

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

**Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Monday, 8th January, 2018**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

**Place: Jubilee Room, Civic Centre**

**Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

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

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

**AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the special meeting held on Thursday 26th October 2017**  
(Pages 1 - 2)
- 4 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 2nd November 2017**  
(Pages 3 - 6)
- 5 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders** (Pages 7 - 14)
- 6 Petition requesting Pedestrian Crossing at Western Approaches**  
(Pages 15 - 18)
- 7 Petition relating to Whitehouse Road** (Pages 19 - 22)
- 8 Requests for Waiting Restrictions** (Pages 23 - 26)
- 9 Exclusion of the Public**

To agree that, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

- 10 Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) - Exceptional Circumstances Application(s)** (Pages 27 - 40)

**Members:**

Cllr T Cox (Chair), Cllr T Byford (Vice-Chair) and Cllr M Flewitt

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**Meeting of Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Thursday, 26th October, 2017**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**3**

**Present:** Councillor T Cox (Chair)  
Councillor T Byford (Vice-Chair)

**In Attendance:** Councillors M Borton, M Butler, T Callaghan, J Garston, D Kenyon  
and J Ware-Lane  
P Geraghty, T Row, C Hindle-Terry and N Hunwicks

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 p.m. - 9.35 p.m.

**426 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Flewitt (no substitute).

**427 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Cox declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 4 in respect of Application Ref No. 17/00013 on the grounds that he works for Barking & Dagenham Council, which was mentioned in respect of this application.

**428 Exclusion of the Public**

Resolved:-

That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below, on the grounds that they would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**429 Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) - Exceptional Circumstances Application(s)**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the exceptional circumstance applications for permanent vehicle crossings (PVX) as set out in Appendix 1 to the report. Some of the applicants attended the meeting in respect of their own application.

Having considered all the evidence and submissions made and the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party, it was:

Resolved:

1. That, in view of the extenuating factors in relation to the individual cases, the following PVX exceptional circumstance applications be granted:

Application Ref. No. 17/00066  
Application Ref No. 16/00181

2. That the following PVX exceptional circumstance applications be refused:

Application Ref. No. 16/00025  
Application Ref. No. 16/00207  
Application Ref. No. 17/00041  
Application Ref. No. 17/00056  
Application Ref. No. 16/00347  
Application Ref. No. 17/00013  
Application Ref. No. 17/00244  
Application Ref. No. 17/00223  
Application Ref. No. 17/00217

3. That, on the basis that planning permission had been granted and no new issues have arisen since the highway and safety implications of the proposals were taken into account in assessing the proposal, the Director for Planning and Transport be delegated authority to grant the PVX exceptional circumstance application ref no. 17/00149

#### Reasons for Decision

To ensure compliance with the statutory duty under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 and the current Policy, to ensure safety, free flow of traffic and protection of the local environment.

#### Other Options

The local highway authority may approve a request with or without modification, or may propose alternative works or reject the request.

Note: This is an Executive function

Not eligible for call-in pursuant to Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(e)(iv)

Executive Councillor: Cox

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

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Cabinet Committee

**Date: Thursday, 2nd November, 2017**

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

# 4

**Present:** Councillor T Cox (Chair)  
Councillors T Byford (Vice-Chair) and M Flewitt

**In Attendance:** Councillors M Borton, M Butler, T Callaghan, J Garston, A Jones, H McDonald, M Terry and J Ware-Lane  
T Row, Z Ali, C Hindle-Terry and N Hunwicks

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 p.m. - 7.10 p.m.

### **430 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **431 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Callaghan – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Lucy Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Taxi Driver.

### **432 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 14th September 2017**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

### **433 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Cabinet Committee 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 reports sought the Cabinet Committee's approval on the way forward in respect of all of these proposals, after having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party the Traffic & Parking Working Party following consideration of all the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting. Large scale plans of the proposals were displayed at the meeting.

