

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

Traffic and Parking Working Party

Date: Thursday, 3rd November, 2016

Time: 6.00 pm

Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

Contact: Tim Row - Principal Committee Officer

Email: 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 19th September 2016 (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations (Pages 7 - 12)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place
- 5 North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue (Pages 13 - 18)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place
- 6 Petition Requesting Zebra Crossing Station Road, Thorpe Bay (Pages 19 - 22)**
Report of Corporate of Place
- 7 Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders**
Report of Corporate Director for Place

To: The Chairman & Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party:
Councillor T Cox (Chair), T Byford (Vice-Chair), M Borton, T Callaghan, M Flewitt, J Garston, M Terry and Cllr J Ware-Lane

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party

Date: Monday, 19th September, 2016

Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

3

Present: Councillor T Cox (Chair)
Councillors M Assenheim*, M Borton, M Flewitt, J Garston and
J Ware-Lane
*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

In Attendance: Councillors B Arscott, S Buckley, S Habermel, J Lamb, C Mulroney,
G Phillips, N Ward and P Wexham
P Geraghty, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

Start/End Time: 6.00 - 8.00 pm

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Terry (Substitute: Councillor Assenheim), Callaghan and Byford (no substitutes).

2 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor J Garston – Agenda Item 4: Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations – Non-pecuniary interest: Family lives in vicinity;

(b) Councillor J Garston – Agenda Item No. 5: Member's Requests (Ref No. 16/10 Salisbury Road, Western Road area propose 1 hour restriction to prevent commuter parking – Non-pecuniary: Family lives in the vicinity;

(c) Councillor Mulroney – Agenda Item 4: Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the section of Southsea Avenue not affected by the proposal;

(d) Councillor Wexham – Agenda Item 4: Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations – Non-pecuniary interest: Knows a resident in one of the roads.

3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 16th June 2016

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 16th June 2016 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders - Various Locations

The Working Party 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 for the introduction of one-way traffic flows in the southern sections of Leighville Grove and Southsea Avenue, Leigh on Sea.

The report also sought an appropriate recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on the way forward, after having considered of all the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the Corporate Director or Place be authorised to confirm the traffic regulation order for the introduction of one way traffic in a southerly direction in the south section of Leighville Grove as advertised.
2. That proposed traffic regulation order for the introduction of one way traffic in a northerly direction in the south section of Southsea Avenue not be confirmed.

5 Members Requests List

The Working Party 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.

Resolved:-

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That no further action be taken in respect of the following requests and that they be removed from the list:

16/02 – Extend existing junction protection at Feeches Road junction with Rochford Road;

16/05 – Extend restrictions in Frobisher Way towards ASDA exit end;

16/06 – Introduction of restrictions in Southchurch Boulevard by Centenary Place;

16/08 – Propose waiting restrictions in Thorpe Hall Close to protect driveway;

2. That consideration of the following requests be deferred and retained on the list:

15/08 – Verge hardening in eastern end of Riviera Drive;

16/11 – Introduction of waiting restrictions in Colbert Avenue west of the church.

3. That request reference no. 14/15 regarding the widening of the pedestrian refuge Ness Road, Shoeburyness, be removed from the list of Member's Requests and added to the list of priorities for approved traffic schemes /maintenance programme or until such time as alternative funding sources can be identified.
4. That the outcome of the investigation regarding request reference 15/01 for the amendment to the priority for traffic in North, South and Central Avenues be reported to the next meeting for consideration.
5. That, in the event of there being no further response from Ward Councillors in the next two weeks in respect request reference 15/07 for a pedestrian crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive, the request be removed from the list and no further be taken in respect to the matter.
6. That request reference 15/18 regarding the creation of new parking facilities and the review of waiting restrictions in Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue be retained on the list and investigated in 2016/17 as part of the wider review of the historic waiting restrictions and officers be requested to investigate the possibility of creating a new parking facility in the crescent slip road at the western section of Delaware Road opposite Blyth Avenue.
7. That in respect of request reference 15/19 for the introduction of a one way system in Saxon Gardens, Ward Councillors be requested to undertake a survey of the residents to assess the preferred direction of flow and that upon receipt of the outcome of the survey, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the appropriate traffic regulation order.
8. That request reference 16/01 for the introduction of waiting restrictions or a parking management scheme to deter airport parking in Rochford Road service road, be retained on the list and that officers arrange a meeting with Ward Councillors and appropriate representatives of the airport to discuss the wider issue of airport parking.
9. That, with regard to request reference 16/03, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order to introduce limited waiting in Rayleigh Road, Eastwood between Edwards Hall School and Jones Corner to encourage parking turnover for local shops and business.
10. That, with regard to request reference 16/04 for the hardening of verges in Silversea Avenue, Ward Councillors be requested to undertake consultation with residents in accordance with the verge hardening policy.
11. That request reference 16/07 for the introduction of waiting restrictions on the bend in Campfield Road, Shoeburyness by Cumberland Packaging be retained on the list to enable further investigations to undertaken and any appropriate controls to be identified.
12. That, with regard to request reference 16/09, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order to introduce one way traffic flow in a northerly direction in Lansdowne Avenue and

subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement to arrange for the order to be confirmed.

13. That, with regard to request reference 16/10, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation order to introduce a one hour waiting restriction in Salisbury Road at the Western Road area, the timing of which restriction to be determined in consultation with the Ward Councillors and subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement to arrange for the order to be confirmed.

6 Parking Management Scheme Shoebury Area

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place which appraised Members of the results of the informal consultation that had recently been undertaken by the Ward Councillors on parking controls in the Shoebury area and which sought Members' approval to recommend to the Cabinet Committee the appropriate way forward. A summary of the analysis of responses to the consultation was circulated the meeting.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

That, subject to the inclusion of Gunners Road and Hinguar Street in the proposed parking management area, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the appropriate traffic regulation order and notices required to introduce a parking management scheme in the Shoebury area proposed, and in the event of there being no unresolved objections following statutory advertisement, the Parking Management Scheme will be added to the list of schemes to be implemented in the order of approval.

7 Petition Requesting Permit Parking Controls Southend East

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place which appraised Members of the receipt of a petition signed by 320 residents of the roads north of Southend East Railway Station requesting parking controls to deter all day parking by commuters.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted and the residents be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.

2. That, in accordance with the agreed policy regarding parking management schemes, Ward Councillors be requested to undertake an informal consultation with residents of the wider area affected, including the area south of the railway, the results of which shall be reported back to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.

8 Petition Requesting Amendment to Existing Parking Controls Shaftsbury Avenue

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place which appraised Members of the receipt of a petition signed by 28 residents of Shaftsbury Avenue, requesting amendments to the existing waiting restrictions in the road between Lifstan Way and Warwick Road.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted and the residents be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.
2. That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the appropriate traffic regulation order and notices for the removal of the existing alternate monthly parking restriction in this section of road to increase parking availability and subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be confirmed.

9 Petition Requesting Parking Controls Eastwood Boulevard

The Working Party received a report of the Corporate Director for Place which appraised Members of the receipt a petition received from 19 residents of Eastwood Boulevard requesting that parking controls be considered on both sides of the street during the periods 8am to 10am and 3pm to 4pm Monday to Friday.

Resolved:

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the petition be noted and the residents be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.
2. That the request to propose waiting restrictions be declined for the reasons set out in the report.
3. That ward Members consider whether area wide parking controls would be appropriate and undertake any necessary consultations in accordance with the Policy.

10 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:

1. 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:

Tylers Avenue Car Park – Amend existing payment method from “pay on foot” to “pay and display” and online payments as a pilot to determine appropriate methods for future parking areas;

Various locations – Introduction of additional electric charging bays/car club electric charging bays and to amend the existing electric charging bays to incorporate a maximum waiting limit.

2. That the locations of the additional electric charging bays/car club electric charging bays be identified in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors.

Chairman: _____

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
3rd November 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 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 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 to 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.

