## Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

# Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and the Environment

to

### Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee

on

5<sup>th</sup> January 2012

Report prepared by: Cheryl Hindle-Terry <u>Team Leader Parking, Traffic Management and Road Safety</u> **Objection to Traffic Regulation Orders – Proposed Loading Restrictions in the Broadway, Leigh on Sea Executive Councillor: Cllr Cox** *A Part 1 Public Agenda Item* 

#### 1. Purpose of Report

For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider the sole objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order in relation to Broadway, Leigh-on-Sea.

#### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party note and consider the objection to the Order and approve implementation of the proposals without amendment.
- 2.2 That the Cabinet Committee note and consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party in respect of the objections and agree implementation of the proposed loading restrictions in Broadway, Leigh without amendment.

#### 3. Background

- 3.1 Members agreed in October 2011 to advertise proposals to implement loading restrictions in Broadway, Leigh on Sea, to prevent delays to traffic during peak hours and also to improve safety.
- 3.2 The formal consultation process commenced on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2011 and comments were invited from resident, businesses and other road users by 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011 This process has resulted in 1 objection being received, details of which are shown in Appendix 1 to this report along with the officer's observations to aid consideration by Members.

#### 4. Outcome of the advertising Process

4.1 It needs to be noted that only one objection has been received and this related to the operational hours of the proposed restrictions. It is the view of officers that such a proposal will have consequential impact on loading and unloading and will have detrimental impact on the businesses in the area (as indicated in officer's response in Appendix 1).

Agenda Item No.

#### 5. Other Options

5.1 Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party may also consider that the proposal as advertised should be implemented with amendments or they may recommend not to implement the proposal at all.

#### 6. Reasons for Recommendations

6.1 To improve highway safety and to reduce congestion, which were the concerns leading to the proposals.

#### 7. Corporate Implications

- 7.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.
- 7.1.1 Ensuring parking is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities.
- 7.2 Financial Implications
- 7.2.1 Costs for confirmation of the Order and amendments suggested in Appendix 1 will be met from existing budgets.
- 7.3 Legal Implications
- 7.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.
- 7.4 People Implications
- 7.4.1 Work required implement any works will be met by existing staff resources.
- 7.4 Property Implications
- 7.5.1 None
- 7.6 Consultation
- 7.6.1 This report provides details of the outcome of the statutory consultation process.
- 7.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications
- 7.7.1 None.
- 7.8 Risk Assessment
- 7.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and so have a positive risk assessment.
- 7.9 Value for Money
- 7.9.1 The proposals offer value for money and will be carried out by contractors procured to provide such.
- 7.10 Community Safety Implications
- 7.10.1 None.
- 7.11 Environmental Impact
- 7.11.1 Neutral.

#### 8. Background Papers

8.1 Traffic Regulation Orders – Requests for New or Amended Restrictions reports dated 27<sup>th</sup> October 2011 and agreed minutes.

#### 9. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Details of representation received and Officer comment Appendix 2 – Plan showing details of the proposed scheme