With reference to the proposed introduction of a shared taxi rank and pay and display parking in Lucy Road, the Cabinet Committee was informed that the taxi rank currently marked in Lucy Road had been removed in 2006 (Minute 1121 of the meeting of Licensing Sub Committee C held on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2006 refers).

Any requests to re-introduce a taxi rank at this location would be a matter for the Licensing Committee to consider and determine.

Resolved:-

1. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to arrange for the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones) (Consolidation) Order 2016 (Amendment No. 16) Order 2017 to be confirmed as advertised and for the proposals to be implemented.

2. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place), in consultation with the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, be requested to expedite the commencement of the statutory consultation process and necessary arrangements for the introduction of a taxi rank in Lucy Road on the northern kerbline from a point 19 metres east of its junction with Herbert Grove to a point 38 metres west of its junction with Seaway (southern section), the hours of operation of which to be 10.00 p.m. until 9.00 a.m.

3. That, subject to the satisfactory outcome of the request to introduce a taxi rank in Lucy Road referred to in resolution 2 above, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to arrange for the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones) (Consolidation) Order 2016 (Amendment No. 18) Order 2017 to be confirmed with the following amendment and for the proposals to be implemented:

- The time the taxi rank shall be in operation to be reduced from 6.00 p.m. until 9.00 a.m. to 10.00 p.m. until 9.00 a.m.

4. That, in the event that the taxi rank does not proceed following the statutory consultation, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to arrange for the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones) (Consolidation) Order 2016 (Amendment No. 18) Order 2017 to be confirmed without the introduction of the taxi rank.

#### Reasons for Decision

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

#### Other Options

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

Note:- This is an Executive Function  
Eligible for call-in to the Place Scrutiny Committee  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

## 434 Requests for Waiting Restrictions

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that sought Members' approval to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new waiting restrictions at the locations indicated in Appendix 1 to the report, 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 implement the proposals.

With reference to the proposals for Ambleside Drive, the Cabinet Committee noted that whilst waiting restrictions of up to 10 metres would be advertised at the various junctions, this may be reduced to a distance of only 5 metres where appropriate.

During the discussion regarding Delaware Road, the Cabinet Committee also considered a suggestion that the Highways team work with South Essex Homes in relation to providing some additional parking facilities on areas of the land in Delaware Road opposite Blythe Avenue and in Delaware Crescent, where indiscriminate parking already occurred. Any proposals arising from this should be the most environmentally friendly solution.

Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party it was:

Resolved:

1. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order(s) for the following requests and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

- Ambleside Drive, Southend on Sea - Amend existing waiting restrictions;
- Delaware Road, Shoeburyness - Amend existing waiting restrictions; and
- Southchurch Boulevard, Southend on Sea - Provide School Keep Clear Marking outside Futures College.

2. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for a traffic regulation order(s) for the introduction of a residents parking scheme in the area covering Pleasant Road (excluding the car park to Norman Harris House), Hartington Road, Hartington Place, Ash Walk and Seaway (southern section only) and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

3. That, in relation to resolution 2 above, officers of the highways team work with the relevant Ward Councillors to identify appropriate areas for shared use resident parking and pay and display parking bays such as the southern extremities of Hartington Road and Pleasant Road and where residents parking is not compromised.

4. That officers be requested to approach South Essex Homes with regard to the introduction of appropriate environmentally friendly parking on the areas of open

space/verge on the north side of Delaware Road opposite Blythe Avenue and in Delaware Crescent.

**Reason for Decision**

To mitigate for likelihood of traffic flows being impeded, to improve safety or increase parking availability.

**Other Options**

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

**Note:- This is an Executive Function**

**Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:**

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox**

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



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

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

on

**8<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty,  
Director for Planning and Transport

---

## **Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

**Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox**  
**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.**

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**

Costs for confirmation of the Order and amendments, in **Appendix 1**, if approved, can be met from existing budgets.

##### **5.3 Legal Implications**

The formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

##### **5.4 People Implications**

Works required to implement the agreed schemes will be undertaken by existing staff resources.

##### **5.5 Property Implications**

None

##### **5.6 Consultation**

This report provides details of the outcome of the statutory consultation process.

