

**Public Document Pack  
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**Traffic and Parking Working Party**

**Date: Thursday, 10th March, 2016**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**Contact: Tim Row - Principal Committee Officer**

**Email: [committeesection@southend.gov.uk](mailto:committeesection@southend.gov.uk)**

**A G E N D A**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 4th January 2016 (Pages 1 - 6)**  
Minutes attached (to note).
- 4 The Maze (Pages 7 - 10)**  
Report of the Corporate Director for Place attached.
- 5 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders (Pages 11 - 20)**  
Report of the Corporate Director for Place attached.
- 6 Member's Request List (Pages 21 - 28)**  
Report of the Corporate Director for Place attached.

**Members:**

Cllr Terry (Chairman), Cllr Norman MBE (Vice-Chair), Cllr Betson, Cllr Callaghan, Cllr Courtenay, Cllr Cox, Cllr J Garston and Cllr Van Looy

This page is intentionally left blank

# **SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party**

**Date: Monday, 4th January, 2016**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**3**

**Present:** Councillor Terry (Chair)  
Councillors Norman MBE (Vice-Chair) Ayling\*, Betson, Callaghan,  
Courtenay, Cox and J Garston

\*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

**In Attendance:** Councillors Assenheim, Aylen, Davidson, Habermel, Mulroney and  
Woodley  
P Geraghty, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 - 7.55 pm

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P R Van Looy  
(Substitute:Councillor Ayling).

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(i) Councillor Assenheim – Agenda Item 6: Members’ Request Reference No. 15/11 – Non-pecuniary interest: Registered Doctor’s Surgery is in the road;

(ii) Councillor Betson – Agenda Item 6: Members’ Request Reference No. 15/24 – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity of Green Lane;

(iii) Councillor Betson – Agenda Item 6: Members’ Request Reference No. 15/39 – Non-pecuniary interest: Husband owns property in Rutland Avenue;

(iv) Councillor Callaghan – Agenda Item 6: Members’ Request Reference No. 15/26 – Non-pecuniary interest: A client of the accountants located in Monometer House;

(v) Councillor Woodley – Agenda Item 6: Members’ Request Reference No. 15/11 – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the Tyrone Road.

### **3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 17th September 2015**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 17th September 2015 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

#### **4 Petition Requesting Parking Controls - Bridgwater Drive**

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a petition comprising 12 signatures from residents of Bridgwater Drive. The petition sought the introduction of parking restrictions for one hour during the mornings and afternoons. Residents had also raised concerns of vehicles parking on areas of the highway adjacent to a local convenient store where waiting restrictions were already in effect and vehicles crossing the footway to access the shop frontage.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted.
2. That consultation be undertaken with the Ward Councillors and residents to identify the most appropriate and acceptable extent of waiting restrictions in Bridgwater Drive, the details of which to be reported to the next meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.
3. That the problems of vehicles crossing the footway be referred to the Environmental Care Team for consideration and any appropriate action.
4. That the request to install a guardrail be declined, in accordance with the Design & Townscape Guide.

#### **5 Petition Requesting Additional Residents Parking Bays - Colchester Road**

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a petition comprising 33 signatures from residents of Colchester Road requesting additional parking bays to be provided for residents.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted.
2. That Officer, in conjunction with Ward Councillors, undertake a consultation exercise with residents on the possible removal of the existing barrier and waiting restrictions in Colchester Road, together with any necessary traffic measures that may be required in this area.
3. That the outcome of the consultation, together with any recommendations be referred to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee at its next meeting.

#### **6 Member's Requests List**

The Working Party received a report from the Corporate Director for Place that appraised Members of the requests that had been received from Members of the Council, together with officers' recommendations relating to those requests.

