

Public Document Pack  
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Traffic and Parking Working Party**

Date: Monday, 9th January, 2017

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 Thursday 3rd November 2016**  
(Pages 1 - 4)
- 4 **Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders - Various Locations** (Pages 5 - 8)
- 5 **Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders** (Pages 9 - 14)
- 6 **Petition for Action on Excessive Speeds, Wells Avenue** (Pages 15 - 18)
- 7 **Request for Waiting Restrictions - Belfairs Park Drive** (Pages 19 - 26)
- 8 **Petition for One-Way Traffic Flow, Westcliff Parade** (Pages 27 - 30)
- 9 **Petition for One-Way Traffic Flow, St Lukes Road** (Pages 31 - 34)
- 10 **Petition for Removal of Waiting Restrictions, Centurion Close Shoebury**  
(Pages 35 - 38)
- 11 **Petition Requesting Permit Parking Controls, Roots Hall Avenue**  
(Pages 39 - 42)
- 12 **Update on Petition Requesting Permit Parking Controls, Southend East**  
(Pages 43 - 50)
- 13 **Petition Requesting Pedestrian Crossing, Waiting Restrictions and a School Crossing Patrol, Darlinghurst Grove Leigh on Sea - Information Item** (Pages 51 - 52)
- 14 **Petition for Maintenance Works, Ashleigh Drive Leigh on Sea**  
(Pages 53 - 56)

**15 Number of Residential Parking Permits Allowed Per Household**  
Item requested by Councillor Ware-Lane in accordance with Council  
Procedure Rule 35.1(d)

**To: The Chairman & Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party:**

Councillor T Cox (Chairman),

Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chairman), M Borton, T Callaghan, M Flewitt, J Garston, M Terry  
and J Ware-Lane

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party

**Date: Thursday, 3rd November, 2016**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

# 3

**Present:** Councillor T Cox (Chair)  
Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chair), B Ayling\*, M Borton, T Callaghan,  
J Garston, L Salter\* and J Ware-Lane  
\*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

**In Attendance:** Councillors M Assenheim, S Aylen and C Mulroney  
P Geraghty, Z Ali, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 - 7.40 pm

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Flewitt (Substitute: Councillor Salter) and Terry (Substitute: Councillor Ayling).

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Ayling – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Station Avenue) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has spoken with residents in East Street;

(b) Councillor Ayling – Agenda Item No. 5 (North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has spoken with residents in the roads.

### **3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 19th September 2016**

Resolved:

That, subject to the following amendment to Resolution 9 of Minute 5 (Members Request List), the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19th September 2016 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed:

‘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 Eastwood High School and Brooklyn’s Avenue to encourage parking turnover for local shops and businesses.’

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

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (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 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.

The Working Party was informed that, in accordance with Minute 39 of the meeting of Cabinet Committee held on 16th June 2016 and Minute 703 of the meeting of Cabinet Committee held on 10th March 2016 respectively, the traffic regulation orders for the introduction of a residents' permit parking places scheme in Greenways and the extension of the Cliffs Area residents' permit parking place scheme to include Westcliff Avenue had been confirmed as advertised, on the basis that no objections had been received in response to the statutory advertisement.

The Working Party discussed the proposed introduction of a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions in Station Avenue at some length. It noted that East Street had not been included in the draft traffic regulation order. Additionally, although the postal address for Priory Mews was registered as Station Avenue, it also had not been included in the proposed scheme. The Working Party concluded that, on the basis that each apartment had the benefit of an off-street parking space available within that the scheme should proceed as advertised and amended at a later date, if necessary, to address any consequential effect in East Street and Priory Mews.

Resolved:-

That Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the traffic regulation order for the introduction of a permit parking scheme and waiting restrictions in Station Avenue as advertised and that consultation be undertaken on the extension of the scheme to include residents of East Street and Priory Mews once the scheme has been implemented.
2. That the traffic regulation order for the extension of the existing junction protection waiting restrictions in Belfairs Park Drive not be confirmed and the officers be requested to review the parking restrictions and prepare proposals to address the problem of inconsiderate parking in the area for consideration at the next meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.
3. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the traffic regulation order for the provision of a loading bay in Western Esplanade as advertised.

