

Public Document Pack  
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Thursday, 16th June, 2016**

**Time: 6.30 pm**

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

**Contact: Tim Row**

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

**AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 10th March, 2016**
- 4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations**  
Report of Corporate Director for Place No. 16/041
- 5 West Leigh Area – Report on Ward Councillor Consultation for Parking Controls**  
Report of Corporate Director for Place No. 16/042
- 6 Greenways – Residents’ Permit Parking Scheme Update**  
Report of Corporate Director for Place No. 16/040

**Members:**

Cllr Cox (Chairman), Cllr Byford (Vice-Chairman) and Cllr Flewitt

This page is intentionally left blank

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Cabinet Committee

**Date: Thursday, 10th March, 2016**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

# 3

**Present:** Councillor Terry (Chairman)  
Councillors Norman MBE (Vice-Chairman) and Betson

**In Attendance:** Councillors Assenheim, Aylen, Buckley, Byford, Callaghan, Cox,  
J Garston, McMahon, Salter, Van Looy and Walker  
P Geraghty, Z Ali, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 - 8.10 pm

### **699 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **700 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(i) Councillor Assenheim – Agenda Item No. 7 (Member's Request List Reference No. 15/11 (Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Patient at doctor's surgery in the road affected;

(ii) Councillor Betson – Agenda Item No. 5 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity of the junction of Neil Armstrong Way; and

(iii) Councillor Van Looy – Agenda Item No. 5 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has a business in Southchurch Road.

### **701 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 4th January 2016**

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

### **702 The Maze**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a proposal to introduce short lengths waiting restrictions along the north and south sides of the carriageway of The Maze, Leigh on Sea at the eastern extremity of the public highway. A plan illustrating the proposals was displayed at the meeting.

Resolved:

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

Reasons for Decision

To ensure that the waiting restrictions cover the extent of the public highway at this location and are consistent.

Other Options

Take no further action.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

### **703 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that appraised Members of the representations that had been received in response to the statutory consultation for proposed Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals within the Borough.

The report also sought the Cabinet Committee's approval on the way forward, after having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party the Traffic & Parking Working Party following consideration of all the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting.

Resolved:

1. That the traffic regulation order for the introduction of junction protection in Neil Armstrong way at its junction with Western Approaches be confirmed with an amendment to reduce the length of waiting restrictions to 13 metres.
2. That the zebra crossing in West Road, Westcliff on Sea close to the junction of Westborough Road be installed as advertised.
3. That the traffic regulation order for the introduction of prohibition of waiting restrictions and resident permit parking places in the Queensway East Area be confirmed as advertised and that officers be requested to work with Ward Councillors and the residents to identify any appropriate amendments that may be required following implementation.
4. That the traffic regulation order for the introduction of limited waiting restrictions in the Shoeburyness Leisure Centre, Library and Youth Centre Car Park be confirmed as advertised subject to concessions being afforded to staff at Shoebury High School, the details of which to be determined by the Executive Councillor for Public Protection, Waste and Transport in consultation with Corporate Director for Place, and Ward Councillors.

5. That the experimental traffic regulation for the introduction of waiting restrictions in the Maze be confirmed as advertised.

6. That traffic regulation order for the introduction of waiting restrictions and residents' only permit parking in the Cliffs Pavilion Area (Winton Avenue, Lydford Road and Milton Road) be confirmed as advertised and that the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary amendments for the inclusion of Westcliff Avenue with the same hours of operation, and subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the amendment to be confirmed and implemented.

**Reason for decision**

The proposals aim to improve the operation of the existing parking controls to contribute to highway safety and to reduce congestion.

**Other Option**

Do nothing - highway safety could be compromised and congestion could increase.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

**704 Member's Request List**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that appraised Members of the requests received from Members of the Council together with officers' recommendations relating to those requests.

Consideration of request reference no. 15/011 regarding the amendment of the operational hours of the existing waiting restrictions in Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road was dealt with under the following item.

**Resolved:**

1. That with reference to request reference no. 14/15 regarding the widening of the pedestrian refuge Ness Road, Shoeburyness, be retained on the list and reported to a future meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration when the details of the estimated costs of the necessary works have been received.

2. That with reference to request reference no. 15/07 regarding the installation of a pedestrian crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive, officers be requested to work with the Ward Councillors to identify to identify an appropriate solution.

3. That consideration of request reference no. 15/38 regarding the introduction of a residents' permit parking scheme in the area around Thorpe Greenways School be deferred pending a full detailed report to be submitted to a future meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.