The Working Party also had before it a supplementary list comprising two additional requests that had been received after the publication of the Agenda.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders as appropriate in relation to the following proposals and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the orders to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

15/11 – Amend operational hours of existing waiting restriction in Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road from 2.00 p.m. until 3.00 p.m. to 11.00 a.m. until noon;

15/20 – Extend double yellow lines at the junction of Church Road with Ness Road;

15/24(a) – Remove loading facility and limited waiting areas in Dane Street;

15/25 – Extend existing junction protection at Alleyn Place with its junction with Crowstone Road onto road hump;

15/27 – Remove summer restriction on east side of Plas Newydd and replace with limited waiting bays;

15/28 – Re-align/remove parking bays at various junctions to improve sight lines in Eastern Esplanade/Thorpe Esplanade;

15/29 – Extend junction protection and remove seasonal restriction on one side of the Burges Terrace;

15/30 – Remove seasonal restriction on eastern side of Lynton Road;

15/31 – Remove seasonal restriction on western side of Walton Road to access of Roslin Hotel;

15/33 – Remove seasonal restriction on eastern side of Clieveden Road;

15/34 – Remove waiting restriction on western kerblines of Warwick Road;

15/43 – Extension of junction protection at Belfairs Park Drive and The Fairway.

2. That no further action be taken in respect of the following requests for the reasons stated in the report and that the requests be removed from the list:

15/10 – Introduction of no waiting at any time in Ashes Road, Shoburyness along the wall opposite 26-20 Ashes Road;

15/15 – Provision of waiting restrictions, Rayleigh Road to protect driveways;

15/23 – Extension of existing restrictions on Delaware Road at eastern junction of Delaware Crescent;

15/35 – Removal of waiting restrictions on western kerb line of Elizabeth Road;

15/36 – Removal of waiting restrictions on western kerb line of Chester Avenue;

15/39 – Verge hardening in Brunswick Road and Rutland Avenue;

3. That further information be sought, including photographic evidence and details of costs for any necessary works, in respect of request Ref No. 14/15 regarding the widening of the pedestrian refuge Ness Road, Shoburyness, the details of which be reported to the next meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.

4. That following requests be removed from the list for the reasons stated in the report and on the basis that any consultation results will be reported to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet when completed:

14/23 – Provision of a 1 hour parking prohibition and junction protection in Dale Road, Dynevor Gardens, Crescent Road and Western Road with longer term request to treat all of area (Tattersall Gardens to Hadleigh Road – South of London Road);

15/08 – Verge hardening at eastern end of Rivera Drive;

15/14 – Introduction of resident parking controls in Station Road, excluding flats at northern extremity;

15/16 – Provision of limited waiting restrictions, to deter non-residents parking Brooklands Avenue and Eastwood Park;

15/38 – Permit parking controls in the Thorpe Greenways School area.

5. That the following requests be retained on the for further investigation when resources are available and reported back to the Traffic & parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee in due course;

15/01 – Amendment of priority North, South and Central Avenues;

15/07 – Installation of pedestrian crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive.

6. That the request reference no 15/18 regarding the possible amendment of waiting restrictions in Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue be investigated as part of the review of waiting restrictions and that the possible hardening of the green area within Delaware Crescent.

7. That, in respect of request reference no 15/19, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to prepare and advertise the necessary traffic regulation order to introduce a one way traffic flow in Saxon Gardens following completion of the survey of residents being undertaken by Ward Councillors to assess the preferred direction of traffic.

8. That consideration of the following requests be deferred for the reasons given:

15/22 – Review of the junction of Ness Road and Campfield Road – Defer pending an application for development;

15/42 – Provision of daytime restriction from 8.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. Monday to Friday in Weare Gifford from its junction with Bishopsteignton to the first bend – Defer pending outcome of appeal for blue badge by local resident.

9. That request reference 15/25(b) for the implementation of speed reduction measure in Green Lane be considered as part of the boroughwide/area treatments in respect of general traffic & parking matters and that investigations be undertaken in to the speed of traffic and in the event of excessive speeds being evidenced, the matter be referred to the Police for consideration and appropriate action.

10. That request reference 15/26 for the provision of waiting restrictions at the access of monometer House in Grange Road be removed from the list for the reasons detailed in the report and that the matter be referred to the Parking Enforcement team for appropriate action.

11. That request reference no. 15/32 for the installation of a build out or left/right turn only at the access to the Roslin Hotel to direct traffic along the seafront be

discussed with the Hotel to identify an appropriate solution without the need for a traffic regulation order or physical measure.