##### **5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

Any implications will be taken into account in designing the schemes.

##### **5.8 Risk Assessment**

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**

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**

The proposals in **Appendix 1** if implemented will lead to improved community safety.

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

None

## **7. Appendices**

**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**

<b>Road</b>	<b>Proposed By</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>Glen Road</b>	<b>Member/Resident</b>	<b>Reduce existing restrictions operational from 8am to 6pm daily alternate months to 10am – 4pm Monday to Friday</b>	2 letters of objection, Objects as the road is narrow, HGV's will have access concerns Will not deter commuters, like to see 1hour parking scheme	The road is narrow but as a cul de sac, traffic is generally light. No support for the proposal, to introduce restrictions in an isolated road to deter commuter parking is contrary to current policy.  <b>Recommend no further action.</b>
<b>The Drive</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction opp No 10 to 14 and o/s 48</b>	2 letters received, one support & one objection. Objection - this will help commuter parking.  Letter of support - agree with proposals	No comments from properties directly affected. The proposal is designed to accommodate visitors during the 1 hour in which parking is prohibited.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b>
<b>Leasway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction o/s No 4</b>	1 letter of objection received, Objection as this will attract commuter parking	Objection is from the property directly affected however removal of this small section will allow for residents and their visitors to park.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b>
<b>The Crossways</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction</b>	1 letter of objection received, Road too narrow, busy road, dangerous location, close to driveway	Allowing a small area of parking will likely reduce speeds. Area not directly outside of any properties.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal.</b>

<p><b>High Cliff Drive</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Passing gap by having double yellow line at various locations in the street</b></p>	<p>5 letters of objection received &amp; 1 letter supporting proposals. Object due to parking displacement, no need for passing gap. Objection passing gap will create less parking, make road one-way working. Objection, as this will create more parking pressure. Objection, passing gap would be too small, need to have a one-way system. Objection would make parking worse, need to have a one-way system in place. Support the proposals. No objection.</p>	<p>Residential street with light traffic however passing gaps would alleviate occasional issues. The small number of residents suggesting one-way traffic is insufficient to consider such a proposal would be supported.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action in regard to waiting restrictions and to propose ward Councillors consider one-way traffic suggestion with residents survey.</b></p>
<p><b>Woodfield Gardens</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Double yellow line at bend</b></p>	<p>4 Letters received, 1 objecting to the proposals. Would like to have a 1 hour parking scheme. Objection as this will not help, would like restrictions to deter commuter parking. Would like to have single yellow line outside driveway to deter commuter parking. Would like to see yellow lines to deter commuter parking.</p>	<p>The road is narrow but as a cul de sac, traffic is generally light. No support for this proposal but to introduce restrictions to deter commuters in an isolated road is contrary to current policy.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<p><b>Kent View Road</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Short term parking bay o/s No 28 and o/s No 18/20. 2 hour limited waiting restriction.</b></p>	<p>4 letters received of objection and 1 letter of support. Objections mentions commuter parking due to lack of enforcement. elderly residents will find it difficult to cross the road. the tranquil character of road will change detrimentally due to increased traffic demand.</p>	<p>Objections are from properties adjacent to the proposed area of parking bay.</p> <p>While additional parking limited to 2 hours would be useful in the area to accommodate visitors to the properties parking is available nearby.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<p><b>Hall Park Avenue</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Remove existing parking restriction near Kings Road</b></p>	<p>1 letter received of objection, Parking space could be very dangerous.</p>	<p>Proposed space is located approximately 15 metres from the junction and not considered to be</p>

				<p>dangerous. The proposal is designed to accommodate resident's visitors.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b></p>
<b>The Ridgeway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>New parking bay near to Hall Park Avenue</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received. Objection, due to narrow road and volume of traffic.</p>	<p>Road is of sufficient width to accommodate this additional parking however, parking is located nearby for local businesses.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<b>Mount Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Relocate parking area further from junction with Leigh Road</b>	<p>1 letter of support received. 1 letter of objection – reduction of parking</p>	<p>Objection appears to result from misunderstanding of proposal. No reduction in parking, relocation of yellow line and parking area only to maintain clear area approaching junction adjacent to raised crossing area.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>
<b>Meadway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking</b>	<p>1 letter received of support.</p>	<p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>
<b>Hall Park Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received.</p>	<p>The proposal is designed to accommodate visitors during the 1 hour in which parking is prohibited.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b></p>

<b>Cliff Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking bay</b>	1 letter received. Concerned about access for refuse vehicles	Road is of sufficient width to accommodate parking and larger vehicle access.  <b>Recommend to proceed with proposal.</b>
<b>Cliffs Pavilion Parking Bays</b>	<b>Cliffs Pavilion</b>	<b>To introduce Pay and Display Parking on land around the Cliffs Pavilion (car park and slip road</b>	5 letters of objection received from residents of San Remo Mansions, main concerns raised include visitors to the Cliffs Pavilion park in San Remo Parade and the introduction of the parking fees will increase and make parking worse for the residents; San Remo Parade should have been included in the nearby residents parking scheme; parking is already difficult especially when performances and events are on residents are blocked in and cannot get out due car owners being at shows; the residents have and try to work with the Cliffs Pavilion and have made the best of a not ideal situation so leave as it is; allow them to have permits for nearby car park	Residents were consulted as to being within the scheme prior to the resident parking controls being introduced. Support was not forthcoming and the road was removed from the scheme area.  Colleagues at the Cliffs Pavilion are supportive of assisting residents with parking issues while ensuring the car park remains available for theatre visitors.  <b>Recommend to proceed with proposals and formally propose the inclusion of this street within the existing permit parking controls.</b>
<b>Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Scheme (Amendment No. 3)</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Extension to the Cliffs Pavilion Area Residents Permit Scheme.</b>	15 Letters of support  8 Letters of Objection main reasons being loss of parking and no provisions for business permits from 2 businesses in the area.	The proposal follows a survey of residents where the majority supported parking controls. Business permits will be available.  No parking provision will be lost in the area.  <b>Recommend to proceed with the advertised proposal.</b>



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

6

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

To

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

On

8<sup>th</sup> January 2018

Report prepared by:

Peter Geraghty, Director for Planning and Transport

---

**Petition requesting Pedestrian Crossing at Western Approaches.**

**Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee**

**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 394 interested parties requesting a pedestrian crossing facility be provided in Western Approaches near to the supermarket, GP surgery and a route to a local school.

## 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 investigate the request and report the findings to a future meeting of this Committee.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Requests for pedestrian crossings are assessed using the numbers of vehicles travelling on the road along with numbers of pedestrians crossing it or near to the requested location.
- 3.2 These volumes are assessed over a 12 hour period, generally 7am to 7pm with any requests being collated and programmed for an assessment twice yearly.
- 3.3 As the request relates to a location which is regularly used as a route to school, any assessment must be undertaken within the school term time. The current volume of works will not allow for assessments to be undertaken, adequate time for the results to be analysed and for a report to be presented to the next scheduled meeting of this Committee in March. As such, the assessments will be undertaken in early April and reported to the next available meeting.

## 4. Other Options

- 4.1 Take no further action. This option is not appropriate at this stage as the requests require assessment to gather data related to the usage of the locations

and any previous accident history before further consideration can be given to the requests.

## **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

5.1 To reflect the existing practice of assessing requests received.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

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

Assessing requests related to pedestrian crossing requests any measures are provided on an evidenced need basis contributing to a Safe and Excellent Southend.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

None.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

None.

6.4 *People Implications*

Existing resources will be used to undertake assessments.

6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

6.6 *Consultation*

None.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

Usage assessments form the basis for any risk assessments and if progressed for future works, Road Safety Audits are undertaken using independent auditors at the design and implementation stages.

