

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

**Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Thursday, 8th March, 2018**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

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

**Contact: Tim Row - Principal Democratic Services Officer**

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

**A G E N D A**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 8th January 2018 (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 4 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders (Pages 7 - 14)**
- 5 Members Requests List (Pages 15 - 42)**
- 6 Requests for Traffic Restrictions (Pages 43 - 46)**
- 7 Petition requesting Parking Controls in Brighton Avenue (Pages 47 - 52)**

**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: Monday, 8th January, 2018**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**3**

**Present:** Councillor T Cox (Chair)  
Councillors M Flewitt

**In Attendance:** Councillors B Arscott, M Borton, H Boyd, M Butler, D Garston,  
J Garston, R Hadley, D Kenyon and C Mulroney  
P Geraghty, C Hindle-Terry and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 p.m. - 7.30 p.m.

**597 Apologies for Absence**

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

**598 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor J Garston – Agenda Item No. 5 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Cliffs Pavilion Parking Bays) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(b) Councillor J Garston – Agenda Item No. 5 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Scheme (Amendment No. 3) – Pecuniary interest: Lives in the area to be included in the proposed extension to the permit parking area (withdrew);

(c) Councillor Flewitt – Agenda Item No. 6 (Petition requesting Pedestrian Crossing at Western Approaches) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(d) Councillor Flewitt – Agenda Item No. 7 (Petition relating to Whitehouse Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Knows the petitioner.

**599 Minutes of the special meeting held on Thursday 26th October 2017**

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the special meeting held on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> October 2017 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

**600 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 2nd November 2017**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2017 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

## 601      **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 report 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.

In response to questions regarding the timescales for implementation of the pay and display parking bays at the Cliffs Pavilion, the Executive Councillor for Transport, Waste and Regulatory Services gave an undertaking to expedite the proposal to include San Remo Parade within the Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Area where possible and, subject to the outcome of the statutory advertisement, to implement both schemes at the same time.

Resolved:

1. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm 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. 3) Order 2017 as advertised, subject to the exclusion of the following:

- High Cliff Drive;
- Woodfield Gardens;
- Kent View Avenue; and
- The Ridgeway.

2. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Borough of Southend-on-Sea ((Off-Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2005) (As amended) (Amendment No.4) Order 2017 as advertised.

3. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the statutory notices and undertake the necessary consultation for the relevant traffic regulation order(s) for the inclusion of San Remo Parade within the Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Area and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be sealed and the proposals implemented.

4. That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Cliffs Pavilion Area) (Prohibition of Waiting & Permit Parking Places) (Zone CP) Order 2016 (As amended) (Amendment No. 3) Order 2017 as advertised.

## Reason for Decision

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

## Other 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: Place Scrutiny Committee  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

### **602 Petition requesting Pedestrian Crossing at Western Approaches**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the receipt of a petition comprising 394 signatures requesting a pedestrian crossing facility be provided in Western Approaches near to the supermarket, GP surgery and a route to a local school.

Resolved:

1. That the petitioner be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.
2. That officers investigate the request and report the findings to a future meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.

## Reason for Decision

To reflect the existing practice of assessing requests received.

## Other Options

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.

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

### **603 Petition relating to Whitehouse Road**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the receipt of a petition comprising 143 signatures requesting that guard-railing be provided at the junction of Whitehouse Road and Blatches Chase, the installation of a pedestrian crossing at the junction of Whitehouse Road and Blatches Chase; and the relocation of the existing pedestrian crossing in Whitehouse Road near to Rayleigh Road.

Resolved:

1. That the petitioner be thanked for taking the time to compile the petition.
2. That officers investigate the request and report the findings to a future meeting of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.

Reason for Decision

To reflect the existing practice of assessing requests received.

Other Options

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.

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

#### **604 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.

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

Resolved:

That the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the relevant statutory notice and undertake the necessary consultation for the introduction of 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:

- Eastwood Boulevard Shopping Area – introduction of 2 hour limited waiting from 8.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. daily;
- Gunners Road and High Street, Shoburyness – amendment of existing waiting restrictions to provide parking bays with limited waiting for a maximum of 20 minutes; and
- Holeythick Lane – the introduction of waiting restrictions on the northbound carriageway (west kerbline) from 7.00 a.m. until 7.00 p.m. daily.

Reason for Decision

Where recommended the objective is 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

### **605 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.

### **606 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.

Resolved:

That consideration of these applications be deferred for consideration at a special meeting to enable the applicants to attend the make to make representations.

Reason for Decision

To ensure a full and proper hearing of exceptional circumstances PVX applications by the Traffic & Parking Working Party.