12. That officers discuss reference 15/37 for the removal of the school keep clear marking in Hornby Avenue with the Ward Councillors to identify concerns and that the Corporate Director be authorised to prepare and advertise any appropriate traffic regulation order should it be necessary.

13. That request reference no. 15/40 for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit trial in Burges Road and Barnstaple Road be referred to the Place Scrutiny in-depth project team for consideration.

14. That request reference no. 15/41 for the extension of the existing junction protection in Johnstone Road/Parkanuar Aveune be discussed with the Ward Councillors to ascertain the parking situation in the area and that any appropriate action be undertaken under the revised policy.

## **7 Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that sought Members' approval to recommend to the Cabinet Committee that amendments to existing and/or the introduction of new waiting restrictions at the locations indicated in Appendix 1 to the report be advertised in accordance with the statutory processes and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the relevant orders to be sealed and the proposals be implemented.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

That following recommendations of officers in respect of the requests as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director for Place be approved and that the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise any necessary traffic regulation orders as appropriate in relation to the following proposals and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the orders to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

Burdett Avenue – Extension of existing waiting restrictions adjacent to junction with London Road; and

Belle Vue Road – Extension of existing waiting restrictions at its junction with Southchurch Road.

## **8 Traffic & Parking Working Group Recommendations**

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that presented the outcome of the meetings of the Working Group to review the existing policies, processes and practices. The purpose of the review was to ensure that all requests for traffic and parking matters were undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner and to ensure that the terms of reference of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee was up to date.

The report also sought Members approval to the revised policies and processes set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director, together with the amended terms of reference for the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee, the introduction of a protocol for public participation in respect of traffic regulation orders as set out in Appendix 2 of the report and the extension proviso (b) of Council Procedure Rule 37.2 so that it would also apply to Working Parties.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That, subject to the following amendment, the revised policies, processes and procedures for traffic & parking investigations as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director for Place be approved:

Section1, item 4 is deleted.

Section 1, items 2 and 6 relate to members of the public only.

Section 3, item 2 – should now read: Any proposals in this regard should have the agreement of at least two Councillors, one of which must be the relevant Ward Councillor.

2. That Executive Councillor for Public Protection, Waste & Transport in consultation with the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to make any minor amendments to the revised policies, processes and procedures prior to adoption.

3. That the amended terms of reference for the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee as set out in Appendix 2 of the report be approved.

4. That the protocol for public participation at meetings of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee in respect of traffic regulation orders be approved.

5. That proviso (b) under Council Procedure Rule 37.2 be extended so as to also apply to Working Parties.

**Chairman:** \_\_\_\_\_



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

4

Report of Corporate Director for Place  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party**  
on  
**10 March 2016**

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

---

## The Maze

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry**  
*A Part 1 Public Agenda Item*

---

### 1. Purpose of Report

To advise Members on the history and background to this location and obtain Members views on whether to proceed with the extension of waiting restrictions.

### 2. Recommendations

- (a) That no further action is taken in respect of this matter; or
- (b) To proceed to extend waiting restrictions on the remaining section of land marked as show on the pan to be displayed at the meeting.

### 3. Background

- 3.1 The Maze is a small residential cul de sac accessed from Rayleigh Road. A local resident expressed concerns regarding the parked vehicles obstructing their premises.. As a matter of expediency, the then Head of Planning & Transport agreed to address the problem under his delegated powers by looking to propose waiting restrictions( apparently double yellow liens) in the relevant section of the Maze.
- 3.2 The proposal did not proceed and significant time and resources were spent to establish to legal status of the highway and legal Counsel advice was also sought details of which were reported to the Council's Cabinet Committee on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2014. In summary the position was that the Council cannot show that the section of the Maze highlighted on the plan to be shown at the meeting was public highway. It was sold into private ownership before The Maze was adopted and there is no evidence of the Council ever having maintained it. As such The Council cannot impose waiting restrictions or undertake other highway enforcement if the land in question is not public highway.