## **5 North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue**

Pursuant to Minute 514 of the meeting of Cabinet Committee held on 4th January 2016, the Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) concerning the outcome of the investigation into the possible amendment of traffic priorities in North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue, Southend on Sea. The report also sought the Working Party's recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on the appropriate way forward.

Resolved:-

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That no further action be taken in respect of the amendment to traffic flows in North Avenue, South Avenue and Central Avenue.
2. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be requested to investigate the possible installation of mobile flashing speed limit signs in these roads to reduce traffic speeds.
3. That a briefing by the Safer Essex Roads Partnership and Community Speed Watch be arranged to which all Members of the Council be invited.

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

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) which appraised Members of the receipt of a petition signed by 95 residents of Station Road requesting the provision of a pedestrian crossing facility in the road. The report also sought the Working Party's recommendation to Cabinet Committee on the appropriate way forward.

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 location be assessed and, in the event the request meets the agreed criteria, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notices/traffic regulation order to provide a pedestrian crossing facility and, subject to there being no objections received, to confirm the order. In the event the request does not meet the agreed criteria, no further action be taken.
3. That any unresolved objections to an advertised proposal be referred back to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.

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

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (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.

The Working Party was informed that the request by the Roslin Hotel related to the waiting restrictions in Walton Road and Clieveden Road, not Lynton Road. This request related to the removal of the seasonal waiting restrictions at these locations and was identical to the previously advertised traffic regulation order earlier in the year, the objections to which had not been considered.

Resolved:-

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That, in respect of the request by the Roslin Hotel, the previously advertised traffic order in respect of the amendment of the waiting restrictions at this location, namely The Southend-on-Sea Borough Council ((Various Roads) (Consolidation of Waiting Restrictions) Order 2006) (as amended) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2016, be considered at the next meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee together with objections received in response to the statutory notice.

2. That the request by Ward Member to amend the traffic flow in Cliffsea Grove to southbound only be approved and that the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders as appropriate and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the orders to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

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

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

4

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

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 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
Western Road Junction with Theobalds Road	Resident	Reduce existing waiting restrictions (removal of double yellow lines) including opposite the junction.	<p>2 letters of objection received.</p> <p>One property is supportive of the proposal however the adjoining properties have objected to the proposal based on the loss of visibility when leaving the property and all day parking by vehicles.</p>	<p>The proposal is to increase parking availability and of the properties directly affected, 2 residents are opposed to the proposal therefore it is <b>recommended to take no further action.</b></p> <p>As the existing restrictions are in excess of guidance and the distance which would be proposed for a junction, <b>recommended to proceed with proposal.</b></p>
Western Road between Harley Street and Canvey Road		Reduce existing waiting restrictions	<p>The proposal is to reduce the existing waiting restrictions while maintaining an adequate level of junction protection.</p> <p>One property is supportive of the proposal however the adjoining properties have objected to the proposal based on the loss of visibility when leaving the property and all day parking by vehicles.</p>	<p>The proposal is to increase parking availability and of the properties directly affected, 2 residents are opposed to the proposal with 1 resident in favour, it is not possible to all residents needs due to the position of the properties therefore it is <b>recommended to take no further action.</b></p> <p>As the existing restrictions are in excess of guidance and the distance which would be proposed for a junction, <b>recommended to proceed with proposal.</b></p>

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Agenda  
Item No.

**5**

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

---

**Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders**  
**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 authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new restrictions/traffic Regulation Orders in accordance with the statutory processes.

## **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) Consider the requests to advertise the requisite Traffic Regulation Orders as shown in appendix 1;
- b) If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the proposal will be added to the existing work programme and the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed;
- c) Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration.

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 Requests for new or amendments to existing waiting restrictions are regularly received from residents and the businesses.
- 3.2 All requests are assessed and investigated against the policy criterion agreed criteria by the Cabinet Committee in January 2016.

## **4. Other Options**

- 4.1 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.

## **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

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

## **6. Corporate Implications**

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

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

### *6.2 Financial Implications*

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

### *6.3 Legal Implications*

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

### *6.4 People Implications*

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

### *6.5 Property Implications*

- 6.5.1 None

### *6.6 Consultation*

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

### *6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications*

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

### *6.8 Risk Assessment*

- 6.8.1 Neutral.

