

**Appendix 1 – Details of objections with officers
comments/recommendations**

<u>Ref No.</u>	<u>Site</u>	<u>Objection/Support</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1	Junction of Denton Close with Denton Avenue	<p>Objections received from nos. 3 and 5 Denton Close.</p> <p>(a). DYL would reduce the number of places available to park at the moment.</p> <p>(b). Vehicle security is an issue as residents have had cars vandalised if not parked in front of property.</p>	<p>To implement the DYL as proposed. Denton Close is not wide enough to accommodate parked vehicles with enough space to allow vehicles to pass. The way in which this is accommodated at the moment is that vehicles park on the footway, completely blocking access for pedestrians.</p>
2	Hornby Close with Hornby Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 56 Hornby Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Feels there is no problem experienced with parking around this junction.</p> <p>(b). Parking restrictions will further exacerbate the parking problem of the whole area further.</p> <p>(c). Problem identified as Hornby Avenue used as a “rat-run” by drivers wishing to miss the traffic control lights at the intersection of Rochford Road, A127 and Hoblethick Lane.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. The highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction. This maintains visibility for drivers using the junction. It also creates passing places for opposing vehicles. Hornby Avenue is a thin road and the DYL is required to maintain turning movement of larger vehicles in and around the junction. The issue of “rat running” is not related to the proposal.</p>
3	Junction of Lavender Grove with Carlton Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 41 Carlton Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Feels that a DYL will disadvantage residents all the time and would like to see a part week restriction to restrict parking at peak traffic flow times.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. Carlton Avenue is a distributor route which is subject to a high volume of parked cars as well as being a major route for buses, HGVs and emergency vehicles. More passing places need to be provided along this stretch of road. We would not recommend parking opposite a junction on a distributor route as turning movements out of Lavender Grove need to be maintained for larger vehicles. Providing part time restrictions on junctions is not generally recommended as visibility should be maintained at all times.</p>
4	Junction of Queen Anne's Drive with Carlton Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 211 Carlton Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Feels that proposals will force the construction of a driveway onto the property.</p> <p>(b). DYL will increase the speed of traffic yet if a resident parking scheme were implemented with the same restrictions this would control the flow of traffic more efficiently.</p> <p>(c). DYL would result in an increase in speed which will lead to the implementation of speed humps at great expense.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. DYL does not directly affect the frontage of this property. The removal of small pockets of parking will not increase speeds significantly enough to warrant the implementation of remedial traffic calming features.</p>

5	Junction of Somerset Avenue with Bridgwater Drive	<p>Objections received from nos. 24, 28 and 30 Bridgwater Drive.</p> <p>(a). DYL will displace parking to a more dangerous position along this stretch of road.</p> <p>(b). No problems currently caused by vehicles parking on the junction.</p> <p>(c). Will cause a serious loss of parking to residents.</p> <p>Support received from nos. 25 and 33 Bridgwater Drive.</p> <p>(a). There has been a serious accident due to parked cars on this junction recently.</p> <p>(b). There are a number of large commercial vehicles which park opposite the junction which obscure visibility.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. We received reports from residents of an accident occurring at the site. An accident did occur on 15/07/2008 as a result of a car parked opposite the junction obscuring the view of both a driver and a pedestrian where the vehicle collided with the pedestrian causing serious injury. Measures are required to ensure adequate visibility is maintained therefore reducing further potential accidents</p>
6	Junction of Somerset Crescent and Yeovil Chase with Somerset Avenue	<p>Objections received from nos. 35 Somerset Avenue, 1, 3, 6, 9 and 16 Yeovil Chase.</p> <p>(a). No problems with parking over the area.</p> <p>(b). This is a forerunner for a CPZ.</p> <p>(c). Will affect the aesthetics of the area.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. While the highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction, this is not enforceable without a TRO. There are no proposals for any other restrictions in the area.</p>
7	Junction of Taunton Drive and Porlock Avenue with Exford Avenue	<p>Objections received from no. 28 Exford Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Cars that are currently parked within 10 metres of the junction will be displaced increasing parking pressure.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. 10 metres of DYL around the junction will not impact significantly enough on parking within the local area to cause competition for parking places but will undoubtedly improve visibility.</p>
8	Junction of Yeovil Chase and Langport Drive with Exford Avenue	<p>Objections received from nos. 38 Exford Avenue and 17 Yeovil Chase.</p> <p>(a). No perceived problems with parking on the junction.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. The highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction. This must be formalised with a TRO to enable enforcement.</p>
9	Junction of Glastonbury Chase with Exford Avenue	<p>Support received from no. 80 Exford Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Problems with RBS staff parking cars along this stretch of road and would like to see a part week restriction implemented,</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. Look into further restrictions at a later date as not within the remit of this consultation.</p>