- 3.3 During, and separate to this process, concerns were also raised by residents and the Police regarding vehicles parked in the proximity of the junction of The Maze and Rayleigh Road. This was investigated and a request to advertise a proposal to extend the existing junction protection was referred to the Cabinet Committee on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2014. The proposal was agreed and advertised however residents expressed concern that the proposal would not fully resolve the parking issues and the Cabinet Committee agreed on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014 that a site visit with ward Members, the Portfolio Holder and residents should be arranged.
- 3.4 The site visit was undertaken and it was felt that due to the narrow width of the road and absence of the formal raised footway, it would be advantageous to introduce yellow lines at the junction as well as the majority of the publically maintained highway on an experimental basis. This approach was subsequently agreed by the Cabinet Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2014.
- 3.5 The experimental order was implemented resulting in double yellow lines in the Maze from its junction with Rayleigh Road on both sides of the road up to the extent of the public highway based on clarification from the legal Counsel.
- 3.7 During this period, there was a county court decision which concluded that the area shown on the plan to be displayed at the meeting is privately owned. However a small piece of land between the existing publicly maintained highway and the privately owned land had no defined status. This resulted in a resident seeking extension of the yellow lines to cover this small area.
- 3.8 At this point further clarification was sought from the Counsel in light of the County Court decision. It was determined by the Counsel that the status less piece of land can be regarded as the public maintained highway and the yellow lines can be extended to cover this.
- 3.9 Based on the latest legal advice, Members are requested to consider whether the waiting restrictions should be extended into this area. It also needs to be noted that restrictions of this nature are in an isolated area and cannot necessarily be enforced on a regular basis as the priorities are to maintain public safety and traffic flows in town centre and other busy areas.

#### **4. Other Options**

The Council could decide to let matters rest and not install yellow lines.

#### **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 5.1 As there are already existing restriction in place, any extension can be covered by the experimental order..

#### **6. Corporate Implications**

- 6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

The use of waiting restrictions supports the objectives of a safe and prosperous borough.

## 6.2 Financial Implications

The Council has already spent significant time and expense researching this problem and an appropriate way forward. The cost of additional lining would be met from existing budget. It should be noted that should Committee agree to install yellow lines the enforcement of said lines would be prioritised with all other waiting restrictions in the borough and that no particular priority or preference will be given to the extended waiting restrictions.

## 6.3 Legal Implications

As set out in the report.

## 6.4 People Implications

None.

## 6.5 Property Implications

None

## 6.6 Consultation

None at this stage.

## 6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

There are no equalities and diversity implications.

## 6.8 Risk Assessment

The risks involved in trying to pursue further action by the Council are set out above, along with the risks of intervening in a neighbour dispute.

## 6.9 Value for Money

Works are undertaken by term contractors procured to ensure value for money.  
.

## 6.10 Community Safety Implications

None

## 6.11 Environmental Impact

None

**7. Background Papers**

Report to Cabinet Committee 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2014

**8. Appendices**

**None**

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Corporate Director for Place  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
**10<sup>th</sup> March 2016**

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

---

## **Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations**

**Executive Councillor: Cllr Terry**

***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 advertised Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals across the borough.

### **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 and Appendix 2 (to be circulated at the meeting) 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 them. 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 the operation of the existing parking controls to contribute to 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 and 2, 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 the operation of the parking scheme while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and 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 proposals in Appendix 1 and 2 if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

### **5.11 Environmental Impact**

- 5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing the Traffic Regulation Orders.

**6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

**7. Appendices**

7.1 Appendix 1 - Details of representations received and Officer observations.

Appendix 2 – further details of representations received and Officer observations To be provided at the meeting.