6.9 *Value for Money*

Assessing requests to obtain data ensures the limited resources are focussed at locations where improvements are likely to result from any works. Any resulting works are undertaken by term contractors procured competitively demonstrating values for money.

#### 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

The request relates to pedestrian safety concerns and will be assessed to determine if a pedestrian crossing is justified at the location.

#### 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

### 7. **Background Papers**

None.

### 8. **Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

7

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

To

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

On

8<sup>th</sup> January 2018

Report prepared by:

Peter Geraghty, Director for Planning and Transport

---

**Petition relating to Whitehouse Road**

**Eligible for call in to Place Scrutiny Committee**

**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 143 interested parties requesting;
- (a) Guardrailing at the junction of Whitehouse Road and Blatches Chase
  - (b) A pedestrian crossing at the junction of Whitehouse Road and Blatches Chase
  - (c) Relocation of the existing pedestrian crossing in Whitehouse Road near to Rayleigh 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 investigate the requests and report findings to a future meeting of this Committee.**

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 Requests for pedestrian crossings are assessed using the numbers of vehicles travelling on the road along with numbers of pedestrians crossing at or near to the requested location.
- 3.2 These volumes are assessed over a 12 hour period, generally 7am to 7pm with any requests being collated and programmed for an assessment twice yearly.
- 3.3 As the request relates to a location, which is regularly used as a route to school, any assessment must be undertaken within the school term time. The current volume of works will not allow for assessments to be undertaken, adequate time for the results to be analysed and for a report to be presented to the next

scheduled meeting of this Committee in March. As such, the assessments will be undertaken in early April and reported to the next available meeting.

- 3.4 The request for guardrail will be assessed at the time the assessment is undertaken.

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

- 4.1 Take no further action. This option is not appropriate at this stage as the requests require assessment to gather data related to the usage of the locations and any previous accident history before further consideration can be given to the requests.

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

- 5.1 To reflect the existing practice of assessing requests received.

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

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

Assessing requests related to highway safety ensures any measures are provided on an evidenced need contributing to a Safe and Excellent Southend.

- 6.2 *Financial Implications*

None.

- 6.3 *Legal Implications*

None.

- 6.4 *People Implications*

Existing resources will be used to undertake assessments.

- 6.5 *Property Implications*

None.

- 6.6 *Consultation*

None.

- 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

None.

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

Assessments form the basis for any risk assessments and if progressed for future works, Road Safety Audits are undertaken using independent auditors at the design and implementation stages.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

Assessing requests to obtain data ensures the limited resources are focussed at locations where improvements are likely to result from any works. Any resulting works are undertaken by term contractors procured competitively demonstrating values for money.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

The request relate to general safety concerns and will be assessed to determine if any changes to the existing road layout is required.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

None.

## 7. **Background Papers**

None.

## 8. **Appendices**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

8

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

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

on

**8<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty,  
Director for Planning and Transport

---

**Requests for Waiting Restrictions**

**Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee**

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox**

**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
Eastwood Boulevard Shopping area	Propose restrictions for a maximum parking time of 2 hours to allow for a parking turnover	Member and businesses	NA	An unrestricted parking bay is currently provided however, long term parking is impacting on the businesses. A parking time limit will prevent the bays being used for all day parking. <b>Recommend to advertise proposals.</b>
Gunners Road and High Street	Amend existing restrictions to provide additional short term parking	Members	NA	Following the introduction of the permit parking area, small improvements including additional short term parking bays can be made by amending areas of existing restrictions. <b>Recommend to advertise proposals</b>
Hobleythick Lane	Propose additional waiting restrictions approaching Prittlewell Chase	Members	Hobleythick Lane is a distributor route where traffic flows should not be impeded by parked vehicles.	Concerns that the area approaching the junction becomes congested with parked vehicles impeding traffic in both directions, this in turn leads to congestion across Prittlewell Chase affecting flows in all directions with north/southbound queues blocking the east/west flows. Daytime restrictions will reduce congestion. <b>Recommend to advertise proposed waiting restrictions operational from 7am to 7pm Daily.</b>

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

10

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank