

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

To

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

On

14th June 2012

Agenda
Item No.

Report prepared by:
Andrew Meddle – Head of Planning & Transport

Informal Parking Consultation Results
Marine Estate Area, Westcliff Station and Seafront Area, Southend East Station Area,
Eastern Esplanade Area and Thorpe Esplanade Area.
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To advise Members of the results of several informal parking consultations.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- i) **Note the results and agree to take no further action on progressing the formal implementation of these proposals; and**
- ii) **Agree that at a time when the work programme allows, officers identify local improvements to highways and parking restrictions in these areas to increase the parking available for residents and local businesses and to reduce the impact of commuter parking, as appropriate;**

3. Background

3.1 Following the introduction of two Parking Management Schemes (PMS) which provide designated residents parking in areas where non-resident parking creates parking pressure, requests for similar schemes elsewhere in the borough have increased.

3.2 In order to form a focussed work programme to address parking issues, it was decided to informally consult residents in several areas, close to stations, the seafront or other traffic generators as to their views on parking.

3.3 Approximately 17,000 consultation packs were sent out which included a covering letter as to why the exercise was being undertaken, an explanation of how parking controls work and a questionnaire.

3.4 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised. The figures relating to each consultation are provided in sections 4 to 8 of this report.

- 3.5 In all of the areas consulted, there was no majority support for any action. However, it should be noted that in each of the areas, small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.
- 3.6 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.
- 3.7 In addition, many helpful comments were received suggesting minor changes such as the introduction of waiting restrictions at or around junctions or the removal of some restrictions to allow parking.
- 3.8 It is suggested that the results are further analysed to collate these comments and when the work programme allows, for investigations to be completed, to assess whether the suggestions meet the criteria within the waiting restrictions policy.
- 3.9 It is also suggested that when sufficient time is available, officers consider the results of the consultation further to identify any small areas which may benefit from additional investigation, the results to be considered further by this committee.
- 3.10 The results for each of these areas is discussed in the sections that follow.

4. Eastern Esplanade Proposals

- 4.1 The table below summarises the results of the consultation for this area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE EASTERN ESPLANADE PMS CONSULTATION			
Number of questionnaires sent out	1584		
Responses received	1001 (31.9%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 47.1%	No = 52.9%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 36.4%	No = 55.2%	
Question 6A & B – <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority or Yellow Line Restrictions?</i>	Permit = 26.1%	Line = 12.3%	Combination = 12.7%

- 4.2 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised.
- 4.3 This was at the mid-level of responses received in the five areas recently surveyed, but clearly a statistically significant response rate. There was no overall consensus or majority support for any comprehensive action. However, it should be noted that small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.
- 4.4 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to

merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.

5. Marine Estate PMS

5.1 The table below summarises the results of the consultation for this area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE MARINE ESTATE PMS CONSULTATION			
Number of questionnaires sent out	2100		
Responses received	955 (45.5%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 41.3%	No = 58.7%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 40.2%	No = 59.8%	
Question 6A & B – <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority or Yellow Line Restrictions?</i>	Permit = 20.7%	Line = 15.9%	Combination = 15.8%

5.2 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised.

5.3 This was the best level of response in the five areas recently surveyed. There was no overall consensus or majority support for any comprehensive action. However, it should be noted that small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.

5.4 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.

6. Southend East Railway Station PMS

6.1 The table below summarises the results of the consultation for this area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE SOUTHEND EAST RAILWAY STATION PMS CONSULTATION			
Number of questionnaires sent out	3803		
Responses received	1001 (26.3%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 49.4%	No = 50.6%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 38.3%	No = 61.7%	
Question 6A & B – <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority or Yellow Line Restrictions?</i>	Permit = 28.5%	Line = 11.7%	Combination = 14.8%

6.2 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised.

6.3 This was on the low side of the level of responses received in the five areas recently surveyed, but nonetheless a statistically significant response rate.

There was no overall consensus or majority support for any comprehensive action. However, it should be noted that small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.

- 6.4 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.

7. Thorpe Esplanade PMS

- 7.1 The table below summarises the results of the consultation for this area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE THORPE ESPLANADE PMS CONSULTATION			
Number of questionnaires sent out	250		
Responses received	102 (40.8%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 37.3%	No = 62.7%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 45.1%	No = 52.9%	
Question 6A & B – <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority or Yellow Line Restrictions?</i>	Permit = 25.5%	Line = 20.6%	Combination = 19.6%

- 7.2 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised.

- 7.3 This was on the high of the level of responses received in the five areas recently surveyed and is a statistically significant response rate. There was no overall consensus or majority support for any comprehensive action. However, it should be noted that small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.

- 7.4 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.

8. Westcliff Station & Seafront PMS

- 8.1 The table below summarises the results of the consultation for this area.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE WESTCLIFF STATION & SEAFRONT PMS CONSULTATION			
Number of questionnaires sent out	7399		
Responses received	1305 (17.6%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 53.9%	No = 46.1%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 47.7%	No = 52.3%	
Question 6A & B – <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority or Yellow Line Restrictions?</i>	Permit = 36.4%	Line = 11.6%	Combination = 17.9%

- 8.2 A high number of responses were received, these were logged and carefully analysed to consider all the issues raised. The key figures are shown in Table 1 above and in detail in Appendix 1 to this report.
- 8.3 This was the lowest response rate in the five areas recently surveyed, but nonetheless statistically significant. There was no overall consensus or majority support for any comprehensive action. However, it should be noted that small sections, individual roads or groups of roads do appear to be supportive of parking controls.
- 8.4 It should be further noted that although there appear to be small areas of support within the larger areas, dealing with parking issues in this way tends to merely displace the parking and any effective scheme must be implemented with adequate boundaries designed to minimise this displacement.

9. Conclusions

- 9.1 In no area was there a clear majority of those living in the area in favour of enhanced parking restrictions. There was no consistency and little predictability about responses either. The highest area in terms of considering there was a parking problem (Westcliff Station & Seafront) still did not receive a majority of respondents in favour of increased parking restrictions. The highest percentage wanting increased parking restrictions, Westcliff Station & Seafront, achieved this from the lowest level of response.
- 9.2 In the areas where the response rate was good, there was no consensus as to what measures should be deployed to tackle the issue. The highest rate of returns was for the Marine Estate (45.5%) from a total of 2100 questionnaires sent out, but less than 10% of all households wanted a PMS. With no consensus there can be no clear mandate to deliver such a significant change to the parking conditions.

10. Other Options

- 10.1 Proceed with suggestions immediately. To investigate and propose resolutions to the issues raised will require staff time however Members have the opportunity to prioritise all requests and can apply an appropriate priority when considering the full works list.

11. Reasons for Recommendations

- 11.1 The recommendation will enable an investigation and appropriate proposals.

12. Corporate Implications

12.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 12.1.1 None at this stage.

12.2 Financial Implications

- 12.2.1 Use of existing budgets for any resulting works.

12.3 Legal Implications

- 12.3.1 None

12.4 People Implications

12.4.1 Neutral

12.5 *Property Implications*

12.5.1 Neutral

12.6 *Consultation*

12.6.1 Any proposals would be subject to full consultation including statutory consultation processes required for any resulting Traffic Regulation Orders.

12.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

12.7.1 None

12.8 *Risk Assessment*

12.8.1 None

12.9 *Value for Money*

12.9.1 N/a at this stage

12.10 *Community Safety Implications*

12.10.1 Neutral

12.11 *Environmental Impact*

12.11.1 Neutral

13. Background Papers

13.1 None

14. Appendices

14.1 None