**Appendix 1 Details of representations received and Officer Observations  
relating to the Report on Traffic Regulation Orders**

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Neil Armstrong Way	Member	Introduce junction protection at junction with Western Approaches	1 letter of objection received. Proposed restrictions would go part over driveway – would like restriction reduced to 13m (to edge of vehicle crossover would not be a problem as no one parks over crossover	No adverse impact on safety by this reduction.  <b>Recommend proceed with amended proposal.</b>
West Road Un-controlled “Zebra” Crossing	Member	Installation of Zebra Crossing in West Road near to Wesborough Road	1 letter of objection – not to zebra crossing but to lorries that park on frontage to shops blocking area of where crossing would go. Suggests that it is installed as a controlled crossing instead.	It is likely that vehicles may impede visibility when parked illegally. An option would be to install guardrail to prevent vehicles accessing the frontages (which have no approved accesses) however this is contrary to design guidance and de-clutter principles. In this location, if a crossing is to be provided, it is recommended that a physical barrier be provided due to the exceptional circumstances.  <b>Recommend proceed with advertised proposal.</b>
Queensway East Area Prohibition of waiting and permit parking Places	Resident’s and Members	Introduction of Residents Permit Parking	<p>Petition with 10 signatures. Residents in Grange Gardens have requested that they are not included in the permit parking scheme. There is little unrestricted parking in this road and some of the residents currently park over their driveways and do not understand why they should pay for a permit to continue doing this. If they are taken out of the scheme they have asked if they can still purchase visitor permits.</p> <p>5 letters have been received from properties outside the area in Southchurch Road, Southchurch Avenue and Quebec Avenue west of Queensway. They object to the fact that they currently park within the area as parking is limited in their own roads. They have requested that these sections of the road be included as eligible for permits</p>	<p>If a road is removed from the scheme, those residents will not be eligible for any permit allocations. Officers will discuss this with residents to ensure they are fully aware of the implications should their road not be part of the scheme and assess their views after this discussion.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposal is to ensure local residents have the opportunity to park in their street by deterring non resident parking. It is very likely that these residents already park in the areas and can be accommodated while meeting the objective of deterring long term parking by town centre workers and visitors.</p> <p>Officers can include the</p>