### *6.9 Value for Money*

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

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

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

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

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

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – List of requests and comments

## APPENDIX 1 – TRO CHANGES/WAITING RESTRICTIONS REQUESTS

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Western Esplanade Between Casino and Shorefield Arches	Provide pedestrian crossing.	Public and Members	NA	<p>A request was received to provide pedestrian ramps in the area near to the Rossi Cafe.</p> <p>On inspection during the summer period, it was apparent that the levels of pedestrian activity at or near this location was extremely high and waiting times to cross was at times, considerable, with pedestrians using sometimes inadequate gaps in moving traffic to cross.</p> <p>While a ramp will be an advantage to those with mobility difficulties, prams and pushchairs, the level of activity in this area is highly likely to be of a level warranting a formal crossing facility.</p> <p>Attempts to undertake counting failed due to the high volumes of vehicular and pedestrian activity with officers unable to correctly monitor numbers.</p> <p>While this level of activity is seasonal, a pedestrian crossing will undoubtedly be of benefit and reduce the potential risk to those pedestrians who risked crossing at inappropriate times. The area is heavily used by older pedestrians who may have a slower than average walking speed therefore increasing risk.</p> <p>A crossing would require the removal of parking availability to ensure that visibility for both pedestrians and drivers is not compromised however until a design is created, the number of spaces to be lost is unknown.</p> <p>It is estimated that at least 6 parking bays may require removal.</p> <p><b>Recommend that a pedestrian crossing facility be provided.</b></p>

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Westcliff Parade	Extend permit parking controls to include Westcliff Parade between Westcliff Avenue and Wilson Road.	Public and Members	NA	<p>Following the introduction of permit parking controls in the area surrounding the Cliffs Pavilion, residents of Westcliff Parade requested the controls be extended to Westcliff Parade in the section between Westcliff Avenue and Wilson Road.</p> <p>Ward Members have undertaken the requisite surveys which, on the date the report has been prepared, are undergoing analysis and to enable a decision to be taken without undue delay, the item has been included in this report. The results of the analysis will be available for the meeting.</p> <p><b>Officers recommend that in the event of the parking scheme Policy criteria being met, the proposal to extend the existing permit parking controls is progressed. If the level of support falls below that defined within the criteria, no further action is taken.</b></p>

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Agenda  
Item No.

6

---

**Petition for Action on Excessive Speeds, Wells Avenue**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition from residents of Wells Avenue requesting action on excessive speeds travelled in the road.

**2. Recommendation**

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

- a) Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**  
**b) Agree to take no further action.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Wells Avenue is a residential street situated near to Southend Airport; the road is approximately 530 metres in length with a carriageway width of less than 7 metres.
- 3.2 Parking is currently unrestricted with vehicles regularly parked on street. The majority of the properties feature off street parking.
- 3.3 Concerns of excessive speeds were raised via the ward Member and in response; monitoring equipment was installed in the road on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016 and removed on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016. The equipment monitors all activity and records;
- Speed of vehicles
  - Numbers of vehicles
  - Lengths of vehicles

- 3.4 The results of the monitoring activity show that average speeds in the road are 21mph with 43 (1.7%) of the 2528 vehicles recorded travelling over 35mph.
- 3.5 No personal injury accidents have been recorded.
- 3.6 As the high majority of vehicles are travelling at fairly low speeds with no recorded accidents, no action is appropriate.
- 3.7 In accordance with the agreed recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee, In Depth Report, no action is to be taken with regard to reducing speed limits in the short term.

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

- 4.1 Given the very low numbers of vehicles travelling in excess of the speed limit, action is not appropriate. Future proposals may result in area wide speed reductions, but at this time, enforcement action is the only available option which is not a power which the local authority hold with the Police being responsible for this action.

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

- 5.1 To reflect the low incidence of excessive speeds evidenced.

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

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

- 6.1.1 While no action is recommended in this street, the monitoring of speed and accident information contributes to a Safe and Healthy Southend.

##### *6.2 Financial Implications*

None.

##### *6.3 Legal Implications*

None.

##### *6.4 People Implications*

None.

##### *6.5 Property Implications*

None.

##### *6.6 Consultation*

None.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

None.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

None as no safety issues are evident.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

**7. Background Papers**

None.

**8. Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Agenda  
Item No.

7

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

---

**Request for Waiting Restrictions – Belfairs Park Drive**  
**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 officer recommendations regarding a request to propose waiting restrictions in Belfairs Park Drive.

**2. Recommendation**

- a) That the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee consider the information provided in this report and agree to take no further action.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 A Member request was received to extend the existing waiting restrictions at the junction of Belfairs Park Drive and the Fairway due to delays on The Fairway caused by vehicles being unable to turn right into Belfairs Park Drive due to both parked vehicles and vehicles waiting to exit onto The Fairway.
- 3.2 As The Fairway is a distributor route and the right turning vehicles could impact on traffic flow, the request met the criteria for the provision of waiting restrictions and a proposal to extend the existing junction protection markings was advertised.
- 3.3 Following the publication of the advertisement, a number of objections were received from residents requesting that waiting restrictions be provided in the entire length of Belfairs Park Drive to deter non-resident parking. The comments were considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Party along with comments from residents who attended the Committee.
- 3.4 The Committee instructed officers to investigate the issue and report the findings to this meeting.

- 3.5 Belfairs Park Drive is a residential street running East/West between The Fairway and Woodside. The majority of properties feature off street parking provision however some properties appear to have maintained their frontage as gardens and are likely to rely on parking being available on street.
- 3.6 The carriageway width ranges from 6.6 metres to 7 metres and is sufficient to accommodate parking while maintaining adequate width for traffic. Very small delays may occur with vehicles being required to give way to oncoming traffic in the locations where on street parking is occurring. As the road is not a major route, this is not a concern.
- 3.6 Site visits have not identified any traffic or safety issues likely to be caused by the parked cars and an interrogation of the accident recording system shows no personal injury accidents have occurred. Photographs showing the on street parking on a weekday are provided at **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 3.7 Installing waiting restrictions in locations which serve no purpose place a strain on the Councils limited enforcement resources. The restriction which prohibits parking for a very short period of the day is particularly resource intensive requiring the patrol to be focussed on a small area at a specific time reducing flexibility and increasing travel time. The growing number of this style of restriction being implemented throughout the borough is placing pressure on the Council's enforcement resources.
- 3.8 As the vehicle is a minor road and no personal injury accidents have been recorded, the request does not meet the agreed waiting restriction criteria adopted by this Committee in January 2016 and officers recommend no further action is taken in regard to this request.

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

- 4.1 Propose waiting restrictions. Each request is considered on its individual merits and the likely impact on public safety, traffic flows or parking and the wider impact on the surrounding network. Proposing waiting restrictions where there is no traffic flow or safety reason to do would be contrary to the Policy agreed by the Committee.

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

- 5.1 The recommendation reflects the findings of officer's investigations and the agreed criteria for the provision of waiting restrictions.

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

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

The assessment of waiting restrictions against the agreed criteria ensures the highway network is effectively managed contributing to a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

## 6.2 *Financial Implications*

Where action is 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*

None.

## 6.4 *People Implications*

None.

## 6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

## 6.6 *Consultation*

None.

## 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

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

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

Neutral.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

None.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

None.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

## **7. Background papers**

None.

## **8. Appendices**

**Appendix 1** Photographs of Belfairs Park Drive taken on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016

This page is intentionally left blank









This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

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

Agenda  
Item No.

**8**

---

**Petition for One-Way Traffic Flow, Westcliff Parade**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

## **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1.1 To advise Members of a petition signed by 131 signatories requesting the traffic flow of Westcliff Parade be amended to one-way.

## **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**
- b) **Agree to amend the traffic flow to one-way westwards in Westcliff Parade;**
- c) **Note that due to the current workload, the proposals will not be progressed until after April 2017.**

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 Westcliff Parade is a busy east-west route running from Clifftown Parade to the Cliffs Pavilion. The carriageway ranges from approximately 8 metres wide to over 11 metres wide.
- 3.2 Parking is currently unrestricted with vehicles regularly parked on both sides of the street. Parking is attributed to residents' vehicles, visitors to the seafront and visitors to the Cliffs Pavilion.
- 3.2 In the narrower sections of the street, there are high levels of conflict between drivers travelling in opposing directions failing to give way.
- 3.3 Amending the traffic flow to eliminate this issue however, amending traffic flows to one-way can result in increased speeds and monitoring will need to be undertaken to assess speeds before and after any changes are implemented.

3.1 Two personal injury accidents have occurred in the period between April 2013 and March 2016. Both accidents are attributed to drivers misjudging the width of the road when parked vehicles are present and colliding.

