

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

to

Traffic and Parking Working Party

On

2nd November 2009

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

Agenda
Item No.

**Parking Management Schemes
Southend Hospital Area
Executive Councillor: Councillor Waite
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

1. Purpose of Report

For Members to consider the outcomes of a recent informal consultation and recommendations for further action.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That Members consider the report and agree with officer recommendations to proceed to the formal consultation stage to implement a Parking Management Scheme in the Southend Hospital Area.

3. Background

- 3.1 Parking is incredibly pressured in many areas of the town due to many factors such as the level of car ownership, the lack of off street parking potential and restrictions on parking due to traffic flow and access requirements. The pressure is hugely exacerbated in this area due to the numbers of staff and visitors to the hospital who park on street. This is due to both lack of available parking within the hospital site and the avoidance of parking charges.
- 3.2 As part of the planning permission to create a multi storey car park granted to the Hospital, conditions as to the on street parking situation were imposed and the Hospital were required to fund any surveys, consultation and eventual Parking Management Scheme (PMS) in the area.
- 3.3 Surveys of parking levels ascertained that the area suffers with non resident parking which effectively displaces residents from their streets and preliminary designs were created. The designs and conditions of the schemes were reported

to Cabinet on 16th June 2009 and agreement given to proceed with an informal consultation to assess residents views.

- 3.4 The Consultation commenced on 10th August 2009 and involved delivery of information and a questionnaire to each property in the areas, two “drop in sessions” held within the Hospital an evening and a Saturday afternoon and high colour posters advertising the consultation and drop in sessions were erected on the affected streets.
- 3.5 This process was very effective and resulted in a high turnout at both of the sessions and a very good percentage of completed questionnaires (42%)
- 3.6 The responses have been very carefully analysed resulting in the recommendation and details of the responses and analysis process are set out below.

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Badgers Close	0	6	3	9
Beeleigh Close	3	0	1	4
Cardigan Avenue	13	3	2	18
Carlingford Drive	26	4	9	39
Carlton Avenue	49	23	8	80
Chase Gardens	3	10	0	13
Cleveland Drive	6	15	4	25
Cliffsea Grove	0	1	0	1
Colemans Avenue	13	3	1	17
Commercial Road	2	2	1	5
Daws Heath Road	0	1	0	1
Earls Hall Avenue	13	31	4	48
Eastbourne Grove	6	30	1	37
Fairview Drive	5	5	1	11
Gainsborough Drive	6	11	2	19
Henley Crescent	1	0	0	1
Highfield Close	0	1	1	2
Highfield Drive	1	0	0	1
Highfield Gardens	1	6	6	13
Highfield Grove	6	11	4	21
Highfield Way	0	1	3	4
Hillborough Mansions, Hillborough Road	3	1	1	5
Hillborough Road	6	1	0	7
Hobleythick Lane	12	14	6	32
Holmsdale Close	2	2	0	4
Kenilworth Gardens	0	1	0	1
Lavender Grove	3	4	1	8
Mayfield Avenue	7	25	4	36
Northville Drive	11	6	5	22
Parkstone Drive	4	13	2	19
Prince Avenue	5	0	0	5
Prittlewell Chase	16	13	8	37
Queen Anne's Drive	8	12	2	22
Richmond Drive	7	10	4	21
Rochester Drive	22	8	8	38
Rosary Gardens	1	1	0	2

Seldon Close	0	1	0	1
Shakespeare Avenue	7	7	2	16
Southbourne Gardens	2	1	0	3
Southbourne Grove	18	17	4	39
Southend Hospital	0	5	0	5
Springfield Drive	5	11	2	18
St George's Drive	3	10	2	15
St George's Park Avenue	0	1	0	1
Thear Close	6	3	0	9
Westbourne Grove	27	20	6	53
	329	351	108	788
Percentage	41.80%	44.50%	13.70%	42.16%

3.7 For the analysis process we removed responses from the northern end of both Southbourne Grove and Westbourne Grove and also Badgers Close. These roads are subject to an alternative restrictions.