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

| Road | Proposed By | Proposal | Comments | Officer Comment |
|--|-------------|---|---|--|
| Greenways | Member | Introduction Residents Permit Parking Places | 1 letter of support received fully supporting the proposal | Recommend proceed with advertised proposal. |
| Cliffs Area Parking Scheme Extension (Westcliff Avenue) | Member | Introduction of Residents Permit Parking Places in Westcliff Avenue | 1 letter of support received fully supporting the proposal | Recommend proceed with advertised proposal. |
| Station Avenue | Member | Introduction of Permit Parking & Waiting Restrictions in Station Avenue | 6 letters of objection received including a petition with 34 signatures. Residents of Priory Mews apartments object as they were not included in original consultation – their full postal address being Station Avenue - they feel they should be included as they do not have sufficient parking space within their curtilages for their visitors who have to park in Station Avenue; they state that at different times during the week there is no parking problems. Residents of East Street adjacent to Station Avenue would like East Street to be included in the scheme due to a lack of parking in East Street; Scheme will not help residents of East Street; scheme as proposed will increase parking pressure on East Street; residents of Station Avenue may opt out of scheme and park in East Street; Reduced parking on East Street is due to vehicles from outside East Street; Residents of Station Avenue who park on East Street would not move their vehicles after hours of operation; would like waiting restrictions to deter commuter parking | Recommend defer any decision until ward Members have consulted East Street residents to ensure any schemes are complementary and meet all residents needs. |

| Road | Proposed By | Proposal | Comments | Officer Comment |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| Belfairs Park Drive | Member | Extension of existing junction protection | 5 letters of objection received. Main concerns are: Extending lines will move parking further back along the road; would like part day waiting restrictions; no benefit to residents; proposal is not what was asked for; commuter parking is causing the problems | The request received was to propose measures to resolve an issue with vehicles on The Fairway waiting to turn into the Belfair Park Drive delaying traffic. The proposal was designed in response to the concern raised. Residents now appear to have concerns with parking by non-residents. Recommend no further action on the advertised proposal and that ward Members consult the wider area with regard to permit parking controls |
| Western Esplanade | | Provision of Loading Bay | 1 letter from Proprietor of Premises, the loading bay is being provided for; does not object to the proposal per se but would suggest that it be sited 2 parking bays to the east for convenience of delivery vehicles to premises | The loading facility has been positioned near to the premises. Re-location would require re-advertisement. Recommend agree to proposal |

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
3rd November 2016

Agenda
Item No.

5

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

North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue
Executive Councillor: Cllr 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 the investigation outcome of a Members Request to amend the traffic priority in North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the outcome of the investigation and agree to take no further action.**
- 2.2 That the Cabinet Committee considers the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and agrees to take no further action.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Ward Members for St Lukes ward requested that consideration be given to amend the existing traffic priority in North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue to reduce traffic speeds and collisions.
- 3.2 The three roads are parallel to each other in an east/west layout with a number of crossroad intersections. Each road is approximately 1.2km (0.8 miles) in length with widths varying from 6.5 metres to 7 metres.
- 3.3 The roads are primarily residential and feature properties with little or no off-street parking and properties with off street parking for more than one vehicle.
- 3.4 Waiting restrictions prohibiting parking at any time are in place at junctions and sections of the roads, which are too narrow to accommodate parking on either both or one side of the road and partial footway parking is provided at a number of locations in each street.
- 3.5 Visibility at each junction is good with waiting restrictions to prevent parked vehicles impeding visibility and STOP signage to highlight that vehicles should stop prior to manoeuvring across the junction.

- 3.6 North Avenue and Central Avenue are bus routes and are designated as distributor routes within the network hierarchy.
- 3.7 Traffic on the three streets has priority at junctions east of Bournemouth Park Road to Hamstel Road.
- 3.8 An investigation to assess the feasibility of the request has been undertaken utilising the following:
- Speed monitoring data
 - Collision history
 - Monitoring of traffic movements
- 3.9 Speed monitoring data undertaken in 2014 indicates that some vehicles travel at excessive speed, however the numbers of vehicles travelling over 35mph and enforceable by the Police is fairly small. It should also be noted that as distributor routes, it is likely that North and Central Avenue are utilised by the emergency services vehicles and these may be travelling over the posted speed limit when attending emergencies. The results of the monitoring are shown below;

| Road | Average Speed | % travelling over 35mph |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| North Avenue | 28 | 35 |
| South Avenue | 21 | 10 |
| Central Avenue | 27 | 27 |