## Other Options

Determine the applications in the applicant's absence. This would be contrary to the Council's Procedure Rules

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank



# 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  
**8<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

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

---

## Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

**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.**

- 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
Colbert Avenue	Member	To introduce No Waiting 9am-6pm - 1 <sup>st</sup> March to 31 <sup>st</sup> October	<p>10 letters received. 3 letters of Support – 1 from a resident of Colbert Ave 2 from a residence in Walton Road</p> <p>7 letters of Objection received main concerns include: What is the purpose served by blocking whole of north side; where do the residents and their visitors park and visitors to the area; restrictions on side roads need to be lifted; best part is extension to junction protections; congestion only in summer months especially at weekends/Bank Holidays; will increase traffic speeds; on the south side there is no pavement thereby forcing passengers into the road; would be more effective at weekends; by reducing parking will force more residents to pave over their front gardens to create off-street parking; negative impact on road safety; when previously discussed there was no consensus as to a solution but there was agreement that the implementation of a scheme like this would be dangerous as would lead to loading and unloading passengers in the road; the restrictions not a good idea – there are only minor parking problems at weekends; would lead to parking problems on Burges Rd – restrictions need to be taken to Thorpe Hall Ave, already have problems entering and exiting property due to parked cars opposite</p>	<p>Several proposals relating to waiting restrictions have been advertised for this area in the last two years resulting in no further action.</p> <p>Residents do not appear to be supportive of any change to existing arrangements.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>

<p><b>Tyrone Road &amp; Fermoy Road</b></p>	<p><b>Member</b></p>	<p><b>To introduce No Waiting Mon-Fri 11am-12 Noon (Tyrone &amp; Fermoy Rds.) And Limited Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm 1 Hour No Return within 4 Hours (Tyrone Rd)</b></p>	<p>6 Letters of Objection – which include 3 from the Doctors Surgery. Main concerns are that the change of parking times would be detriment to their patients – many are elderly and have mobility problems which would stop them parking near to the surgery; can see the need for some form of restrictions but not at the same times as the surgery times; would have a negative effect on patients health. Existing Orders was to prevent commuter parking not restrict access to the surgery or residents parking on the road where they have limited off-street parking; current system works well feels that the proposals are just for the benefit of residents of Tyrone Rd and not the community; Car park in The Broadway is small and would be too far for elderly and infirm to walk to the surgery as would if you park in joining roads, Waste of Council money; existing restrictions are perfect, if changed parking will be horrendous; do not allow this to happen.</p>	<p>There does not appear to be support for any changes to existing arrangements.</p> <p>This is the third proposal for this street in the last two years and comment from this and previous proposals indicate no support for change.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
---	----------------------	---	--	--

<b>Rayleigh Road</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>To introduce No Waiting at Any time</b>	1 letter of objection received; proposal would not improve safety or traffic flow would prevent parking outside property, already restrictions on other side of road, proposals would only make parking available in side roads which are already congested.	No support for proposal.  <b>Recommend no further action.</b>
<b>The Rodings</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>To introduce No Waiting at Any time</b>	5 letters of objection received – main concerns are loss of parking – currently parking from flats above shops causes no problems. Further new builds nearby will increase no. of vehicles to the area already with limited parking availability ; restrictions will cause hardship for Nos 15 & 17 and would prevent parking in front of properties; main reasons for installation was to remove cars on approach to corner opposite 8/10 The Rodings; suggest restrictions from lamppost No. 2 for a distance of 10m only; if restrictions go in between church car park and vicarage will push traffic round into already congested and narrow Rodings. Flats above shops will have nowhere to park; will have a major impact on residents and businesses	No support for proposal.  <b>Recommend no further action.</b>
<b>Chalkwell Park Drive</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>To introduce a One-Way Street Southwards between A13 London Rd and Pall Mall</b>	7 letters of Support – 6 from Chalkwell Park Drive and 1 from a resident of Marguerite Drive  44 letters of objection received  34 letters from residents of Chalkwell Park Drive and 10 from residents of Marguerite Drive  Main concerns include increase speed, difficulties access driveways; would rather have a 20mph scheme; increase of speed and frequency of vehicles will impact on street scene; no evidence to support why it is proposed; only those who will benefit will be those using it as a cut through; not environmentally friendly; cause inconvenience for properties at	The proposal has attracted significant opposition.  <b>Recommend no further action.</b>

			top of road; monies better being spent elsewhere; no benefit to residents; would have detrimental effect on nearby roads; would have to drive round the block to gain access to main road; want it to stay two-way; would like residents parking; one way streets do not reduce traffic flow; safety grounds; no logic in changing things that do not need changing; no evidence will reduce non-resident parking; traffic flows will increase on neighbouring roads; will not make any difference; waste of money; what's the point in the proposals, parking near to your house will become harder;	
Borough Wide	<b>Officers and Members</b>	<b>Amend structure of parking charges; Town Centre Car Parks excluding Tylers Avenue and York Road</b>		<p>The proposals are designed to encourage longer stay parking in a number of the town centre and seafront parking areas by removing the parking tariff for 1, 3 and 5 hours. Several car parks will remain available for short term parking.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and  
Cabinet Committee**  
on  
**8<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty  
Director of Planning and Transport

---

## **Members Requests List**

**Portfolio Holder – Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

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

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee to receive, note and consider new “Member’s Requests” and Officers’ recommendations as detailed in **Appendix 1** of this report.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Traffic and Parking and the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Working Party and Officer recommendations on each of the proposals as detailed in Appendix 1 to this report, and agree:
- a) **To proceed with Officers’ recommendations; or,**
  - b) **To proceed with Officers’ recommendations; or,**
  - c) **To take no further action.**
  - d) **That all agreed actions will be added to the existing work programme and progressed in order of approval unless members have indicated higher priority.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 Members may formally request highway and traffic improvement works to be considered. These requests vary from minor traffic, road safety and parking initiatives and may include new pedestrian crossing facilities, traffic speed, road safety and residents parking schemes.
- 3.2 Officers receive and add all such requests to the “Members list” and report these back to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee. Any recommendations agreed will then become part of the work programme. Officers’ initial recommendations are based on limited findings of the investigation and/or the outcome of surveys/consultations where possible. If the Working Party/Cabinet Committee agree for items to be further investigated, updates will be presented to future Traffic and Parking Working Party & Cabinet Committee meetings for consideration and decision, as and when they become available.