				<p>provision of permits to addresses on the boundary of the scheme.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals with the inclusion of Westcliff Avenue being subject to the same operational hours as the adjacent roads.</b></p> <p>.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Queensway East Area Prohibition of waiting and permit parking Places (Cont©)			<p>1 letter objects to the removal of some of the double yellow lines in York Road on the grounds that this road now carries a high volume of traffic and is used as a cut through by commercial vehicles</p> <p>1 letter is from a person who visits their elderly mother who lives in the area. They are concerned that they will have to pay to continue to provide care and parking in the road will be more difficult if the scheme is introduced.</p> <p>1 letter has been received from the head teacher of Porters Grange Primary School. Many of the staff currently park in the area and if the scheme is introduced believe that recruitment of new teachers will become difficult.</p> <p>1 letter of support has been received.</p>	<p>Officers do not consider there to be a safety hazard by removing areas of waiting restrictions which will also deter use of the road by inappropriate vehicles.</p> <p>If the resident requires regular visits for care purposes, a permit can be provided at a very reasonable charge and the introduction of controls will improve parking availability.</p> <p>The purpose of the scheme is to improve the potential for residents to park. Colleagues can arrange to visit the school to advise on alternative modes of travel.</p> <p>During the informal consultation, the residents association worked very hard to ensure residents responded with their views resulting in overwhelming support for parking controls.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal with minor amendments as described above</b></p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Shoeburyness Leisure Centre, Library & Youth Centre		<p><b>Introduction of limited waiting times in the car park area</b></p> <p><b>Maximum stay 3 hours return prohibited within 3 hours</b></p> <p><b>Daily</b></p>	<p>31 letters of objection received.</p> <p>Main concerns raised include:</p> <p>Large impact on community putting more parking on the roads especially near the school whose pupils/teachers park in the parking area; Hours of restriction do not meet users of the library and leisure centres needs as will reduce time at these venues; the car park has spaces available throughout the day so does not require time restrictions; Parking areas used by staff of the centres who will end up having to park on the road; restrictions will cause disruption and road safety issues; will have an impact on teaching staff from the school who park there and will force them onto already congested streets; allow the school a number of designated parking spaces with permits and perhaps also to staff of the library and leisure centre; school has agreement with Leisure Centre to use spaces and they pay towards the maintenance and upkeep costs as part of the arrangements this agreement has been in place for many years. Council has already made comments about students and teachers parking on roads in the area and introducing this will increase nos. Problems have only arisen since library moved to the site.</p>	<p>The land is owned and managed by the Council and provided primarily for the use of users of the facilities.</p> <p>Indiscriminate parking is preventing users being able to access the parking areas.</p> <p>No formal agreement is in place regarding the use of the car park for school staff.</p> <p>While parking may be displaced into adjacent roads, this is occurring at present due to the facilities users being forced to park elsewhere. No additional parking pressure is anticipated to be created by implementing parking restrictions in the car park.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal to ensure the parking area is available for use by those using the facilities.</b></p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
The Maze	Members Officers & Residents	Experimental Traffic Order – No Waiting at Anytime	<p>3 letters of objection – proposals mean that vehicles now park in Rayleigh Road/Dandies Drive. Suggest providing limited number of parking spaces in The Maze at its junction with Rayleigh Road which would help the parking situation.</p> <p>11 letters of support from residents of The Maze A complete success, hope they become permanent; have helped exiting property; very happy with waiting restrictions; safe for residents</p> <p>1 letter of objection to the removal of any of the waiting restrictions.</p>	<p>While there were three initial objections, one letter was from a resident of Rayleigh Road. Officers consider that the resident is unaffected by the waiting restrictions. One objection was resolved by the offer of a reduction in lines which was not responded to and the remaining objection relates to the presence of the restriction directly outside of No.1 The Maze. While this property does have off street parking, it is not possible to access the property directly from this area resulting in the resident having to carry heavy loads from the parking area into the The Maze and creates difficulties for a regular visitor to the property who has mobility difficulties.</p> <p><b>Recommend to confirm the Order as permanent with any agreed amendments noting the matter for discussion in the last item of the meeting.</b></p> <p><i><b>This matter was considered by Members at the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 however, possibly due to postal issues, a number of residents were unaware that the meeting was to take place and did not have the opportunity to present any views in person.</b></i></p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
<b>Cliffs Pavilion Area Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking (Winton Avenue Lydford Road and Milton Avenue)</b>	<b>Resident's and Members</b>	<b>Introduction of Residents Permit Parking 11 am to 9.00 pm daily</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received parking in roads will be restricted when visiting relative in care home in Winton Avenue Residents of the care home should be allowed permits for their visitors to park in the scheme roads.</p> <p>1 Petition received via Ward Cllr- Residents in Westcliff Avenue would like to have residents parking permits but for 8am to 8pm 7 days per week</p>	<p>permits will be available to those properties within the permit parking areas.</p> <p>While it is possible to include this road, controls should match that of the proposed permit parking area. varying times of similar restrictions can lead to confusion for motorists which should be avoided.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
**10<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

Agenda  
Item No.

**6**

Report prepared by: Zulfiqar Ali, Group Manager, Highways  
and Traffic Group

---

## **Members Requests List**

**Portfolio Holder – Councillor Terry**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee to consider updates and officer recommendations to items within the Members Request List as detailed in Appendix 1 of this report. This is an interim update pending the implementation of a new process as agreed by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking and the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Working Party and Officer recommendations on each of the proposals as detailed in Appendix 1 to this report, and agree:
- a) **To proceed with Officers' recommendations and agree priority where applicable; or,**
  - b) **To proceed with Officers' recommendations, with amendments and ; agree priority if applicable; or,**
  - c) **To take no further action.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 Members may formally request highway and traffic improvement works to be considered. These requests vary from minor traffic, road safety and parking initiatives and may include new pedestrian crossing facilities, traffic speed, road safety and residents parking schemes and are subject to an agreed process. During the transitional period of amending the current method of managing these requests, officers have compiled previously considered items where clarification is required or where an update is available.

#### **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1 To provide a rationalised and consistent management and decision-making process for all formal requests for highways and traffic management improvements by Ward Councillors via the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee.

