

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and  
the Environment

to

**Traffic and Parking Working Party**

On

**8<sup>th</sup> September 2011**

Agenda  
Item No.

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

---

## **Proposed Milton Area Parking Management Scheme**

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***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**

- I) Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party are asked to note the outcome of the informal consultation as detailed in appendix 1 and are recommended not to proceed with the proposed Parking Management Scheme in the area.
- II) The Cabinet Committee is asked to note the outcome of the informal consultation as detailed in appendix 1, consider views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and agree not to proceed with the proposed Parking Management Scheme in the area.

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 Parking is 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 proximity to the town centre with drivers seeking free all day parking, the numbers of properties without frontages to create off street parking and the density of properties leads to high levels of parking demands and pressure.
- 3.2 In order to assess the situation and to gauge public opinion, all properties both residential and commercial have been informally consulted on proposals to implement a Parking Management Scheme in the area. Plans and a detailed questionnaire were sent to 1361 properties and 2 open sessions were held for residents & businesses to view large scale plans and discuss proposals with officers.

3.3 The process resulted in a response of 225 completed questionnaires which represents 16.61% of those consulted. Members are asked to note that a response of this nature is generally regarded as quite low. As a guide and for comparison, the two schemes we have recently implemented attracted 26% and 42% responses). The responses have been carefully analysed and residents views and comments have been a key consideration in the recommendation.

3.4 The details of the responses and analysis is set out below.

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Albert Mews	1	0	0	1
Ashburnham Road	21	3	5	29
Avenue Road	11	11	3	25
Avenue Terrace	6	10	2	18
Gordon Road *	1	1	0	2
Hamlet Road	15	1	1	17
London Road	1	0	2	3
Milton Road *	0	1	1	2
Park Crescent	1	2	0	3
Park Road	7	12	3	22
Park Street	23	8	6	37
Park Terrace	4	4	2	10
Princes Street	17	6	5	28
Queens Road	7	3	3	13
St Vincents Road	7	7	1	15
Total	122	69	34	225

\*Not included within proposed area

3.5 The results were then further analysed by assessing the response of “unsure category”. 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
Albert Mews	1	0	0	1
Ashburnham Road	22	7	0	29
Avenue Road	11	14	0	25
Avenue Terrace	8	10	0	18
Gordon Road *	1	1	0	2
Hamlet Road	15	2	0	17
London Road	2	1	0	3
Milton Road *	0	2	0	2
Park Crescent	1	2	0	3
Park Road	7	15	0	22
Park Street	25	12	0	37
Park Terrace	4	6	0	10
Princes Street	19	9	0	28
Queens Road	10	3	0	13
St Vincents Road	7	8	0	15
Total	133	92	0	225

\*Not included within proposed area

3.6 This showed that 59% of those responded indicated a degree of acceptance of the proposals as outlined during the consultation stage. While there is a majority in favour of a Parking Management Scheme, responses from several roads on the western side of the area are opposed to the scheme. The reasons for opposition include comments indicating that a number of residents do not feel there is a parking problem, opposition to the concept of paying for permits with no guarantee of parking and the loss of available parking which is often an unfortunate effect formalising parking arrangements.

3.7 In light of the comments received, it is potentially possible to downsize the scheme and the boundaries of the scheme revised to exclude those roads where the majority of residents are in opposition. A breakdown of the remaining roads and the support/opposition is set out below. Members are asked to note that if this option was considered it will lose the wider purpose of parking management scheme in the area and is likely to lead to a short term solution as it will displace parking to the adjoining areas thereby causing additional parking strain. However this is not the course of action which officers would recommend.

Road Name	Yes	No	Unsure	Total Road Response
Albert Mews	1	0	0	1
Ashburnham Road	22	7	0	29
Hamlet Road	15	2	0	17
London Road	2	1	0	3
Princes Street	19	9	0	28
Queens Road	10	3	0	13
Total	69	22	0	91

3.8 In this case “No action” is a serious consideration particularly as there is no wider area support for the proposals. The level of response (16.6% has been comparatively low and may not be regarded as representative of all those affected. It also needs to be noted that the ward councillors have not indicated a strong views about the need for any changes. In view of this, it can reasonably be assumed that the formal consultation could lead to high level of objections which will not only have financial implications but will impact on scarce staff time. As such it is recommended not to proceed with the proposals at this stage.

#### 4. Other Options

##### Option 1

(a) To advertise the current proposals in accordance with statutory requirements and authorise officers to make minor design amendments resulting from the formal consultation and in the event of no unresolved objections to the proposals, confirm the order and implement the proposals.

(b) To report back any unresolved objections to committee for consideration.

##### Option 2

(a) Advertise the revised proposals set out in 3.6 of this report in accordance with statutory requirements and agree to minor design amendments resulting from the formal consultation and In the event of no unresolved objections to the proposal, confirm the Order and implement the proposal.

(b) To report back any unresolved objections to committee for consideration.

### Option 3

To agree to take no further action and instruct officers to monitor the situation and review this at a later date.

## **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 from the existing budgets.

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 and the Cabinet Committee 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**

T & P Work Programme

**8. Appendices**

None