- 3.3 The Committee is aware of the increasing workload resulting from “Members Requests”. This is a small team with limited financial and staffing resources to address all requests which require extensive investigations in most cases. As such there is a need to prioritise these on the basis of impact on safety, accessibility and traffic flows and programmed against the limited budget and staffing available to undertake necessary investigations to deliver these in the most efficient way.
- 3.4 It needs to be noted that once a formal conclusion has been reached on the individual items, to the agreement of the Traffic and Parking Working Group & the Cabinet Committee, these will be removed from the list and where appropriate, added to the work programme. In such cases, the Working Party and the Cabinet Committee is asked to agree future prioritisation of each of the items on the basis of impact on safety and accessibility.
- 3.5 Officers will update Members of the progress of their individual requests and will inform them of the findings, investigations, the recommendations and reasons thereof, as well as the decisions made by this Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **6.4 People Implications**

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

#### **6.5 Property Implications**

None

#### **6.6 Consultation**

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

### **7. Background Papers**

None

## **8 Appendices**

### **8.1 Appendix 1.**

This page is intentionally left blank

-----

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

**Note: Cabinet Committee in January 2016 agreed the following criterion for dealing with requests of waiting restrictions:-**

### **Waiting Restrictions**

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

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

Reference Number	Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/30	August 2017	Cllrs Bright & Holland	Provide limited waiting parking restrictions Southchurch Boulevard adjacent to church to deter all day parking by coaches	<p>Unrestricted parking is currently provided however, long term parking is occurring, impacting on the church.</p> <p>While vehicles, including larger vehicles and occasionally, coaches, preventing long term parking will likely impact on residents of Southchurch Rectory Chase who rely in this area to accommodate parking and the proposals will affect these residents.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposals but Members should be aware that if implemented, no concession will be available to residents allowing them to leave their cars in the parking bays during the prohibited period.</b></p>
17/31 20	August 2017	Cllrs Davidson and D Garston	Reduce speeds in roads surrounding Earls Hall School	<p>Please refer to Appendix 2.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/32	August 2017	Cllrs Davidson and D Garston	Provide pedestrian refuge, Southbourne Grove junctions with Bridgewater Drive and Carlton Avenue.	<p>Insufficient carriageway widths to install a minimum width 1.8metre refuge island. Any installation would impede vehicle movements into the junctions from Southbourne Grove including buses.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/33	August 2017	Cllrs Davidson and D Garston	Shakespeare Drive/West Road junction. Propose measures to prevent reduced visibility.	<p>This location was subject to accident remedial works prior to 2010 following a number of personal injury accidents. The junction layout was amended to provide additional visibility of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Accident data records shows no accidents have occurred in the last 3 years. Two approaches have issues.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To reverse the current one-way arrangements to northbound traffic flow however, this could merely move the issue to an adjacent road.</li> <li>To narrow the junction providing one exit lane only, this could lead to a left turning or straight ahead movements being delayed by right turning manoeuvres. Delays can in turn encourage risk and could lead to accidents where currently none have been recorded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/34	August 2017	Cllrs Davidson and D Garston	Measures to prevent accidents, Westbourne Grove, Prince Avenue junction.	<p>The eastbound carriageway of Prince Avenue joins with Westbourne Grove at a bend and the westbound carriageway of Prince Avenue joins this several meters further southwards. Two accidents have occurred in the last three years at the westbound junction.</p> <p>The contributory factors to the accidents have been stated as wet road surface and an inexperienced driver therefore, it is highly unlikely any physical measures could prevent further accidents.</p> <p>It has been noted as part of the investigation that the surface of the eastbound carriageway approaching Westbourne Grove requires attention and a small section is programmed for resurfacing in the next 8 weeks.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/35	October 2017	Cllrs Cox And Jarvis	Introduce accident prevention measures Maya Close and Ness Road	Please see Appendix 3
17/36	October 2017	Cllr Borton	Introduce permit parking controls – Area west of North Road	Please see Appendix 5
17/37	December 2017	Cllr Mulroney	Reposition pedestrian refuge, Leigh Broadway junction with Leigh Hill.	Please see Appendix 4

17/38	December 2017	Cllr Mulroney	Traffic Calming Marine Parade	Please see Appendix 7
17/39	January 2018	Cllr Mulroney	Provide ambulance bay, Health centre, London Road neat Marguerite Drive	<p>Any parking bay provided would require excavation of the footway and a new area of carriageway to be formed. While the footway is fairly wide, the root protection area (RPA) of two young trees would be encroached by any parking bay and as these trees grow, the RPA would be further encroached and possibly damage the trees. In addition, the centre has parking availability on site and if an ambulance bay is required, this should be accommodated within the property.</p> <p><b>Recommend no action</b></p>
17/40	February 2018	Cllrs Holland and Bright	Provide a period of parking prohibition (1 hour) on newly created parking spaces, Riviera Drive.	<p>Members agreed that an area of verge in Rivera Drive would be hardened and parking bays created to reduce parking pressure in the area. 21 additional parking bays have been created. Commuters are utilising some of the bays but residents are also benefitting from the additional parking.</p> <p>The parking prohibition is designed to deter all day parking by commuters however there are concerns that such measures would be detrimental to local residents who would be required to move their vehicles for the period and many residents have no alternative parking provision.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposals but Members should be aware that if implemented, no concession will be available to residents leaving their cars in the parking bays during the prohibited period.</b></p>
17/41	February 18	Cllr McDonald	Reduce operational hours of Queensway East parking scheme.	The scheme is currently operational until 9pm daily as requested by the majority of residents who felt the parking issues were present until this time each day. Parking controls have prevented daytime parking which was the scheme aim and residents feel that the current time is onerous. Given the parking controls for



				<p>the car parks and on street pay and display parking end at 6pm, evening controls are of little benefit as non-residents can use these areas free of charge.</p> <p><b>Recommend to propose a reduction in the operational hours until 6pm daily.</b></p>
17/42	Mar 2018	Cllr McGlone	North Crescent in vicinity of bend approx. o/s No 168 – Parking Restrictions on an alternate monthly basis	<p>Does not meet criteria. No accidents recorded and as a residential street, traffic flows are not a concern.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/43	Mar 2018	Cllr McGlone	Eastwoodbury Lane – Waiting restrictions between Bristol Road and Vickers Road	<p>Does not meet criteria. No accidents recorded at the location.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/44 23	Mar 2018	Cllrs Flewitt Buckley McGlone	Warners Gardens – waiting restrictions to stop long stay parking near to entrance to allotments	<p>Does not meet criteria. Recommend no further action unless entire area parking issues addressed to prevent displacing parking to residential streets. Officers are analysing the results of a consultation within the area related to parking. While the initial results indicate little support for parking controls, there may be a smaller area within the large consultation area where parking controls are supported. Until this work is completed, it is not appropriate to propose parking controls in isolated areas as this will merely displace the parking issues into the residential streets.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>
17/45	Mar 2018	Cllr Waterworth	Extension of existing Waiting Restrictions at entrance to allotments in Manchester Drive on northside westwards to bus stop	<p>Does not meet criteria. Request is to protect private access contrary to agreed policy (as agreed by the Committee January 2016).</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>

17/46	Mar 2018	Cllr Philips	One Hour Waiting restrictions in Thames Close to deter commuter parking – request supported by all residents of Thames Close	<p>Does not meet criteria relating to waiting restrictions or parking controls to deter non- residential parking. The request is contrary to the agreed policy regarding the introduction of waiting restrictions and could lead to displaced parking. Parking controls designed to deter non-resident parking should be part of an area wide solution to avoid moving vehicles into adjacent roads.</p> <p><b>Recommend officers support ward members to undertake the necessary surveys within the wider area.</b></p>
17/47	Mar 2018	Cllr Hadley	Introduce waiting restrictions, Hinguar Street by Saxon Court to assist access into and out of the car park.	<p>The road is residential with the majority of residents relying on parking on-street. The access for Saxon Court is very wide and if the managing agent removed 1 parking space adjacent to the access, manoeuvring would be possible.</p> <p>The agreed policy relating to waiting restrictions does not allow for the protection of private access.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>

Reference Number	Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
16/01	Feb 16	Cllr Buckley	Rochford Road Service Road. Propose restrictions to deter parking.	<p>Parking is believed to be related to the airport and preventing parking in an isolated area will merely displace these vehicles.</p> <p>Agreed as below.</p> <p>That request reference 16/01 for the introduction of waiting restrictions or a parking management scheme to deter airport parking in Rochford Road service road, be retained on the list and that officers arrange a meeting with Ward Councillors and appropriate representatives of the airport to discuss the wider issue of airport parking.</p> <p><b>Update: there is no provision within the Airport Surface Access Strategy for funding towards parking controls as the Airport regularly monitor passenger transport modes and report 29% of passengers arrive by public transport.</b></p> <p><b>Officers are aware of increased residents parking issues. Suggest ward Members consult the wider area as to parking issues with a view to considering permit parking controls. Officers can assist with defining an appropriate area and analysing results.</b></p> <p><b>Please see Appendix 6 for the results of the consultation</b></p>

Reference Number	Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
16/04	May 16	Cllr Courtney	Harden verges Silversea Drive	<p>Agreed as below</p> <p>Ward Councillors be requested to undertake consultation with residents in accordance with the verge hardening policy.</p> <p>Cllr Courtenay is undertaking a consultation with residents and the results will be reported to a future meeting. <b>The estimated costs for this work are £40,000. Members are requested to note that this work would require a number of verge areas to be maintained due to trees and, lamp columns and driveways therefore minimal additional parking will be created. No further update received.</b></p>
16/07	May 16	Cllr Hadley	Campfield Road. Propose waiting restrictions on bend by Cumberland Packaging	<p>Agreed to maintain on the list.</p> <p>Officers advise that waiting restrictions will not prevent the practice of vehicles waiting to enter the businesses.</p> <p>A Ward Member has offered to informally discuss the issue with the associated businesses to attempt a resolution.</p> <p>No feedback from Councillor prior to report being finalised</p>
17/02	Oct 16	Cllr Walker	Harden verges, Mansell Close	<p>Estimated costs of works £12,000.</p> <p><b>To be included in 2018/19 work programme</b></p>
17/05	July 2017	Cllr Hadley	Waking Avenue junction with Elm Road, extend existing waiting restrictions	<p>Does not meet criteria. Junction currently protected with 10 metres of waiting restrictions. No accident history.</p> <p><b>Recommend no action.</b></p>

Reference Number	Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
17/06	July 2017	Cllr Jarvis	Provide waiting restrictions in Teigngrace to deter residents from neighbouring street parking	Does not meet criteria. No traffic flow or safety issues identified. Officers have also received comments from neighbours expressing concern at rumour of parking controls therefore any proposal would attract objections.  <b>Recommend no action.</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Southend on Sea Borough Council

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

Earls Hall School Area

20mph speed limit request

#### Background

Speed monitoring equipment was installed in the streets below for a period of 7 to 10 days in each location. The equipment continuously monitors all traffic movements and the average speeds of vehicles is provided against each street.

Street	Average speeds
Colemans Avenue	22mph
Fairview Drive	14mph
Henley Crescent	16mph
Midhurst Avenue	21mph
Richmond Avenue	21mph
Rochester Drive	24mph

As shown, the average speeds in each street are fairly low.

There have been four collisions in the past three years resulting in slight injury casualties.

#### June 2016 16:12

Colemans Avenue outside the school – Two cars rear shunt, Vehicle 2 slowed to turn into school car park and failed to judge path/speed of other vehicle

Contributory factor: Careless/Reckless (Driver)

#### July 2016 15:30

Midhurst Avenue junction with Hobbeythick Lane - Car/pedestrian, car turning at junction

Contributory Factor: Failed to look (Driver)

#### July 2015 13:00

Rochester Drive 100m south of A127 – Car/Cyclist, car reversing off drive

Contributory Factor: Failed to look (Driver)

**July 2014 19:15**

Richmond Drive junction with Fairview Drive – Moped only, skidded on mud possibly left by gas works, possible oil as well

Contributory Factor: Road Environment – oil/mud

**Recommendation**

In accordance with the decision taken by the Place Scrutiny Committee following an in-depth study into potential speed limit reductions in residential areas, no action is being on this issue is being undertaken until the Department for Transport have concluded their own review on nationally applied speed limits in residential areas. These results were expected in 2017, but is now expected by June 2018.

Exceptions to this Policy include locations where three or more accidents have occurred and speed if considered to be a contributory factor to the cause of the accidents. As shown in the information provided, four accidents have occurred in the area within a three year period however, no accidents related to speed have been recorded and three of the four accidents have been attributed to driver error.

We are actively recruiting Community Speed Watch (CSW) volunteers to help run sessions throughout the borough to record and report speeding vehicles. The coordination of CSW volunteers is now managed by Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and more information about becoming a volunteer can be obtained by emailing [community.speedwatch@essex-fire.gov.uk](mailto:community.speedwatch@essex-fire.gov.uk)

Should residents have concerns, it may be helpful to pass this information to them to try and recruit volunteers willing to participate in this area.



## Southend on Sea Borough Council

---

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

#### **Maya Close**

#### **Background**

An accident occurred in 2015, which sadly resulted in the death of a motorcyclist. The motorcyclist was travelling along Ness Road when a vehicle exited Maya Close. Councillors have requested consideration be given to introducing a mandatory left turn from Maya Close into Ness Road to prevent future accidents at this junction.

The accident data compiled by the Police states that the driver of the vehicle failed to look properly. There are no indications that the rider of the motorcycle was travelling at an inappropriate speed.

#### **Observations**

The junction is a staggered crossroad layout with junction protection on all arms of the crossroads. A small convenience store is located on the eastern side of the junction and a planter area to the boundary of this property could be impeding visibility of approaching traffic.

A further issue noted during observation was short term parking on the area of double yellow lines outside the convenience store.

#### **Recommendation**

There appears to be little benefit in restricting traffic movement from this junction. Vehicles exiting left into Ness Road from Maya Close will still require visibility of southbound traffic therefore restricting the movement to left turn only would not prevent future similar accidents.

Consideration is being given to build outs bringing the junction further into Ness Road and preventing illegal parking. Ness Road is a Primary Distributor Route accommodating large vehicles throughout the day and there are concerns that any narrowing of the carriageway could impede traffic flows. Proposals are being designed and will be assessed by an independent safety auditor.

It is recommended that pending the outcome of the independent assessment, officers discuss the planters with the convenience store and request that any foliage is maintained at a minimum level to maintain visibility.

### Appendix 3 – Members Request List

In the event that a build-out would not impede larger vehicles and the safety assessment indicates it is appropriate to do so, the build-out will be programmed for the coming financial year.

## Southend on Sea Borough Council

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

Broadway and Leigh Hill, request to relocate refuge.

#### Background

The area is very busy with both pedestrian and vehicular traffic and a pedestrian refuge is in place assisting pedestrians to cross the road.

East of the refuge, a Tesco Express is located and for a number of years, deliveries to the store have created issues with both traffic and noise.

Colleagues in Public Protection have placed restrictions on deliveries prohibiting any activity between 7pm and 7am daily to protect local residents from noise and disturbance.

