

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

11

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic & Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
25th June 2015

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

**Results of Consultation to Extend Colchester Road Area Parking Management
Scheme**

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For Members to consider the outcomes of a recent informal consultation on a possible parking management scheme in the roads bounding West Road, London Road and North Road (the Colchester Road Extension Area).

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee to note the outcome of the informal consultation as detailed in Appendix 1 with a recommendation not to proceed with a Parking Management Scheme in the area.**
- 2.2 **Agree that at a time when the work programme allows, officers identify and propose 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 successful consultation with residents in the Colchester Road Area (Baxter Avenue, Boston Avenue, Harcourt Avenue, Colchester Road, Sweyne Avenue and Chelmsford Avenue), proposals for a parking management scheme were implemented in the area in March 2011.
- 3.2 However, as a result of this scheme, some non-residential parking was displaced into neighbouring roads adjacent to the area and Ward Councillors surveyed residents and received responses indicating support for a proposed extension to the original area to be considered.
- 3.3 The results of the survey were considered as part of the Members Request process and the project was included in the 2013/14 work programme for progression. The project was not allocated a high priority and was subsequently included in the 2014/15 programme.

- 3.4 All occupiers of residential and commercial properties were consulted on the possibility of a parking management scheme in the area and questionnaires were sent to 1052 properties.
- 3.5 Two drop in sessions were also held for residents and businesses to view large scale plans of the area and discuss the proposals with Officers.
- 3.6 The process resulted in 235 completed questionnaires being returned which represented a return percentage of 22%. This is significantly below the agreed consultation response threshold agreed by Members of the Cabinet at their meeting held on 8th January 2013 for new Parking Management Scheme proposals which requires a response rate of at least 40%. These results are summarised at Appendix 1.
- 3.7 The responses do indicate that the roads adjacent to the original area are now experiencing additional displaced parking and as a result support for measures in these roads are higher than roads further to the west. Notwithstanding these findings, it is shown that the response rate in any of the roads in the area did not meet the criteria to warrant further consideration.
- 3.8 As such it is recommended that Members agree not to proceed with a Parking Management Scheme. However the information collected during the consultation has highlighted the need for some minor amendments to the existing waiting restrictions such as reduction of double yellow lines and removal of alternate side parking where safe to do so. Members are asked to authorise officers to carry out these changes and proceed to formal advertisement.

4 Other Options

- 4.1 Proceed with the formal consultation to implement a Parking Management Scheme. This option would not meet the criteria set within the agreed policy; or,
- Take no further action. This option prevents the opportunity to make improvements to the existing restrictions in the area

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 Where recommended the objective is to mitigate for likelihood of traffic flows being impeded, to improve safety or increase parking availability.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 Ensure the highway network is effectively managed contributing to a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

6.2 Financial Implications

- 6.2.1 Where recommended, the source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation where applicable.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 Staff time will be prioritised as needed to investigate, organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals based on the committee priorities.

6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 Formal consultation will be undertaken including advertisement of the proposal in the local press and on the street as appropriate.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 The objectives of improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 Neutral.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 All works resulting from the scheme design are to be undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 All proposals are designed to maximise community safety through design, implementation and monitoring.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 All proposals are designed and implemented to ensure relevant environmental benefits are attained through the use of appropriate materials and electrical equipment to save energy and contribute towards the Carbon Reduction targets where appropriate.

7. **Background papers**

None

8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Summary of Consultation responses

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE COLCHESTER ROAD EXTENSION AREA CONSULTATION

Number of questionnaires sent out	1052		
Responses received	235 (22.4%)		
Question 4 – <i>Do you think there is a parking problem in your road?</i>	Yes = 73.6%	No = 26.4%	
Question 5 – <i>Would you be supportive of introducing parking restrictions in your area?</i>	Yes = 59.1%	No = 39.6%	Unsure = 1.3 %
Question– <i>Would you like – Permit Scheme offering residents priority</i>	Yes = 59.5%		No = 40.5%

Road Name	Number Delivered	Number Returned	Q4 Parking Problems	Q5 PMS Support	Q6 Residents Permits
ALBANY AVENUE	34	9 (26.5%)	7 (77.7%)	6 (66.6%)	6 (66.6%)
ALBION ROAD	61	20 (32.8%)	11 (55.0%)	4 (20.0%)	5 (25.0%)
AVEBURY ROAD	16	5 (31.5%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)
BALMORAL ROAD	19	2 (10.5%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
CARISBROOKE ROAD	28	14 (50.0%)	5 (35.7%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)
CLAREMONT ROAD	91	15 (16.5%)	8 (53.3%)	6 (40.0%)	6 (40.0%)
CLIFF AVENUE	32	7 (21.9%)	5 (71.4%)	4 (57.4%)	4 (57.4%)
HAMLET COURT ROAD	146	21 (14.4%)	9 (42.8%)	9 (42.8%)	9 (42.8%)
NORTH ROAD	232	33 (14.2%)	30 (84.8%)	28 (84.8%)	27 (81.8%)
OSBORNE ROAD	47	16 (34%)	15 (93.7%)	12 (75.0%)	12 (75.0%)
RAYLEIGH AVENUE	63	17 (27.0%)	14 (82.6%)	10 (58.6%)	10 (58.6%)
ROCHFORD AVENUE	51	16 (31.4%)	13 (81.3%)	9 (56.3%)	9 (56.3%)
SALISBURY AVENUE	187	34 (18.2%)	28 (82.4%)	24 (70.6%)	25 (73.5%)
TUDOR ROAD	45	17(37.8%)	15 (88.2%)	15 (88.2%)	15 (88.2%)
WINDSOR ROAD	46	9 (19.5%)	6 (66.6%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)