 2 however for proposal 3 there is very little response. This may be due to the fact that the proposal is to increase the number of bays which is generally seen as welcoming. As such it could be implemented with slight amendment to increase the existing bay numbers by another 10 bays as detailed in Appendix 2 to this report.

#### **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

4.1 All proposals were advertised with an aim to improve parking availability for residents, provide greater flexibility for parking and improve usage of the parking bays.

#### **5. Corporate Implications**

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

5.1.1 Ensuring parking is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities.

#### **5.2 Financial Implications**

5.2.1 Costs for confirmation of the Order and amendments suggested in Appendix 1 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 Work required implement any works will be met 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 None.

## **5.8 Risk Assessment**

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and so have a positive risk assessment.

## **5.9 Value for Money**

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

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

5.10.1 None.

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

5.11.1 Neutral.

## **6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Details of representations received.

Appendix 2 – Locations of increased bays