3.8 This result was then further analysed and it was noted that the majority of residents in roads east of Hobleythick Lane and also south of Prittlewell Chase were against the proposals as they feel they do not have problems associated with the Hospital. Where roads are on the periphery of an area it is a simple process to exclude these roads from further consideration and it is also important to recognise that the "No" response received overall was drastically altered when these roads were removed as shown. We have also removed roads which do not form part of the proposed PMS

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Cardigan Avenue	13	3	2	18
Carlingford Drive	26	4	9	39
Carlton Avenue	49	23	8	80
Chase Gardens	3	10	0	13
Colemans Avenue	13	3	1	17
Commercial Road	2	2	1	5
Eastbourne Grove	6	30	1	37
Fairview Drive	5	5	1	11
Hillborough Mansions, Hillborough Road	3	1	1	5
Hillborough Road	6	1	0	7
Holmsdale Close	2	2	0	4
Lavender Grove	3	4	1	8
Northville Drive	11	6	5	22
Prince Avenue	5	0	0	5
Prittlewell Chase	16	13	8	37
Queen Anne's Drive	8	12	2	22
Richmond Drive	7	10	4	21
Rochester Drive	22	8	8	38
Southbourne Gardens	2	1	0	3
Southbourne Grove	13	11	4	28
Thear Close	6	3	0	9
Westbourne Grove	22	19	6	47
Total	243	174	65	488
Percentage	49.85%	35.65%	13.31%	

- 3.10 The results were then further analysed by assessing the response of “Unsure”. By considering the question “do you think parking controls should be introduced in this area” and also by the additional comments provided we were able to place each “unsure” answer into either the “Yes” or “No” category.

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Cardigan Avenue	14	4	0	18
Carlingford Drive	33	6	0	39
Carlton Avenue	56	24	0	80
Chase Gardens	3	10	0	13
Colemans Avenue	14	3	0	17
Commercial Road	3	2	0	5
Eastbourne Grove	6	31	0	37
Fairview Drive	6	5	0	11
Hillborough Mansions, Hillborough Road	4	1	0	5
Hillborough Road	6	1	0	7
Holmsdale Close	2	2	0	4
Lavender Grove	4	4	0	8
Northville Drive	14	8	0	22
Prittlewell Chase	22	15	0	37
Queen Anne's Drive	9	13	0	22
Richmond Drive	11	10	0	21
Rochester Drive	27	11	0	38
Southbourne Gardens	2	1	0	3
Southbourne Grove	16	12	0	28
Southend Hospital	0	6	0	6
Thear Close	6	3	0	9
Westbourne Grove	24	23	0	47
	282	195	0	477
Percentage	59.11%	40.88%	0.00%	36.1% Response Rate

- 3.11 Two roads resulted in a majority response of “No”, Both of these roads (Chase Gardens and Eastbourne Grove) can be excluded from the area however this will inevitably result in displaced parking. Residents will also be disadvantaged as all of the properties in these roads will not be eligible to purchase either residents or visitors permits.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Mark out parking bays in the streets surrounding the hospital. This would ensure parking is controlled in suitable locations and that residents accesses are protected. Obviously this option gives no advantage to residents or their visitors.
- 4.2 No action. This option is not viable, residents expectations of a resolution to their parking concerns have now been raised and to take no action would result in a negative perception of the Council

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To improve parking priority for residents while incorporating road safety, access and traffic flow requirements

6. Corporate Implications

- 6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

The proposal is based on a reduction of potential traffic hazards therefore resulting in safer roads.

Providing residents with priority parking availability is responsive to residents needs and leads to an excellent council

- 6.2 Financial Implications

Costs to be met by Southend Hospital.

- 6.3 Legal Implications

The formal statutory consultative process will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation and any resulting objections referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for their consideration as required by the Constitution of the Council.

- 6.4 People Implications

Staff time as required to organise and monitor the required works, will be met from existing resources.

- 6.5 Property Implications

None

- 6.6 Consultation

As above

7. Background Papers

None

8. Appendices

None