A Traffic Regulation Order has also been in place for several years and restriction on loading prohibit activity from 7.30am to 9.30am and 4.30pm to 6.30pm to ensure the most busy traffic periods are not interrupted however, the area is very busy throughout the unrestricted period. As a result, any loading activity should take place between;

7am to 7.30am

9.30am to 4.30pm

6.30pm to 7pm.

During the permitted loading period from 9.30am to 4.30pm, the area is subject to high pedestrian footfall and concerns have been raised as to potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles due to impeded visibility caused by delivery vehicles. The excerpt from Google Maps below demonstrates the issue very clearly.

#### View Eastwards



**View westwards**



**Observations**

The pedestrian refuge is very well used and while stationary vehicles delivering to the store impede visibility, the island allows for a two stage crossing and pedestrians can cross without significant delay. The footway has been widened on the south side to reduce the width of the carriageway pedestrians need to negotiate and this feature also provides enhanced visibility of westbound traffic from the southern footway however, the visibility is impeded of eastbound traffic from the northern footway as traffic invariably manoeuvres around the stationary vehicle moving back into the eastbound carriageway shortly before the refuge. Pedestrians are unable to see oncoming traffic and drivers are not able to see pedestrians crossing the eastbound carriageway until they are manoeuvring past the stationary vehicle.

The accident history for the area shows no personal injury accidents have occurred in the last three years at this location.

Accidents are recorded further eastwards as shown in the excerpt from the accident map below.



### **Accident details**

Of the five accidents shown in the above excerpt, three involve injury to pedestrians. One accident relates to a pedestrian crossing the road when the vehicle, which was reversing into a parking space ran over the pedestrian's foot.

One accident involved a vehicle attempting to exit on to Broadway and head west. The pedestrian was crossing Broadway and was hit by the vehicle.

One accident relates to an intoxicated pedestrian who intentionally placed themselves in front of a vehicle.

### **Recommendation**

Moving this refuge eastwards would involve the loss of parking in an area where parking availability is much needed. While there are two car parks within a five minute walk of the location, both are very busy and vehicles often wait for a space to be made available.

More importantly, there are serious concerns that the removal of this facility will not deter pedestrians from using the location as a crossing point and be required to cross both carriageways in one single movement. Accidents may occur as a result creating an issue where previously the location is evidenced as an appropriate place to cross.

Given the evidence that the location is not subject to accidents and that relocation of the pedestrian activity would require the loss of parking in a very busy local shopping area, no further action relating to the refuge is recommended at this time.

Further loading restrictions could be placed from the junction of Elm Road to West Street to prohibit deliveries however, Members are advised that while a loading restriction is managed by the creation of a Traffic Regulation Order, the general provision relating to objections differ from other restrictions. If loading activity is proposed to be prohibited between the hours which include the period from 10am to 4pm (unless the location is within 15 metres of a junction), where objections are received, consideration of objections cannot be undertaken by a local Committee and a public inquiry must be held. This is to ensure onerous restrictions are not un-necessarily placed on loading and servicing activity.

There is however, the opportunity to provide a loading bay located near to the location in West Street. Such a proposal could mitigate additional loading restrictions but regardless of mitigation, any objections would need to be scrutinized at a full public inquiry.

This would remove unrestricted parking but the loading bay could be dedicated for this activity from 7am to 7pm and reverting to unrestricted parking outside of these times.

**Recommend that no further action is taken with regard to relocation of the refuge.**

**Propose the provision of a loading bay in West Street operational from 7am to 7pm reverting to unrestricted parking overnight.**

**If agreed, officers will monitor the usage of the loading bay and activity in the area of the refuge. In the event that loading activity continues at the location, authorisation to propose loading restrictions will be sought at a future meeting.**

## Southend on Sea Borough Council

---

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

Salisbury Avenue area – Permit Parking Controls

#### **Background**

The area is adjacent to the Colchester Road area, which is subject to parking controls to deter non-resident parking. Parking is pressured as the majority of properties have no off street parking provision and rely on being able to use the currently unrestricted parking on street.

Parking by non-residents is very common due to the proximity to;

- Hamlet Court Road, West Road and London Road shopping areas
- Schools in Salisbury Avenue and North Road
- Football stadium

Ward Members have consulted residents of the area as to their views on permit parking controls being introduced and the following responses were received representing a 35% response.

After analysing the results, over 70% of residents are supportive of permit parking controls however, the level of responses is less than the 40% agreed by this Committee as the response threshold. This figure appears to be heavily affected by the lack of responses from North Road.

North Road is the street dividing the existing Colchester Road area and this proposed new area and proposed controls have been agreed for advertisement by this Committee to introduce permit parking only in the car parking areas managed by South Essex Homes in the area.

**Table 1**

<b>Road Name</b>	<b>No. of Properties</b>	<b>No. of Returns</b>	<b>% Returned</b>	<b>In Favour</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>% In Favour</b>
Albany Avenue	28	12	43	10	2	83
Albion Road	60	10	17	2	8	20
Avebury Road	19	6	32	6	0	100
Balmoral Road	15	3	20	3	0	100
Carisbrooke Road	28	11	39	3	8	27
Claremont Road	74	15	20	7	8	47
Cliff Avenue	30	9	30	9	0	100
Hamlet Court Road	145	33	23	17	16	51
North Road	153	25	16	22	4	88
Osborne Road	45	14	31	9	5	64
Rayleigh Avenue	49	34	69	22	4	65
Richmond Avenue	16	6	38	6	0	100
Rochford Avenue	49	30	61	28	2	93
Salisbury Avenue	139	81	58	74	7	91
Tudor Road	42	20	48	17	2	85
Windsor Road	41	5	12	1	4	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>71%</b>

**Recommendation**

While the level of responses falls below the agreed threshold, given the support from surrounding streets, the proposed controls in the South Essex Homes car parks and the likelihood North Road will be an isolated street between two permit parking areas as well as potential displaced parking from the car parks, it is recommend to proceed with a formal consultation encompassing all the streets listed in Table 1.



## Southend on Sea Borough Council

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

#### Airport Area – Permit Parking Controls

##### Background

The area is adjacent to the Airport and the business park with reports of both long and short term parking disadvantaging residents.

Members have undertaken a survey encompassing a very large area to determine the resident's views on whether a parking problem exists in their street and the levels of support for parking controls to be implemented to reduce parking pressure.

**Table 1**

Road Name	Number of Properties	Number returned	% Returned	Number in Favour of Residents Parking	% in Favour of Residents Parking
ALTON GARDENS	104	22	21.2	11	50.0
ARAGON CLOSE	23	4	17.4	1	25
AUDLEYS CLOSE	18	4	22.2	2	50
AVRO ROAD	22	2	9.1	1	50
BEECHMONT GARDENS	37	12	32.4	9	75.0
BEVERLEY GARDENS	29	4	13.8	2	50
BRISTOL ROAD	17	5	29.4	3	50
BYRNE DRIVE	80	15	18.8	1	6.7
CAROLINE'S CLOSE	31	5	16.1	4	80.0
CRANSTON AVENUE	11	3	27.3	2	66.7
DENTON AVENUE / DENTON CLOSE	80	10	12.5	4	40.0
DEREK GARDENS	87	22	25.3	10	45.5
DOLPHINS	35	7	20.0	5	71.4
EASTWOODBURY LANE / CRESCENT	143	47	32.9	29	61.7
FAIRLAWN GARDENS	41	9	22.0	3	33.3
FEECHES ROAD	140	32	22.9	8	25.0
HAMPTON GARDENS	136	38	27.9	15	39.5
HORNBY AVENUE	120	23	19.2	12	52.2
KEITH WAY	96	22	22.9	2	9.1
LARKE RISE	5	5	100.0	1	20.0
MANNERS WAY	168	40	23.8	15	37.5
MARINA CLOSE	10	4	40.0	2	50.0
MARLOW GARDENS	19	2	10.5	0	0.0

## Appendix 6

Road Name	Number of Properties	Number returned	% Returned	Number in Favour of Residents Parking	% in Favour of Residents Parking
NIGHTINGALE CLOSE	41	4	9.8	3	75.0
OAKEN GRANGE DRIVE	87	24	27.6	8	33.3
ROCHFORD ROAD	243	59	24.3	39	66.1
SHERBOURNE GARDENS	49	17	34.7	4	23.5
SIDMOUTH AVENUE	28	5	17.9	4	80.0
SOUTH CRESCENT	107	19	17.8	5	26.3
THORNFORD GARDENS	131	31	23.7	7	22.6
VICKERS ROAD	15	7	46.7	3	42.9
WELLS AVENUE	104	37	35.6	28	75.7
WILLMOTT ROAD	19	14	73.7	1	7.1
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>2444</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>42.8%</b>

After analysing the results, the level of responses and support for parking controls falls well below the agreed threshold of at least 40% of residents responding to the consultation and of these, 70% of residents support parking controls.

Officers have not had adequate time to fully analyse responses from each road to avoid delaying the reporting of these results, after an in-depth analysis, it may be apparent that a smaller area confined to the immediate area surrounding the airport is supportive of controls and officers will continue with this work.

Any proposals will include Eastwoodbury Crescent which is directly adjacent to the Airport.

### Recommendation

That Officers continue with the analysis and discuss the results with the ward Members. In the event that a smaller area is supportive of controls, the Committee is requested to authorise advertisement of any resulting proposals and refer comments to a future meeting of this Committee.

## Southend on Sea Borough Council

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

#### Marine Parade Traffic Calming

##### Background

Marine Parade is a busy East-West road with the majority of the road being subject to waiting restrictions prohibiting parking at any time. The section from Canvey Road westwards features junction protection and a waiting restriction prohibiting parking between 2pm to 3pm. The road has a fairly wide carriageway.

The route is subject to high levels of use with concentrated activity in the busy morning and evening peak with traffic utilising this route to avoid London Road. The road is not designated as a distributor or secondary distributor route within the Local Transport Plan.

Speeds were monitored over 8 days with equipment at various locations as detailed in the table below.

**Table 1**

Location	Vehicles Record	Average Speed
Near Vernon Road	52699	29mph
Near Salisbury Road	54562	29mph
Near Crescent Road	42315	24mph

The results do show significant levels of vehicles travelling at inappropriate speeds however, as a straight wide road with limited on-street parking, excessive speed could arise.

A Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) has been in place in the road for several years and members may recall the effectiveness of permanent VAS signage being questioned with the resulting actions of purchasing such signage for temporary use only.

Accident data has been investigated and two accidents resulting in personal injury have been recorded.

25<sup>th</sup> September 2015, 02:50 am Junction with Tattersall Gardens.

A stolen vehicle attempting to evade a Police vehicle, the driver of the stolen vehicle failed to notice the junction.

Likely contributory factors are given as; speed, drug impairment, poor manoeuvre.

## Appendix 7

29<sup>th</sup> September 2017 08:27 am, Junction with Thames Drive.

A cyclist entered the road without warning and was struck by vehicle 1, the cyclist then fell onto vehicle 2 which braked and was hit from the rear by vehicle 3.

Likely contributory factors are; failure of the cyclist to look and give way to oncoming traffic.

### **Recommendation**

In accordance with the decision taken by the Place Scrutiny Committee following an in-depth study into potential speed limit reductions in residential areas, no action is being on this issue until the Department for Transport have concluded their own review on nationally applied speed limits in residential areas. These results were expected in 2017, but is now expected by June 2018.

Exceptions to this Policy include locations where three or more accidents have occurred and speed if considered to be a contributory factor to the cause of the accidents. As shown in the information provided, four accidents have occurred in the area within a three year period however, no accidents related to speed have been recorded and three of the four accidents have been attributed to driver error.

We are actively recruiting Community Speed Watch (CSW) volunteers to help run sessions throughout the borough to record and report speeding vehicles. The coordination of CSW volunteers is now managed by Essex County Fire and Rescue Service and more information about becoming a volunteer can be obtained by emailing [community.speedwatch@essex-fire.gov.uk](mailto:community.speedwatch@essex-fire.gov.uk)

Should residents have concerns, it may be helpful to pass this information to them to try and recruit volunteers willing to participate in this area.

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

6

**Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)**  
**to**  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet**  
**Committee**  
**on**  
**8<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

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

---

## **Requests for Traffic Restrictions**

**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 or traffic restrictions are regularly received from residents and the businesses as well as officer and Member suggestions.
- 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
Alexandra Street	Reposition Ambulance Bay	Members and Officers	NA	The bay is provide for the operational requirements associated with Project 49. The bay can be repositioned to better suit the operation and increases pay and display parking provision by 1 bay.
Strand Wharf	Propose prohibition of driving except for authorized access	Officers	NA	<p>The area is shortly to be placed under the control of Leigh Town Council and used as a public amenity.</p> <p>Access on foot will be maintained however, vehicle access needs to be controlled by prohibiting any unauthorized vehicles to reduce risk to users of the area.</p> <p>Loading, servicing and public launching activities will be maintained along with any special event needs as and when required. Tenants of Plumbs Yard will be permitted to access the area and park in their designated parking bays in accordance with their lease arrangements.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposals.</b></p>
Whittingham Avenue junction with Poynings Avenue	Extend junction protection	Member	The area is a Junction	The junction is wide and as such, the standard 10 meters of double yellow line does not sufficiently protect visibility. Recommend to extend existing protection by 5 meters in Poynings Avenue.



# 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> March 2018**

Report prepared by:  
Peter Geraghty Director for Planning and Transport

---

## **Petition requesting Parking Controls in Brighton 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 47 residents of Brighton Avenue requesting parking controls to provide priority for residents.

### **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 at this time.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 Permit style parking controls are proposed on an area wide basis only, this ensure parking is not merely displaced to adjacent streets.
- 3.2 The area is adjacent to Southend East rail station and suffers with significant parking issues due to commuter parking.
- 3.2 Ward Members and interested residents have undertaken previous surveys in the area north of the rail station to assess the views of residents as to permit parking controls and while the results indicated support for the suggestion, the impact on streets south of the rail station was considered to be significant and residents of these streets were unlikely to support controls in their area.
- 3.3 The area encompasses three separate electoral wards and discussions were held with Members representing these wards with the recommendation that no further action be taken. This recommendation was considered and supported by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

- 3.3 There was sympathy for residents in the area and to try and relieve some of parking pressures, agreement was given to harden some of the verges in the eastern end of Riviera Drive to provide additional parking. Works were completed in January with an additional 21 spaces being provided. Photographs of the areas which have been hardened are show at **Appendix 2** to this report.

#### **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 a previous decision by this Committee.

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

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

Consistent application of agreed policy ensures we act fairly and consider applications in accordance with set criteria in relation to parking contributing to the safe and efficient management of the traffic network.

##### *6.2 Financial Implications*

No further implications.

##### *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 however the works to harden grassed verges were undertaken by our term contractor procured through competitive tendering demonstrating value for money.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

None.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

The verge works were designed to maintain soft areas to support drainage and healthy tree growth which reduces the environmental impact of the project.

**7. Background Papers**

None.

**8. Appendices**

**Appendix 1** Map of the area discussed by members

**Appendix 2** photographs of the completed works in Riviera Drive

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council</b> Department for Place PO Box 5560, Civic Centre Victoria Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 6ZQ		Project Title <b>Southend-on-Sea</b>				Date <b>12/12/16</b>	
		Drawing Title <b>Ambleside Drive Area</b>				Quality Project No.	
		<b>Boundary 1</b>				Scale @ A4 <b>Not to Scale</b>	
		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