3.3 Amending the traffic flow to one-way will prevent further accidents of this nature.

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

4.1 There are two options. Take no action. An alternative option is to prohibit parking on one side of the road, however given the parking difficulties in the area, this is likely to negatively impact on residents.

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

5.1 To reflect residents views while meeting the parking needs of the local community.

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

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

Reducing potential conflict leads to a Safe Southend.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

Any costs will be met through existing budgets.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

Statutory consultation is required for any amendment to traffic flows.

6.4 *People Implications*

Officer time to progress the works.

6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

6.6 *Consultation*

As above.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

The traffic network is designed and maintained to consider the needs of all road users. The proposal impacts all road users and no equality or diversity issues have been identified.

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

Risk assessments are undertaken when modifying the highway.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

All works are undertaken by term contractors procured through competitive processes demonstrating value for money.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

The action recommended will reduce potential anti-social behaviours resulting from driver conflict.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

## 7. **Background Papers**

None.

## 8. **Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Agenda  
Item No.

9

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

---

**Petition for One-Way Traffic Flow, St Lukes Road**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a survey undertaken by the Parish Church involving 18 residents of St Lukes Road. The resulting petition requests the traffic flow be amended to one-way (Eastwards) from Bournemouth Park Road to Ely Road.

**2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Thank Father McClusky for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**
- b) **Agree to amend the traffic flow to one-way eastwards in St Lukes Road from Bournemouth Park Road to Ely Road, and;**
- c) **Note that due to the current workload, the proposals will not be progressed until after April 2017.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 The Parish Church offers a number of activities attracting visitors. Parking is currently unrestricted outside of the church and utilised by these visitors, which narrows the carriageway resulting in traffic having to give way to oncoming vehicles. The road can become busy and an alternative to restricting parking is to amend the traffic flow to one-way which reduces the likelihood of conflict between vehicles.
- 3.2 A questionnaire was given to each of the 18 properties in this section of the street asking the residents views on the traffic and asking if there was support for amending the traffic flow. The results indicate 84% of the residents are in favour of the suggestion.

- 3.2 While in general, amending traffic flows to one-way increases traffic speeds, this section of the road is approximately 140 metres in length and features a sharp bend which is likely to act as a traffic calming measure.
- 3.1 One personal injury accident has been recorded in this section of the road in April 2014; however this relates to a collision with a moving vehicle hitting a stationary vehicle. The driver left the scene and when identified, gave a positive breath test.
- 3.3 Ward Members have been party to discussions with the Church and residents.

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

- 4.1 Take no action. The single recorded accident does not involve circumstances, which can be remedied by engineering measures and as such, taking no action will not compromise safety, however the proposal will reduce conflict between drivers without reducing parking availability for community activities.

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

- 5.1 To reflect residents' views while meeting the parking needs of the local community.

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

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

Reducing potential conflict leads to a Safe Southend.

##### *6.2 Financial Implications*

Any costs will be met through existing budgets.

##### *6.3 Legal Implications*

Statutory consultation is required for any amendment to traffic flows.

##### *6.4 People Implications*

Officer time to progress the works.

##### *6.5 Property Implications*

None.

##### *6.6 Consultation*

As above.

## 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

The traffic network is designed and maintained to consider the needs of all road users. The proposal impacts all road users and no equality or diversity issues have been identified.

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

Risk assessments are undertaken when modifying the highway.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

All works are undertaken by term contractors procured through competitive processes demonstrating value for money.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

The single recorded accident does not involve circumstances, which can be remedied by engineering measures, however the action recommended will reduce potential anti-social behaviours resulting from driver conflict.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

## 7. **Background Papers**

None.

## 8. **Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Agenda  
Item No.

**10**

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

---

**Petition for Removal of Waiting Restrictions, Centurion Close Shoebury**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition from residents of Centurion Close requesting removal of recently introduced waiting restrictions at and around the junction of Lowry Close.

**2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**
- b) **Agree to take no further action as the location is a junction and the waiting restrictions provided formalise the guidance in the Highway Code that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Centurion Close is a small residential street situated off of Constable Way. Lowry Close is accessed from Centurion Close.
- 3.2 Contact was received from a resident requesting junction protection at the junction of Centurion Close and Lowry Close.
- 3.3 The site was assessed and as the location is a junction, the request was referred to this meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014 for approval to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order. The request was agreed and placed on the work programme for progression.
- 3.4 The proposal was advertised as part of a larger advertisement relating to other locations in the local newspaper on site on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2015. On the 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015, Ward Members were emailed a copy of the advertisement and a letter was sent to the properties affected advising residents of the proposals.

