

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

To

**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**

On

5th January 2011

Agenda
Item No.

Report prepared by:
Andrew Meddle (Head of Planning & Transport)

**Petition Regarding the Changing of Parking Restrictions in Midhurst Avenue,
Southend-on-Sea**

Economic & Environment Scrutiny Committee

Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide a response and recommended course of action with regard to a petition presented to Full Council requesting the changing of parking restrictions in Midhurst Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, following the introduction of the Parking Management Scheme around Southend Hospital.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

1. Note that Midhurst Avenue has already been identified to be part of the post-implementation review of the Hospital Parking Management Scheme. This will be part of a comprehensive report that will be presented to the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee in 2012. Ward Councillors and the petitioners will be engaged in discussions and consulted on proposals.
2. No further action is considered necessary as a result of this specific petition at this stage.

3. Background

- 3.1 A petition (attached) containing 47 signatories from residents of Midhurst Avenue was presented to Full Council in October 2011. The petitioners have requested that the same parking restrictions that have been installed in streets within the Hospital Parking Scheme (PMS) area, be installed in Midhurst Avenue.
- 3.2 The Petition as presented is detailed below:

“PETITION FOR PARKING – MIDHURST AVENUE

Parking problems have got worse since Southend Council have put parking restrictions in surrounding areas and residents have been verbally abused when they have asked drivers to keep their driveways clear. We also have also now got all the parents from Earls Hall School parking in Midhurst Ave as all other entrances have parking restrictions, we also have the Royal Bank of Scotland and the vets parking here as there are no restrictions in place. When this was reported in the Evening Echo it was stated that they would be enforced right down to the 127. If we had known that Midhurst Ave would not be included we have objected at the time.

WE THE UNDERSIGNED WOULD LIKE THE SAME RESTRICTIONS IN PLACE FOR MIDHURST AVENUE”

- 3.3 The streets surrounding Southend Hospital have always been attractive to visitors travelling by car to the hospital, who use these streets to park their cars at no charge. Following a planning application by the Hospital to develop a multi storey car park within its own site a planning agreement was entered into under section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1991, in which the hospital would fund all reasonable costs to implementing parking controls in the residential streets surrounding the Hospital. Parking surveys were carried out to establish the extent of the problem.
- 3.4 This showed that parking stress was evident in these streets. Informal consultation with the local community supported this evidence and a Parking Management Scheme (HPMS) was proposed. The streets included in the PMS originally incorporated Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent (which can only be accessed by Midhurst Avenue. Following representations during the informal consultation with the local community in 2008, that Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent should not be included in the PMS proposals, these two streets were removed from the scheme catchment area and the boundary of the PMS was moved to Coleman’s Avenue and Carlton Avenue, thus excluding Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent.
- 3.5 After further development, including detailed design and statutory consultation, the Hospital Parking Scheme became fully operational in May 2011. A natural and predictable consequence of parking controls in the form of a PMS, is the displacement of traffic into surrounding streets which are adjacent to the PMS, particularly if no parking restrictions exist in these streets (as in the case of Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent). The petition from residents of Midhurst Avenue is a consequence of this displacement of parking demand.
- 3.6 In accordance with best practice, Parking Management Schemes are the subject of a Review of terms of their operation within the first 6 to 9 months of the scheme going ‘live’. This ensures that the parking layout, the zone boundary, the hours and days of operation etc. meet with the requirements of the local community within the zone. This Review also assesses the displacement of parking in the streets surrounding the PMS and aims to mitigate against any negative effects, which may have been caused by the implementation of the PMS.
- 3.7 The Review of the Hospital Parking Management Scheme has already started, as it is part of the Highways and Traffic Management Service work

programmes, and the effects of the displaced parking into Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent will be investigated as part of this process. Early proposals are that the HPMS zone boundary should be extended to incorporate Midhurst Avenue and Henley Crescent into the HPMS, hence giving local residents preferential parking and protection from undesirable parking by those from outside the area. A report outlining these proposals and the other details of the Review of the HPMS is planned for presentation to the Traffic and Parking Working Group and Cabinet Committee in 2012. Subject to this Committee's decision, the necessary Traffic Regulation Order making procedures will be followed and zone boundary of the HPMS will be extended to the A127 (Prince Avenue) and Holeythick Lane, unless there are objections which cannot be overcome.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 It would to react to this petition independent of the post-implementation review, but this would not be a coordinated approach, nor would it offer value for money.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 The recommendation enables a proportionate response to be made to the issues raised.
- 5.2 The adherence to Council policy allows for a consistent approach to be taken, enabling the best use of resources.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 The recommendations are consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities.

6.2 Financial Implications

- 6.2.1 None

6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 None

6.4 People Implications

- 6.4.1 Neutral

6.5 Property Implications

- 6.5.1 Neutral

6.6 Consultation

- 6.6.1 None

6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 6.7.1 None

6.8 Risk Assessment

- 6.8.1 None

- 6.9 Value for Money

6.9.1 The recommendation will deliver value for money and a proportionate response.

6.10 Community Safety Implications

6.10.1 Neutral

6.11 Environmental Impact

6.11.1 Neutral

7. Background Papers

7.1 None

8. Appendices

8.1 None