4. That with reference to request reference no. 15/07 regarding the introduction of waiting restrictions at the junction of Collins Way, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order and, subject to the being no objections following statutory notice, to arrange for the order to be sealed.

#### Reasons for Decision

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.

#### Other Options

Each request needs to be considered on its individual merits and their impact on public safety, traffic flows or parking and wider impact on the surrounding network. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

### **705 Member's Request List Reference no. 15/11 (Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road)**

The Cabinet Committee reconsidered Minute 514 of its meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 in respect of Members Request ref no. 15/11, which sought the amendment of the 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. This matter had been referred back for re-consideration by the Place Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2016 (Minute 586 refers). The Cabinet Committee had before it the relevant extract from report of the Corporate Director for Place and the excerpts from the Minutes.

#### Resolved:

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

#### Reasons for Decision

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.

### Other Options

Each request needs to be considered on its individual merits and their impact on public safety, traffic flows or parking and wider impact on the surrounding network. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Not eligible for call-in as this matter has previously been subject to the call-in procedure.

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

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

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  
**16<sup>th</sup> June 2016**

Agenda  
Item No.

**4**

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

---

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

3.3 All schemes approved by the Traffic & Parking Working Party/Cabinet Committee are added to the on-going work programme for implementation unless members have indicated a higher order of priority.

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

4.1 The Officers comments reflect their assessment in terms of the compliance with the agreed policy criterion. Members may wish to consider level of support, representations from residents and ward councillors to assess if there is a justification to depart from the policy on exceptional basis.

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

5.1 The proposals aim to improve the operation of the existing parking controls to contribute to highway safety and to reduce congestion.

#### **6. 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 When recommended for action, waiting restrictions have been assessed using the criteria agreed by this Committee designed to reflect the powers delegated to the Council acting as the Traffic Authority. Where action is not recommended, the requests or proposals do not meet this agreed criteria and as such, the circumstances set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.3.2 The recommendations set out against each of the advertised proposals states whether the proposal meets this criteria and the relevant recommendation. When approved by the Cabinet Committee for advertisement, the formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation however for consistency, the original recommendation is stated.

##### **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 When a request is recommended for progression, the proposal meets the requirements set out in the agreed criteria and will have been assessed on both safety and traffic related benefits.

## **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 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. To be provided at the meeting.

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

### **The Council's agreed policy criterion 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

#### **a) Junction Protection**

- 1) 10m of yellow lines at junctions to improve safety, accessibility of the emergency vehicles and compliance with the Highways Code.
- 2) The function has already been delegated to officers by the T& P
- 3) Proposal – To extend this delegation to all junction protections based on officer professional judgement in terms of the length which may vary from location to location.\*it may be practical to reduce the length at some junctions while increasing at particularly wide bell mouths.
- 4) Ward members to be informed in advance of implementation

#### **b) Waiting Restrictions**

These will only be considered if one of the following criteria is met;

- 1) Where a road safety problem has been identified by collision studies ( 3Pia in 3 years) and it is clear that an actual reduction in collisions may follow the introduction of such an Order.
- 2) Where evidence of the obstruction of the highway or visibility at junctions occurs on a frequent and severe basis, causing particular difficulties for emergency service vehicles and/or public transport.
- 3) Where commerce and industry are seriously affected by presence of parked vehicles.
- 4) Where the installation of TROs is essential to provide maximum benefit from capital investment.
- 5) On strategic routes and major distributors appropriate waiting and loading restrictions can be used to ensure that adequate road space is available for moving traffic. Waiting restrictions will not be provided for individual private accesses in isolation.
- 6) Cost of schemes and likely savings through accident reduction need to be part of priority

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Marcus Avenue	Member	Introduction of 'No Waiting' 11am to 12 Noon Monday to Friday	<p>4 letters received 3 in support 1 objection.</p> <p>The concern set out in the letter of objection was that the area has a large no. of elderly residents who require workman to visit their properties if the restrictions proceed will encourage workman to have to leave to park elsewhere and return when able to park and also visitors would not be able to park outside the properties when visiting relatives. From their observations they do not feel that there is a problem with parking because their observations showed a lack of vehicles every weekday.</p>	<p>While there is a level of support from those who responded to the consultation, there is undoubtedly an adverse impact on residents with regard to visitors and workmen. A waiting restriction prohibits all waiting during the hours of operation and general exemptions are not available. Short term exemptions, such as the ability for a builder to park while undertaking works are available for a charge of £30.00 per 7 day period however visitors are not accommodated for. If this is a requirement, a permit parking scheme is more appropriate.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Parkanaur Avenue	Member	<b>Introduction of junction protection 'No Waiting' at Anytime for 10m from Johnstone Road southwards</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received With support from 8 other residents of the road</p> <p>The main concerns raised are that the extension of the double yellow lines by 10m will not help the situation will encourage vehicles to park in a smaller stretch of road.</p> <p>Feel that single yellow lines should be introduced on both sides of Parkanaur Avenue (south of Johnstone Road) with 1 hour parking.</p> <p>If other restrictions in the Thorpe Bay area are brought in they will add to the problem in Parkanaur unless there are similar measures implemented there.</p>	<p>While there is a level of support, the request did not meet the criteria as the junction is currently protected with 15 metres of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now are asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p>

