

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

Traffic and Parking Working Party

The Cabinet Committee

On

2nd November 2009

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

**Agenda
Item No.**

**Parking Management Schemes
Chalkwell Station 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 not proceed to the formal consultation stage to implement a Parking Management Scheme in the Chalkwell Station Area.

AND

2.2 That Members agree to the advertisement of any Traffic Regulation Orders to reduce/remove any existing waiting restrictions which can be removed without compromising safety or traffic flow to provide additional parking.

AND

2.3 That Members agree to the advertisement of various Traffic Regulation Orders designed to prohibit parking at dangerous areas and to reduce existing waiting restrictions where possible.

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 commuters parking on street to access Chalkwell Station. This pressure is further exacerbated due to the introduction of a 1 hour prohibition in the easternmost roads of the area which effectively prevents commuters from parking in these roads.

3.2 As part of the Local Transport Plan programmed works for 2008, 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.

3.3 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 in the area on an evening and a Saturday afternoon and high colour posters advertising the consultation and drop in sessions were erected on the affected streets.

3.4 This process was very effective and resulted in a good turnout at both of the sessions and a very good percentage of completed questionnaires (26.5%)

NB many properties returned a questionnaire and wrote a letter direct to the department

3.5 The responses have been 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
Leigh Road	8	8	1	17
Carlton Drive	0	14	1	15
Nelson Drive	2	4	1	7
Somerville Gardens	1	12	1	14
Woodfield Road	19	22	6	47
Woodfield Gardens	12	6	2	20
Glen Road	7	5	0	12
Grand Parade	11	4	2	17
Cliff Gardens	2	0	0	2
Undercliff Gardens	8	5	5	18
The Ridgeway	8	10	2	20
Hillside Crescent	13	11	4	28
Beach Avenue	23	13	0	36
Upland Road	6	0	0	6
Cliff Road	10	6	1	17
Cliff Avenue	2	5	1	8
Kent View Avenue	1	10	1	12
Ridgeway Gardens	2	1	1	4

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
The Crossways	3	10	1	14
King's Road	13	15	3	31
Mount Avenue**	8	14	1	23
Hillway**	9	5	0	14
The Drive**	13	1	0	14
Park Side**	2	4	0	6
The Meadway**	9	3	0	12
The Leasway**	19	4	0	23
Hall Park Avenue**	23	2	1	26
Totals	234	194	35	463
Percentage	50.50%	41.90%	7.55%	43%

3.6 **This indicates a majority in favour of the introduction of a PMS however residents indicated that while they were in favour of a PMS, the response included the caveat that their roads remain unaffected. Hall Park Avenue, the road on the extreme eastern boundary of the area, had also requested that their road be subject to the 1 hour prohibition currently in place in their neighbouring roads.

3.7 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 as shown in the table below. Where there is no clear indication the answer has remained as "unsure"

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Leigh Road	9	8	0	17
Carlton Drive	0	15	0	15
Nelson Drive	2	4	1	7
Somerville Gardens	1	13	0	14
Woodfield Road	20	26	1	47
Woodfield Gardens	12	8	0	20
Glen Road	7	5	0	12
Grand Parade	12	4	1	17
Cliff Gardens	2	0	0	2
Undercliff Gardens	11	7	0	18
The Ridgeway	9	11	0	20
Hillside Crescent	17	11	0	28
Beach Avenue	23	13	0	36
Upland Road	6	0	0	6
Cliff Road	11	6	0	17
Cliff Avenue	3	5	0	8
Kent View Avenue	1	11	0	12
Ridgeway Gardens	3	1	0	4
The Crossways	3	11	0	14
King's Road	11	17	0	31
Mount Avenue**	8	14	1	23
Hillway**	9	5	0	14

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
The Drive**	13	1	0	14
Park Side**	2	4	0	6
The Meadway**	9	3	0	12
The Leasway**	19	4	0	23
Hall Park Avenue**	23	2	1	26
Totals	246	209	5	463
Percentage	53.13	45.14	1.07%	43%

- 3.8 The roads which wish to remain unaffected are indicated by ** in order to assess the views of residents in the roads directly affected by the introduction of a PMS, the results were further analysed by removing the roads which wish to remain unaffected.

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Leigh Road	9	8	0	17
Carlton Drive	0	15	0	15
Nelson Drive	2	4	1	7
Somerville Gardens	1	13	0	14
Woodfield Road	20	26	1	47
Woodfield Gardens	12	8	0	20
Glen Road	7	5	0	12
Grand Parade	12	4	1	17
Cliff Gardens	2	0	0	2
Undercliff Gardens	11	7	0	18
The Ridgeway	9	11	0	20
Hillside Crescent	17	11	0	28
Beach Avenue	23	13	0	36
Upland Road	6	0	0	6
Cliff Road	11	6	0	17
Cliff Avenue	3	5	0	8
Kent View Avenue	1	11	0	12
Ridgeway Gardens	3	1	0	4
The Crossways	3	11	0	14
Totals	152	159	3	314
Percentage	48.40%	50.63%	0.95%	

- 3.9 Therefore the residents of those roads affected by the introduction of a PMS are against the proposals
- 3.10 During the survey process, various locations were identified such as junctions which currently have no waiting restrictions, these areas are considered dangerous and therefore we need to propose restrictions to prohibit parking. Additional works are being undertaken identifying any areas of existing restrictions which could be removed without compromising safety or traffic flow to provide additional parking.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Do Nothing. This option will result in dangerous areas remaining untreated.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

5.1 To reflect the opinions of residents.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

The recommendation reflects the wishes of the residents which leads to an excellent Council and proposals to control parking leads to safer roads.

6.2 Financial Implications

Costs for the scheme to be met from previously agreed budgets through the Local Transport Plan

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