#### **6. Corporate Implications**

##### **6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities**

The Members Requests List is a mechanism for Ward Councillors to request issues within their wards which they believe may be a safety hazard and improving traffic flow contributes to a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

##### **6.2 Financial Implications**

Requests which are recommended for any action will be funded via existing budgetary resources. However, the resources are limited and the Working Party and the Cabinet Committee has an ongoing agreed priority programme based on its earlier decisions. Unless the Committee agrees to allocate a priority for the new requests, these will be added to the bottom of the list and undertaken subject to availability of financial and staffing resources.

##### **6.3 Legal Implications**

Where requests involve any requirement for a Traffic Regulation Order, the relevant statutory procedures will be followed including the requirement for formal consultation with affected frontagers' and advertisement in the local press.

##### **6.4 People Implications**

There are limitations in staff time and an increase in Members' requests can place additional strain on limited resources which may lead to delays in investigations and reporting back to the Working Party and the Cabinet Sub Committee.

##### **6.5 Property Implications**

None

##### **6.6 Consultation**

Formal and informal consultation will be carried out, as required, and directed by this Committee. In addition all ward councillors are to be informed of the consultation process prior to its commencement.

#### **7. Background Papers**

None



## **8 Appendices**

### **8.1 Appendix 1.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## MEMBERS REQUESTS LIST FOR HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING SCHEMES

**Note: Cabinet Committee in July 2011 agreed the following criterion for dealing with requests of waiting restrictions:-**

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.
- (e) At a junction (agreed Jan 13)

Reference Number	Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
14/15	March 14	Cllr Assenheim	Widen pedestrian refuge, Ness Road	<p>Widening the refuge on the northern side would involve significant alterations to existing kerblines in order to maintain existing carriageway width. Costs would be significant as area would have to be excavated and formed into carriageway standard surface, requiring suitable drains and relocation of the existing utility equipment. There is no accident history at this location.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised that buses over run the kerb however no issues identified on site visit.</p> <p><b>Members requested an estimated price for works and this will be provided at the meeting.</b></p>

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/07	June 15	Cllr Salter	Consider pedestrian crossing Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive.	To be investigated when resources allow during financial year 2016/17.  <b>Subsequent concern as to potential loss of parking raised by ward Member. If ward Members are not in agreement, recommend that this request is removed from the list.</b>
15/11  26	July 15	Cllr Woodley	Amend operational hours of existing waiting restriction in Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road.  Currently operational from 2pm to 3pm, request for amendment in operational hours to 11am to noon.	<b>The decision of the committee was called - in by the Place Scrutiny and it was referred back to T &amp; P for reconsideration.</b>  <b>Recommend to advertise proposals</b>
15/38	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Propose residents permit parking scheme- Greenways School area	Ward Councillors have undertaken initial consultation in Greenways with the following results;  37 Properties consulted, 25 responses received-, a 67% response Of these responses, 24 are supportive of proposals to introduce permit parking controls (96%). However a number of comments indicate that the proposals are supported as long as there is no charge for permits. The Committee is aware that the current parking policy on residents parking requires an areawide approach(

				<p>except streets around schools). This was introduced as single street parking controls lead to migration of the parking problems on streets nearby, resulting in complaints from residents, necessitating extension of the parking controls on a piecemeal basis which deviates from the wider parking management objectives and are costly. Furthermore to date all parking management schemes have been introduced on the basis of a reasonable cost of the permits as determined by the T &amp; P. Provision of free permits along this street, will set precedence and may have financial consequences in future.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider representations from ward councillors and decide if this scheme can be considered outside the existing policy.</p>
15/48 15	Jan 2016	Cllr Flewitt and Buckley	Collins Way	<p>This item has been subject of discussion at the previous T &amp; P where it was decided to authorise the advertisement of TRO in Western Approaches but that the junction protection requested in Collins Way not be progressed at this stage but be considered as part of the measures being considered by the Traffic &amp; Parking Working Party as part of the wider strategic plan to reduce speed, improve road safety and address parking issues within residential areas.</p> <p>Under the policy agreed by the T &amp; P on 4/1/2016, this function is now delegated to officers. However, this item had been discussed at your recent meeting, hence it is being brought back for your endorsement to proceed to implement junction protection as originally proposed.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank