

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

to

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

on

13th July 2009

Agenda
Item No.

Report prepared by: Cheryl Hindle-Terry, Team Leader
(Demand Management)

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations Surrounding Southend University Hospital and Royal Bank of Scotland Buildings

Executive Councillor: Councillor Waite
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee to consider objections to advertised traffic regulation orders, and make an appropriate decision.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party hear the objections to the orders

2.2 That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party in respect of the objections heard and

- 2.2.1 Make the orders without amendment
- 2.2.2 or as amended and set out in Appendix 1
- 2.2.3 or take no further action

2.3 In the event of either 2.2.1 or 2.2.2 being agreed to authorise the Chief Executive and Town Clerk to make the Orders as advertised, or amended to reduce the impact.

3. Background

3.1 As per the report agreed by this Committee on the 12th February 2009, Officers have undertaken a review of various junctions surrounding Southend University Hospital and Royal Bank of Scotland buildings. Where new or amended restrictions were considered beneficial, the required statutory advertisement procedure has been undertaken and resulted in objections. These objections have been summarised in Appendix 1 to the report with a recommendation for consideration.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 No action on requests received. This option is not viable, all locations raised as a concern are inspected by Officers to provide a professional opinion as to any perceived safety or traffic flow concern. Where the concern is supported, proposals to restrict parking are investigated. Where Officers do not agree that a perceived safety or traffic flow problem exists, no further action is taken.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To improve road safety and traffic flow at the various locations detailed in Appendix 1.

6. Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

The majority of the proposals are based on a reduction of potential traffic hazards therefore resulting in safer roads.

- 6.2 Financial Implications

Traffic Regulation Orders require formal advertisement which has been undertaken and funded, if recommendations are agreed, a majority of the resulting cost to the Council will be funded through the section 106 agreements with both Southend University Hospital and the Royal Bank of Scotland to implement the required lining works.

- 6.3 Legal Implications

The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

- 6.4 People Implications

Staff time as required to organise and monitor the required works.

- 6.5 Property Implications

None

- 6.6 Consultation

Formal consultation has been undertaken including advertisement of the proposal in the local press and on the street. In addition those residents likely to be affected by the proposals received a letter and plan explaining the proposal in detail.

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 Report to Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee on the 12th February 2009; “Streets in the Area Around the Royal Bank of Scotland Offices – Dangerous and Obstructive Parking” prepared by Paul Edwards.

8. Appendices

- 8.1. Appendix 1 – details of objections and officers comments/recommendations