- 3.5 No comments were received relating to Centurion Close, however comments concerning other items proposed within the Traffic Regulation Order were received.
- 3.6 For information, when advertising a number of items within a single Traffic Regulation Order, any proposals cannot be progressed until all comments relating to any item within the Order have been resolved. While this can sometimes delay less contentious proposals, there are significant cost savings achieved by working in this manner.
- 3.7 The un-related items were resolved in due course and the Traffic Regulation Order was confirmed on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The agreed proposal was placed on the works list for future referral to the contractor. Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party agreed in September 2015, that no works would be undertaken pending the capture of all existing waiting restrictions for the now completed online Traffic Regulation Order system. This meant that installation of the lines was held in abeyance.
- 3.8 Following completion of the online Traffic Regulation Order survey, works were sent to the contractor and completed in August 2016.
- 3.9 The waiting restrictions act as protection from parking at the junction and as such, meet the requirements for installing such waiting restrictions. Whilst the petition is noted, there were no objections received to the proposal when it was advertised and there is no justification on highways grounds for removing them after they have been so recently installed.

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

- 4.1 Remove the waiting restrictions. This is not recommended as the location is a junction and the restrictions provided maintain a clear area of visibility for road users.

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

- 5.1 To reflect the existing policy and practice to provide waiting restrictions around junctions.

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

- 6.1 *Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.*

Waiting restrictions contribute to road safety leading to a Safe and Healthy Southend.

- 6.2 *Financial Implications*

None.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

None.

6.4 *People Implications*

None.

6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

6.6 *Consultation*

None.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

None.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

Waiting restrictions are provided at junctions to contribute to road safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

**7. Background Papers**

None.

**8. Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Agenda  
Item No.

**11**

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

---

**Petition Requesting Permit Parking Controls  
Roots Hall Avenue  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox  
*A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

## **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition signed by 16 residents of Roots Hall Avenue requesting Permit Parking Controls to deter non-resident parking.

## **2. Recommendation**

**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 to;**
- b) **Advertise a proposal to introduce a Permit Parking Area in Roots Hall Avenue and review all existing waiting restrictions in the street. The operational hours of the scheme to be decided by discussion with residents.**
- d) **Further agree that in the event that no objections are received to the proposal, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed. Any objections will of course be referred to this Committee for consideration.**

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 Roots Hall Avenue is a cul-de-sac, which is subject to a parking restriction prohibition parking at any time on one side of the street due to its narrow width. The opposing side of the street remains unrestricted. The residential properties have no private frontages and residents rely on parking availability on street.
- 3.2 Roots Hall Avenue is sited off of West Street, which is subject to parking controls prohibiting parking at any time with a small area of limited waiting parking fronting the shops on the south side of the street. West Road commences further westwards and is subject to a parking prohibition at any time from West Street to Shakespeare Drive.

- 3.2 The road nearest to Roots Hall Avenue is Colchester Road, this road is part of a Residents Parking Scheme with a small number of parking bays subject to a limited waiting period. Roots Hall Drive is situated further westwards and is subject to a parking prohibition operational at all times due to the narrow road width.
- 3.2 The Policy related to permit parking controls states that individual streets should not be considered for such parking controls due to the likelihood of parking being displaced to nearby roads, however due to existing parking controls, this is extremely unlikely.
- 3.3 The road features 26 residential addresses, 16 signatories represents 61% of the residents therefore meeting the response and support criteria set out in the Policy which requires 40% of residents respond to any consultation and of 70% of those responding express support for parking controls.
- 3.4 The location and extent of existing parking controls in the area provide the opportunity to consider Roots Hall Avenue as an exception to the current Policy as displaced parking is highly unlikely to result from permit parking controls being introduced.

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

- 4.1 Take no further action. The Council is required to consider petitions related to parking controls and success from other permit parking style controls demonstrates that we can improve the parking situation for residents by introducing controls.

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

- 5.1 To manage parking.

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

- 6.1 *Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.*

Managing parking leads to a safer environment contributing to a Safe Southend.