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
St James Avenue	Member	Introduction of 'No Waiting' 11am to 12 Noon Monday to Friday	<p>1 letter of objection received and 27 letters of support received</p> <p>The letter of objection main concerns is that the proposal does not do enough to solve the problem. Suggest it would be safer to restrict parking to 9am to 1pm on one side and 1pm to 5pm on the other side this makes more sense allowing vehicles pass one another safely and still allow parking.</p> <p>Also suggests where properties have driveways at the rear, parking at least on one side should be allowed perhaps limited to 1 hour no return within 4 hours 9am to 6pm</p>	<p>While there is substantial support for the proposal, the proposal does not meet the agreed criteria for waiting restrictions.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now are asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p>
Burgess Terrace	Member	Introduction of 'No Waiting' March to October from 9am to 6pm on the west side between Burgess Terrace and Thorpe Esplanade	<p>1 letter of objection received</p> <p>Believes that the restrictions in place are more than adequate for the area. Cannot see why local residents have to make adjustments to their parking facilities to accommodate the Roslin business which is causing a huge inconvenience to the whole community in the area surrounding the hotel.</p>	<p>There is no apparent support for the proposal.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Corporate Director for Place

to

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

on

**16<sup>th</sup> June 2016**

Report prepared by:

Cheryl Hindle-Terry - Team Leader, Parking, Traffic  
Management and Road Safety Team

---

## West Leigh Area – Report on Ward Councillor Consultation for Parking Controls

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

---

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

- 1.1 To advise Members of the results of a consultation on parking controls and seek views as to the way forward.

### **2. Recommendation**

**2.1. That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:-**

- a) Recognise the efforts of the Ward Councillors in compiling and distributing the questionnaires and collating responses;**
- b) Note officers comments in paragraph 3.9, and Appendix 1 regarding the outcome of the consultation and decide on the way forward.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 This committee considered a Member request in September 2014 regarding the implementation of parking controls in an area of the West Leigh ward. The committee decided that ward Members should undertake a consultation with residents of the wider area in accordance with the agreed policy relating to parking schemes.
- 3.2 The ward Members undertook an informal consultation with residents involving a considerable number of properties. The consultation letter made suggestion that to deal with commuter parking the parking control scheme may operate for one or two hours during the day and could restrict parking, say between 2pm to 3pm and that there will be a reasonable charge for the permits for those we need them. The residents were asked to indicate if they support the proposal of a permit controlled parking scheme and indicate their preference as to its

operational hours. The results of this phase of consultation are detailed in this report.

3.3 Officers assisted Ward Members in devising consultation questionnaire and the selection of the area. Members delivered questionnaires to all addresses within the selected area which included the following roads:

1. Berkley Gardens
2. Burnham Road
3. Canvey Road
4. Chapmans Walk
5. Cottesmore Gardens
6. Crescent Road
7. Dale Road
8. Dynevor Gardens
9. Hadleigh Road
10. Hamboro Gardens
11. Harley Street
12. Herschell Road
13. Leigh Gardens
14. Marine Close
15. Marine Parade
16. Medway Crescent
17. Park Road
18. Quorn Gardens
19. Ray Walk
20. Salisbury Road
21. Tattersall Gardens
22. Thames Drive
23. Theobalds Road
24. Western Road

3.4 Members are asked to note that these roads are in close proximity to Leigh on Sea Railway Station and while a number of streets are subject to a part day waiting restriction, some streets remain available for all day parking by non-residents.

3.5 There are 1649 properties within the selected area and 292 responses have been logged which equates to a 17% response rate and the majority of these responses are in favour of parking controls (62%). However, as Members are aware the current policy, requires at least 40% responses from the properties in the area and at least 70% of those responding must support the proposal in its overall context. As such the actual response rate in this case of 17% is well short of the minimum agreed policy threshold of 40%. However there are streets within the area where there is varying degree of support. Members are asked to note that the current policy states that any residents parking scheme are considered on an areawide basis unless there are exceptions due to proximity of schools etc.

3.6 Further work has been undertaken to establish where residents are supportive of parking controls and where higher levels of responses have been received.

**Appendix 1** contains a breakdown of the streets, the number of properties, the number of responses and the percentage of support.

- 3.8 Members will note from the breakdown, one street meets the previously agreed threshold for a response rate of 40%; however, there are a small number of streets where the support for parking controls is higher than the required 70%. While these responses are supportive of controls, the response level is still below the agreed policy criteria.
- 3.9 As the overall consultation response falls below the agreed policy thresholds, justification for an areawide parking control scheme is unmet. However, there is a varying degree of response/support from streets within the area and ward councillors have specific concerns regarding the impact of the commuter parking which led to the consultation exercise. Members are asked to note that 10 out of 24 streets consulted already have limited hour parking restrictions in their streets. It is the view of the ward councillors that those with restrictions already in their streets are happy and didn't feel the need to respond. Whilst others who have no such restrictions and suffer from the impact of the commuter parking have responded. Streets with current level of restrictions are shown in bold on the attached **Appendix 1**. In view of this unique situation, members may wish to take into account ward councillors' representations in this regard before making any decisions in this regard. Committee's views are sought in this regard.

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

- 4.1 Proceed with the formal proposal for a parking scheme. As the results do not meet the required level of response, this is not an appropriate option.

#### **5. Reasons for Recommendation(s)**

- 5.1 Following a survey of all residential streets, the response fails to meet the Council's criteria for progressing with a Parking Management Scheme.

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

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

- 6.1.1 Meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

##### *6.2 Financial Implications*

- 6.2.1 Should any works be agreed, costs would be met through existing capital budgets.

##### *6.3 Legal Implications*

- 6.3.1 Statutory consultation would be undertaken for the implementation of any waiting restrictions.

#### 6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 Any agreed works will be met within existing resources.

#### 6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None.

#### 6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken.

#### 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 None identified at this stage.

#### 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 Any works will be subject to assessment for safety.

#### 6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 Any works are undertaken by term contractors appointed through the competitive tendering process.

#### 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 Actions resulting from proposals are designed to safely accommodate parking.

#### 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 Effective parking controls help to improve the quality of the local environment.

### **7. Background Papers**

7.1 Consultation results

7.2 Parking Management Policy Guidelines

### **8. Appendices**

8.1 Appendix 1

## Appendix 1 – West Leigh Area - Results of Parking Consultation

Road Name	No of Properties	No of responses returned	No. in Favour	No. Against	% Returned	% returned in favour	% returned against
<b>Dale Road</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Dynevor Gardens	17	6	5	1	35%	83%	17%
Cottesmore Gardens	56	17	10	7	30%	59%	41%
Harley Street	40	12	7	5	30%	58%	42%
Canvey Road	78	22	15	7	28%	68%	32%
Herschell Road	81	23	15	8	28%	65%	35%
Marine Parade	110	26	19	7	24%	73%	27%
Leigh Gardens	35	8	3	5	23%	38%	63%
Burnham Road	79	16	12	4	20%	75%	25%
Crescent Road	77	15	10	5	19%	67%	33%
Theobalds Road	37	7	3	4	19%	43%	57%
	1649	291	179	112	18%	62%	38%
<b>Western Road</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>45%</b>
Berkley Gardens	57	9	7	2	16%	78%	22%
Medway Crescent	43	7	3	4	16%	43%	57%
Marine Close	40	6	3	3	15%	50%	50%
Quorn Gardens	73	11	2	9	15%	18%	82%
Chapmans Walk	57	8	4	4	14%	50%	50%
Ray Walk	15	2	2	0	13%	100%	0%
Park Road	42	5	1	4	12%	20%	80%
Hamboro Gardens	27	3	2	1	11%	67%	33%
Tattersall Gardens	115	13	7	6	11%	54%	46%
Salisbury Road	127	11	6	5	9%	55%	45%
Thames Drive	86	8	6	2	9%	75%	25%
Hadleigh Road	134	11	7	4	8%	64%	36%

Percentage Returns                      17%  
 Overall Percentage  
 In Favour                                      62%

Note: 10 streets out of 24 currently have one hour parking restrictions. These have been highlighted above.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

6

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

Report prepared by: Zulfiqar Ali  
Group Manager, Traffic Management & Highways Network

---

**The Greenways – Residents’ Permit Parking Scheme Update**  
**Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony 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 detailed background to the initial Member’s request for a Residents Parking Scheme in the Greenways and agree the way forward.