- 3.10 Collisions at or near junctions recorded between 2010 and 2015 have been investigated and are detailed below:

| Date | Location | Detail | Likely Cause * |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 13/12/10 | Central Avenue/Lonsdale Road | Vehicle on Lonsdale Road failed to give way | Careless/reckless. Failed to look properly |
| 07/05/10 | Central Avenue/Lonsdale Road | Cyclist on Lonsdale Road failed to give way | Careless/reckless. Failed to look properly |
| 15/02/11 | South Avenue/Westbury Road | Vehicle on Westbury Road initially stopped then proceeded | Careless/reckless. Failed to look properly. Nervous/panic |
| 31/03/13 | South Avenue/Westbury Road | Vehicle on Westbury Road failed to give way | Failed to look properly |
| 07/02/13 | North Avenue/Lonsdale Road | Vehicle on North Avenue struck pedestrian crossing road | Misleading signal. Pedestrian failed to judge vehicle path |
| 19/09/12 | Central Avenue/Bournemouth Park Road | Rear shunt at junction | Driver distracted |
| 18/12/10 | North Avenue/Westbury Road | Vehicle on Westbury Road failed to give way | Slippery road due to weather. Disobeyed traffic sign |
| 04/11/10 | Westbury Road/North Avenue | Vehicle on Westbury Road failed to give way | Failed to look properly. Distraction inside vehicle |
| 01/10/12 | Bournemouth Park Road/Central Avenue | Vehicle on Central Avenue failed to give way | Failed to look properly |
| 15/06/12 | Bournemouth Park Road/Central Avenue | Vehicle on Bournemouth Park Road disobeyed | Disobeyed traffic signal |

* When attending collisions, the attending Police officer will determine the likely factors contributing to the accident.

- 3.11 Considering the description of recorded accidents, the main cause appears to be drivers failing to look properly for traffic on the priority route. Visibility has been checked on all junctions and no issues which may impede visibility were identified. Members are also requested to note that no personal injury accidents appear to have been recorded since from February 2013 to March 2016 which is the period investigated.
- 3.12 Speed can contribute to accidents of this nature with drivers failing to properly judge the speed of an approaching vehicle and believing they are able to clear a junction before the priority traffic approaches.
- 3.13 In these circumstances, a potential measure to reduce accidents would be to highlight traffic priority at the junctions by installing give way signage rather than rely purely on road markings and where give way signage is in place, seek approval via the Department for Transport for site specific authorisation to install STOP signs. Give way and STOP signs are designed to provide a period for the driver on the minor route to assess whether it is safe to cross the priority route.
- 3.14 The junctions detailed in 3.9 all feature STOP signage highlighting that vehicles should stop to check for traffic on the priority road at the junction before proceeding if it is safe to do so.
- 3.15 Given the findings of the investigation as detailed, vehicles on the minor roads are failing to look properly and give way to the priority traffic which may be travelling at excessive speed.
- 3.16 Amending the traffic priority was requested to reduce speeds and consequently, reduce accidents at the junctions, however it is believed that this will merely result in inappropriate speeds transferring to the minor roads with little reduction on the priority roads due to the distance between junctions.
- 3.17 Vehicles travelling on North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue are able to gain higher speeds approaching junctions, the roads are slightly wider than the minor roads with the majority of parking either prohibited or confined to marked bays along the streets. If the traffic priority was amended, any accidents resulting from failing to give way at the junctions would likely increase in severity due to the higher speeds travelled.
- 3.18 As North Avenue and South Avenue are also bus routes, amending the traffic priority will significantly affect bus timetables as buses will be required to give way at each junction.
- 3.19 As distributor routes, North Avenue and Central Avenue are designed and maintained to manage higher levels of traffic including heavy vehicles. By amending the priority, these vehicles may be encouraged onto other, unsuitable routes in the wider area.

- 3.20 Vehicles responding to emergency calls may also be adversely affected by amending traffic priority to the minor roads.
- 3.21 As a result of the investigations and the points raised above, it is highly unlikely that amending the traffic priority will have any positive benefits in relation to speed or accident reduction and will offer no benefit in relation to the costs or resources involved, as such, it is recommended that no further action be taken.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Amend the traffic priority of the roads as requested. Traffic schemes are generally considered where the scheme will provide a benefit to road users by reducing speeds or accidents. Where no benefit is likely to be gained, no further action is considered.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.

- 5.1.1 Traffic schemes are designed for a range of issue from reducing accidents to ensuring the free flow of traffic. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.6 Consultation

- 5.6.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.7.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The investigation has been undertaken to assess if amending the priority of traffic is feasible which includes an assessment of the likely impact the risks of supporting the recommendation are included in the background information.

5.9 Value for Money

5.9.1 The cost benefit analysis of traffic schemes considers the financial and resource cost of the design and implementation of schemes in relation to the benefit to be achieved. As the recommendation is to take no further action as little benefit is likely, value for money has been considered within the investigation.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

5.10.1 No impact if recommendation supported.

5.11 Environmental Impact

5.11.1 None if the recommendation is supported.

6. Background Papers

6.1 Accident data, speed monitoring data, traffic monitoring.

7. Appendices

7.1 **None**

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

6

Report of Corporate of Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**

On
3rd November 2016

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

**Petition Requesting Zebra Crossing
Station Road, Thorpe Bay**

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

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received from 95 residents of Station Road requesting a pedestrian crossing facility be provided.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- a) **Note the petition and thank the residents for taking the time to compile the petition; and agree for officers to;**
- b) **Assess the location and in the event the request meets the agreed criteria, agree to the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to provide a pedestrian crossing facility and if no objections are received, confirm the TRO, or;**
- (c) **Assess the location and in the event the request does not meet the agreed criteria, take no further action, and;**
- (d) **Note that any objections to an advertised proposal will be referred back to this meeting for consideration.**

3. Background

3.1 Requests for Pedestrian crossings are assessed periodically to determine;

- The number of pedestrians crossing at or near the requested location,
- The number of vehicles using the road at or near the location,
- Any geographical features which may affect the installation of a pedestrian crossing,

Where the volume of pedestrians and vehicles meet the required threshold and there are no visibility issues such as a bend, trees or other feature, the request is agreed and progressed.

3.2 Due to the resources required to assess each location (at least 2 staff for a 12 hour period), assessments can only be undertaken periodically when the work programme allows.

3.3 The location will be assessed when resources are available which is likely to be March 2017.

4. Other Options

4.1 The recommendation is in accordance with the protocol agreed by Members of the Working Party in January 2016.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

5.1 To reflect the request from residents and in accordance with the agreed protocol.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

6.1.1 Assessment of sites where a crossing is requested ensures facilities are provided at locations where a benefit to road users will be achieved. The recommendation meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of being a Safe Southend.

6.2 Financial Implications

6.2.1 Assessment of each location requires the continuous observation of pedestrian and vehicle movements for a 12 hour period, usually between 7am and 7pm. The resources required to assess this request can be allocated when the work programme allows without financial implications outside of agreed budgets.

6.3 Legal Implications

6.3.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken if the location meets the required pedestrian and vehicle volumes.

6.4 People Implications

6.4.1 Any works will be undertaken with existing resources.

6.5 Property Implications

6.5.1 None.

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken if the location meets the required pedestrian and vehicle volumes.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 Pedestrian crossing facilities are designed to improve the opportunity for pedestrians to cross a road and can offer greater benefit to those pedestrians with mobility difficulties. The objectives of managing improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 The assessment of locations for suitability for the provision of pedestrian crossings includes any risks to safety.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 Any schemes designed to improve safety are subject to a cost benefit analysis to determine if the cost of the works is balanced with benefits to be achieved.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 Pedestrian crossing facilities are designed to improve community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 Pedestrian crossing facilities require as a minimum, illuminated beacons, tactile paving and road markings. The environmental impact of these features on an urban street is minimised as far as practical.

7. Background Papers

7.1 None

8. Appendices

8.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank