

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Corporate Director for Place  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**

on  
**21st January 2014**

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

---

**Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Areas**  
**Place Scrutiny Committee - 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 representations in respect of 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 The proposals aim to improve highway safety and to reduce congestion.

#### **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, in Appendix 1, if approved, 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 Works required to implement the agreed schemes will be undertaken 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. As such are likely to have a positive impact.

##### **5.9 Value for Money**

5.9.1 Works associated with the schemes listed in Appendix 1 will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

##### **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

5.10.1 The schemes in Appendix 1 if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

##### **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**

| <b>Road</b>      | <b>Proposed By</b> | <b>Proposal</b>                                  | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Officer Comment</b>  |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|---|
| Glenbervie Drive | Officers           | Install junction protection at various junctions | One objection relating to loss of parking  | <b>The proposal has been designed in consultation with ward Councillors who are aware of the parking pressure. In an attempt to improve junction visibility while minimising the loss of parking availability, areas of existing restrictions are being reduced. Recommend to proceed with the proposal to improve junction visibility.</b> |
| Weare Gifford    | Officers           | Implement junction protection                    | One objection relating to the proposed length of waiting restrictions and requesting the restriction extends into the entire access road of the close.                 | <b>The original proposal meets the Councils agreed criteria for protecting junctions. The suggested amendment would not meet the criteria and would require re advertisement at significant cost.</b><br><br><b>Recommend proceed with advertised proposal of junction protection only.</b>   |
| St Andrews Road  | Members            | Implement junction protection at all junctions   | One objection related to the junction of Connaught Gardens. Objector concerned that parking will be displaced to their property. Suggests the proposal is un-necessary | <b>The Council is committed to improving safety and while no accidents have been recorded at this location, junction visibility should be maintained in accordance with the highway code. The proposal formalises the guidance contained within the highway code. Recommend to proceed with proposals</b>                                   |

| Road                                  | Proposed By | Proposal                                       | Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|---|
| Caulfield Road                        | Members     | Implement junction protection at all junctions | One objection received relating to loss of parking availability.   | <p><b>The Council is committed to improving safety and while no accidents have been recorded at this location, junction visibility should be maintained in accordance with the highway code. The proposal formalises the guidance contained within the highway code. Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>   |
| Highlands Boulevard and Dundee Avenue | Officers    | Provide junction protection                    | <p>Comment received stating proposal un-necessary. Will result in detrimental impact to area, increase parking stress and parking in side roads, will encourage parking on verges.</p> <p>Support received regarding proposal for Dundee Avenue junction</p> | <p><b>The proposals merely reinforce the highway code guidance to maintain visibility. Recommend proceed with proposals as advertised.</b></p> <p><b>This matter was considered at the meeting of the Working Party on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2013 and Members decided to reduce the extent of the proposals to 5 metres of waiting restrictions within the side junction. Due to the wide entry of this particular junction, 5 metres of waiting restrictions are not sufficient to provide adequate positioning and visibility of vehicles. (see plan attached)</b></p> <p><b>Recommend to confirm advertised proposal of 12 metres of waiting restrictions at this junction</b></p> |