**2. Recommendation**

**2.1. That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:-**

- a) **Note Officers comments in para 4.1 and recognising the safety of children and parents in the vicinity of the school, agree to advertise the proposal to introduce a Residents’ Parking Scheme(RPS) in The Greenways, covering 8am to 5pm, Mondays to Fridays;**
- b) **If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, officers implement the scheme;**
- c) **Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic & Parking Working Party/cabinet Committee for consideration.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 A Member’s request was considered at the Traffic & Parking Working Party/Cabinet Committee at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016. Members of the committee deferred this item pending further clarifications. The issues raised were particularly in relation to the consultation by ward members on the basis that there will be no cost to the permits which may have led to a much higher degree of support for the proposals (67%). This was seen as a major deviation from the current policy as all permits currently are at a reasonable cost. It was felt that further clarification/information is needed before approving any recommendations in this regard.
- 3.2 Officers have liaised with ward members and this report attempts to provide additional information as requested to assist the committee in their decision in this regard.

#### 4. Assessment against the policy and the latest situation

- 4.1 The Traffic & Parking at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016 reviewed existing policies and procedures to ensure future policies are efficient, effective and enable improvements to make better use of the financial and staffing resources in investigating, prioritisation and progressing future parking/traffic schemes. Section 2(1) of the agreed policies in this regard states: *“parking controls and residents permit schemes can be introduced in a single road or immediate area where school parking presents serious danger to children and parents. Such schemes are only to be implemented on an exceptional basis with the agreement of all ward councillors who will ascertain degree of support for such scheme that meets the policy thresholds for the Parking Management Schemes. The impact of any displaced parking in neighbouring roads will be a consideration by the ward Members. Safety restrictions of this nature may also be developed if there are at least three personal injury accidents within the proximity of school caused by parked vehicles”*.
- 4.2 As reported at 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016 meeting, ward councillors support this scheme and have undertaken initial consultation in The Greenways which involved consulting 37 Properties in total, of these 25 responded (67% response). Of these responses, 24 are shown support for the proposals to introduce permit parking controls (96%). However a number of comments indicated that the proposals were supported as long as there is no charge for permits.
- 4.3 With regard to accidents at this location, our records show that there have been no accidents along the Greenway during the last three years period. However, there have been various complaints and internal discussions with the school and the Council staff/members as there is a perception that indiscriminate parking at this location is presenting a safety hazard to children and parents visiting the school.
- 4.4 The Committee is aware that the current parking policy on residents’ parking requires an areawide approach (except streets around schools). This was introduced as single street parking controls lead to displacement of the parking problems on streets nearby, resulting in complaints from the residents in those streets, necessitating extension of the parking controls on a piecemeal basis which deviates from the wider parking management objectives and is 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 Traffic & Parking Working Party. Provision of free permits will also set precedent and may have financial consequences in future.
- 4.5 Since the decision of the Traffic & Parking Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016, ward councillors have undertaken further consultation with residents. The issue of cost of the permit has been discussed with the residents and officers have been informed by ward councillors that on the basis that residents will need to pay for any parking permit, the level of support for a Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) remains the same. However, the residents have suggested that the permit parking should cover 8am to 5pm from Mondays to Fridays.
- 4.6 Members are asked to note that the new policy on residents’ parking whilst requires areawide proposals; it does allow some room for exceptions around



schools. This is as a result of acknowledgement of the parking and safety issues around the schools. Single street residents' permits are not ideal as these move parking problems to the surrounding streets in the area. However, the non-residential parking at this location is largely attributed to school staff and it is expected that the proposed restrictions will force most of the parking to move to the Southchurch East car park where there is well lit, safe and controlled parking provision for school staff.

- 4.7 Members are asked to agree to implement the proposal based on the latest information provided by the ward councillors.
- 4.8 All schemes approved by the Traffic & Parking Working Party/Cabinet Committee are added to the on-going work programme for implementation unless members have indicated a higher order of priority.

## **5. Other Options**

- 5.1 If this proposal is not approved status quo will remain. However, officers will continue to work with the school to encourage their staff to better utilise the car park at Southchurch East at to reduce parking stress on the Greenway.

## **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

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

## **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**

10<sup>th</sup> March 2016 – T & P – Members' Requests Report