10	Junction of Bruton Avenue and Dulverton Close with Dulverton Avenue	<p>Support received from no. 9 Dulverton Close. (a). Support proposals in principle yet fear that introducing DYL will exacerbate the parking problems.</p> <p>Objection received from no. 60 Dulverton Avenue (a). DYL will go across frontage of property which will cause a reduction in parking.</p>	Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. The highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction however enforcement is not possible without a TRO.
11	Junction of Porlock Avenue with Dulverton Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 28 Dulverton Avenue. (a). No perceived problem on junction.</p>	Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised. The highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres of a junction however enforcement is not possible without a TRO.
12	Rosary Gardens	<p>Support from nos. 7 and 14 Rosary Gardens. (a). Feel that DYL should be extended due to the thin width of the carriageway and the level of parking.</p>	Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised with a view to reviewing the parking situation in greater detail at a later point.
13	Western Approaches	<p>Objection received from no. 5 Roach Vale. (a). DYL will cause those parking at the site of proposals to move into surrounding residential roads.</p>	Reduce length of DYL to 30m north of the new bus stop clearway. The proposal was advertised prior to the installation of a new bus stop clearway. Providing a DYL prior to the clearway will allow ease of manoeuvring into the clearway while still providing some parking.
14	Junction of Purley Way with Denton Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 86 Denton Avenue. (a). DYL will remove parking at both the front and the rear of property.</p>	To reduce the length of DYL on the west kerb to the start of the driveway of no. 86 Denton Avenue. To implement the DYL as advertised within Purley Way. Parking cannot be accommodated and still maintain access to all properties unless vehicles are accommodated on the footway which will not leave enough room for pedestrians to pass.
15	Junction of Denton Avenue with Dolphins and various corners	<p>Objections received from nos. 9, 10 and 12 Dolphins. (a). Dolphins is a cul-de-sac and as such does not receive through traffic or experience parking problems from surrounding amenities. (b). Will cause a significant loss of parking.</p>	Proceed with the implementation with DYL directly on the junction of Denton Avenue with Dolphins, but remove any DYL on various corners within Dolphins.

16	Junction of Sidmouth Avenue with Rochford Road	<p>Objection received from no. 87 Rochford Road and no. 3 Sidmouth Avenue.</p> <p>(a). There will be a significant reduction in parking for residents.</p> <p>(b). Length of DYL is over zealous.</p>	Proceed with the implementation of proposals at a reduced length of 10 metres into Sidmouth Avenue.
17	Junction of Denton Approach with Prince Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 227 prince Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Will remove parking directly outside the frontage to the property.</p>	Proceed with the implementation of proposals at a reduced length of 8 metres on the north kerb of Prince Avenue service road fronting no 227. Vehicles turning into service road are doing so from a 40mph dual carriageway, and as such do so at high speed. It would be dangerous for any vehicle to park on the junction as this would obscure the view for other vehicles. However we can accommodate a small reduction in the proposal to compromise between road safety and parking demand.
18	Junction of Prince Close with Prince Avenue	<p>Objections received from nos. 273 and 287 Prince Avenue.</p> <p>(a). Feels the length of DYL is too long and resident only bays should be marked.</p> <p>(b). DYL will increase parking pressure and congestion within the service road.</p>	Proceed with the implementation of proposals with DYL at reduced length on the junctions with Prince Avenue service road and Prince Avenue to maximise parking. Not within the remit of this consultation to implement TRO for resident parking. Can be considered for the future.
19	Southern bend of Henley Crescent	<p>Objections received from nos. 21, 25, 28, 30, 32 and 52 Henley Crescent.</p> <p>(a). Currently no problems with dangerous parking on the bend.</p> <p>(b). DYL seems unnecessary as Henley Crescent is not a through road.</p> <p>(c). Will reduce parking significantly and may create a parking problem.</p>	Recommendation is not to implement the proposals for this site.
20	Junction of Fairview Drive with Colemans Avenue	<p>Objection received from no. 25 Colemans Avenue.</p> <p>(a). DYL will remove parking across the entirety of the property which will disadvantage him as he has no off-street parking.</p>	Proceed with implementation of proposals with a reduction of DYL to 10 metres south of the junction on the west kerb.
21	Junction of Thear Close and Richmond Drive with Fairview Drive	<p>Objections received from nos. 4, 9, 10, 11 and 12 Thear Close.</p> <p>(a). There is no problem with access or turning movements within the Thear Close turning head itself.</p> <p>(b). DYL in turning head of Thear Close will remove parking for residents.</p>	Proceed with implementation of proposals with the removal of the DYL proposals for the turning head of Thear Close.

22	Junction of Fairview Drive with Rochester Drive	<p>Objection received from no. 2 Fariview Drive.</p> <p>(a). DYL across drive will prevent the use of parking over the drive.</p> <p>(b). Wishes to see DYL extended further into Fairview Drive.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals with the reduction of DYL to the northern extent of the driveway to no. 2 Fairview Drive on the east kerb of Rochester Drive. We cannot justify an extension of DYL in Fairview Drive.</p>
23	Junction of Somerton Avenue with Langport Drive	<p>Objection received from no. 30 Langport Drive.</p> <p>(a). No problems experienced by residents within the turning head.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals with a reduction of DYL to 10 metres on all sides of the junction.</p>
24	Junction of Martock Avenue with Dunster Avenue	<p>Objections received from nos. 17 and 19 Dunster Avenue.</p> <p>(a). DYL opposite junction will create serious parking problems as not all properties have driveways.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals with the removal of DYL opposite junction.</p>
25	Whole order	<p>Objections received from nos. 62 Eastbourne Grove and 7 Yeovil Chase.</p> <p>(a). Feels this is the forerunner to a CPZ.</p> <p>(b). Advises that we can enforce under the highway code.</p> <p>(c). Feels that financing of works as confirmed in report dated 12 February 2009 is incorrect.</p> <p>Support received from Southend University Hospital Area Residents Association.</p> <p>(a). Feels these are important safety measures.</p>	<p>Proceed with implementation of proposals as advertised with minor adjustments to proposals as per officer recommendations. This consultation is not on a CPZ, DYL is required around all junctions regardless of other restrictions placed on the highway. This is to maintain a smooth traffic flow and maintain road safety. Highway code states that parking should not occur within 10 metres however the highway authority has no enforcement powers unless a TRO is in effect. All finance for the project was agreed by this Cabinet Committee on 12th February 2009. Objections are not based on traffic grounds.</p>