

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Corporate of Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
31st October 2013

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

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders - Various Areas

Executive Councillor: Cllr Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider details of the objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders for proposed waiting restrictions at various sites and decide on action.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the objections to the proposed Orders and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:**

- (a) **Implement the proposals without amendment; or,**
(b) **Implement the proposals with amendment; or,**
(c) **Take no further action**

- 2.2 **That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party, following consideration of the representations received and agree the appropriate course of action.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Cabinet Committee periodically agrees to advertise proposals to implement waiting restrictions in various areas as a result of requests from Councillors and members of the public based upon an assessment against the Council's current policies.

- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached Appendix 1 were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make their representations for or against the proposals. This process has resulted in the objections detailed in Appendix 1 of this report. Officers have considered these objections and where possible tried to resolve these and observations are provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 All proposals were advertised with an aim to improve highway safety and to reduce congestion, which were the concerns and considerations leading to the proposals.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking and traffic is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 Costs for confirmation of the Order and amendments suggested in Appendix 1 can be met from existing budgets.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 Work required to implement any works will be met by existing staff resources.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

- 5.6.1 This report provides details of the outcome of the statutory consultation process.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.7.1 Any implications will be taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and so have a positive risk assessment.

5.9 Value for Money

- 5.9.1 The proposals offer value for money and will be carried out by contractors appointed by means of a tendering process.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

- 5.10.1 None.

5.11 Environmental Impact

- 5.11.1 Neutral.

6. Background Papers

6.1 None

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Details of representations received and Officer observations.

**Appendix 1 Details of representations received and Officer Observations
relating to the Report on Traffic Regulation Orders - Objections
(Various Areas)- 31/10/2013**

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Thorpe Hall Close	Ward members	Provide junction in access to close, provide part day restriction in remainder of close	Nine objections received stating un-necessary works – obstruction in access were occurring due to large scale developments at 2 nearby properties and builders unable to park due to existing restrictions therefore used the close. Adverse impact on residents and visitors due to loss of parking.	Recommend proceed with junction protection only for 10m. No further action on additional proposals.
Herschell Road near to London Road junction	Ward member	Provide part day restriction to ease traffic flow at traffic lights	One objection received: concerned at loss of parking provision.	The proposal was put forward to relieve alleged congestion at this busy junction. Whilst there has only been one objection, officers have monitored the situation. This route is not defined as a distributor or strategic route and there is a need for on street parking. Introduction of part day restriction will not have any beneficial impact, Recommend no further action
Rosary Gardens	public	Provide double yellow lines partly into T section of close	Two objections received: Loss of parking, will push parking further into close. One suggestion of extending line partially	There does not seem to be a consensus with 1 comment saying all un-necessary and 1 suggesting partial. No safety issue identified, junction and access protected with existing restrictions. Recommend no further action
Bristol Road/Wilmott Road	TM Team	Provide double yellow lines at and opposite junction	One objection received, suggesting vehicles not usually parked however reports from Cory confirm they do experience difficulty in accessing the road.	Access difficulties for refuse freighters were reportedly resulting in damaged verges. Lines at and opposite the junction will

				remove the likelihood of damage. Proceed with proposal
Bonchurch Avenue, Various junctions	Public	Provide double yellow lines at junctions	One Objection received: Loss of parking, will force cars into fewer spaces leaving pedestrians to cross between cars	Junctions should be protected for visibility and will also provide clear areas for pedestrians to cross. Proceed with proposal.