- 6.2 *Financial Implications*

Any costs are met through existing budgets.

- 6.3 *Legal Implications*

The statutory consultation will be undertaken prior to any further action.

- 6.4 *People Implications*

None.

6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

6.6 *Consultation*

Traffic Regulation Orders are subject to statutory consultation requirements.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

Waiting restrictions are amended to manage parking, reduce accidents and/or improve traffic flows. The objectives of managing parking and improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities and childcare responsibilities.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

N/A

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

None.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None

**7. Background Papers**

None

**8. Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Agenda  
Item No.

**12**

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

---

## **Update on Petition Requesting Permit Parking Controls Southend East**

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**

***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

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

- 1.1 To advise Members of discussions between ward Members of Southchurch, Thorpe and Kursaal wards to discuss a petition signed by 324 residents of the roads north of Southend East Railway Station requesting parking controls to deter all day parking by commuters.

### **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Note the outcome of the meeting and agree to;**
- b) **Acknowledge the concerns of ward Members regarding any proposals to introduce a Permit Parking Area in the streets detailed in Appendix 1.**
- c) **Confirm that no further action is to be taken with regard to proposals to introduce a Permit Parking Area in the streets detailed in Appendix 1 to this report, and;**
- d) **Agree to progress with hardening parts of the verge in Riviera Drive.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 A Permit Parking Area operational for part of the day was requested by way of a petition and this was reported to the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016.
- 3.2 The streets north of Southend East railway station feature a mixed design of properties. Several streets feature houses with adequate frontage to accommodate vehicles on the property whereas other streets front directly onto the street resulting in residents relying solely on parking provision on street.

- 3.2 Southend East railways station attracts large numbers of commuters; the level of parking by non-residents is increasing resulting in residents being prevented from parking near to their homes.
- 3.3 Members of the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee considered the request, but raised concerns related to displacing the parking into other streets.
- 3.4 Officers were instructed to arrange a meeting with ward Members from Southchurch, Thorpe and Kursaal wards to seek their views.
- 3.5 Members met on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and discussed the effect that any proposals to restrict parking may have on adjoining streets and whether, from their understanding of residents views, it would be practical or possible to gain resident support to extend the area to reduce the risk of displacing parking into adjoining streets. This extended area is shown at **Appendix 2** to this report.
- 3.6 Discussions whether to include streets south of the railway station resulted in the view that as most of the properties feature off street parking provision, it was unlikely that residents would be supportive of a Permit Parking Area and therefore, displaced parking would be highly likely in these streets.
- 3.7 Ward Members agreed the following;
- (a) Restricting some of the area will concentrate the parking problem into the adjacent streets;
  - (b) Residents of the wider area were not supportive of controls when asked, implementing controls around the proposed area will displace the parking into these roads which essentially moves the parking issue rather than provide a solution.
  - (c) To try and relieve the parking pressure in the immediate area, the ward Members are requesting that the Committee agree to a verge hardening proposal at the eastern end of Riviera Drive to be undertaken as soon as practical. The number of additional spaces this could provide is not known until the area has been surveyed and a design created.

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

- 4.1 Introduce the Permit Parking Area. While this is an option, support for similar controls in the wider area is unlikely leading to the parking issue being moved elsewhere rather than resolved.

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

- 5.1 To reflect Members views on the impact to the wider area of a Permit Parking Area being introduced in the area shown in Appendix 1 to this report.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

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

6.1.1 While no action is recommended, Members and officers have worked together to fully consider all residents views leading to an Excellent Southend.

### *6.2 Financial Implications*

Any costs will be met through existing budgets.

### *6.3 Legal Implications*

None if the recommendation is agreed.

### *6.4 People Implications*

Officer time to progress verge works.

### *6.5 Property Implications*

None.

### *6.6 Consultation*

None.

### *6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.

### *6.8 Risk Assessment*

Risk assessments are undertaken when modifying the highway.

### *6.9 Value for Money*

All works are undertaken by term contractors procured through competitive processes demonstrating value for money.

### *6.10 Community Safety Implications*

None.

### *6.11 Environmental Impact*

While green areas of Riviera Drive will be hardened, any existing trees will be retained to soften the landscape and prevent additional surface drainage strain.

## **7. Background Papers**

Report to the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

## **8. Appendices**

**Appendix 1** - Plan of area

**Appendix 2** - Plan of wider area discussed



# Southend on Sea Borough Council

Department for Place  
PO Box 5560, Civic Centre  
Victoria Avenue, Southend on Sea,  
SS2 6ZQ

Project Title  
**Southend-on-Sea**

Drawing Title  
**Ambleside Drive Area  
Boundary 2**

Date  
**12/12/16**

Quality Project No.

Scale @ A4  
**Not to Scale**

Designed

Drawn by  
PWM

Checked by

Approved by

Drawing Number

Drawing Status

Preliminary

Tender

Working

As Constructed



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecutions or civil proceedings. Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Licence number: 100019680

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend on Sea Borough Council

Department for Place  
PO Box 5560, Civic Centre  
Victoria Avenue, Southend on Sea,  
SS2 6ZQ

Project Title  
**Southend-on-Sea**

Drawing Title  
**Ambleside Drive Area  
Boundary 1**

Date  
**12/12/16**

Quality Project No.

Scale @ A4  
**Not to Scale**

Designed

Drawn by  
PWM

Checked by

Approved by

Drawing Number

Drawing Status

Preliminary

Tender

Working

As Constructed



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecutions or civil proceedings. Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Licence number: 100019680

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Agenda  
Item No.

**13**

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

---

## **Petition Requesting Pedestrian Crossing, Waiting Restrictions and a School Crossing Patrol, Darlington Grove Leigh on Sea – Information Item**

**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 school users requesting a pedestrian crossing facility, waiting restrictions and a School Crossing Patrol be provided.

### **2. Recommendation**

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

**Note the petition and that officers will assess the location and provide a report of the findings to this Committee.**

### **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 In school areas, the assessments are undertaken during the busy morning and afternoon periods. This is also the case for assessment of sites for School Crossing Patrol attendance.

- 3.2 An assessment will be undertaken and the findings reported to this Committee in March 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**9<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Agenda  
Item No.

**14**

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

---

**Petition for Maintenance Works, Ashleigh Drive Leigh on Sea**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

## **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition from residents of Ashleigh Drive highlighting the state of footways and carriageways and requesting that the Council rectify this as soon as possible.

## **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition, and;**
- b) **Agree to take no further action as the location is a junction and the waiting restrictions provided formalise the guidance in the Highway Code that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction.**

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 To ensure public safety, our entire highway network is inspected on a regular cyclical basis, at least once per year, by our inspectors and any Category 1 defects that are identified at that time are prioritised for urgent repair. Inspections are undertaken by a team of inspectors.
- 3.2 Due to the limited budgets for highway maintenance, regrettably the Council can currently only prioritise repairs that are classified as 'Category 1' highway defects. These are highway defects that meet the threshold of being 40mm deep or deeper in the carriageway and are therefore considered to be a risk to the safety of road users. This is in line with national guidelines.
- 3.3 We also employ an independent company to carry out an annual condition survey of all our roads and footways throughout the Borough and this information is used to create our maintenance programme.

- 3.4 Based on the results of the latest assessment, the carriageway is considered to be “mid-life” and surfacing is not programmed until 2021/22 financial year. The footways are in a “fair” condition and no major works are planned.
- 3.5 The road will be inspected to ensure any Category 1 defects are repaired.

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

- 4.1 Resurface the carriageway and footways. Resurfacing and major works are planned under a forward programme. Inclusion in the programme is based on the need for repairs and prioritised according to the condition and to include Ashleigh Drive in the programme prior to that planned will result in planned works for a road with more serious defects being delayed. Budgets are limited and need based prioritisation is a fair and consistent manner by which to manage the required works within these budgets.

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

- 5.1 To reflect the existing practice of a need based work programme.

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

- 6.1 *Contribution to Council’s Vision & Corporate Priorities.*

Management of major works on a needs based priority system ensures a fair and consistent approach contributing to a Safe Southend.

- 6.2 *Financial Implications*

None.

- 6.3 *Legal Implications*

None.

- 6.4 *People Implications*

None.

- 6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

- 6.6 *Consultation*

None.

- 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.



## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

The condition of the street has been assessed and programmed based on the current surface condition.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

All highway works are undertaken by term contractors procured competitively demonstrating values for money.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

Waiting restrictions are provided at junctions to contribute to road safety.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

## 7. **Background Papers**

None.

## 8. **Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank