

Public Document Pack
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Cabinet Committee

Date: Monday, 4th January, 2016
Time: 6.00 pm
Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

Contact: Tim Row – Principal Committee Officer
Email: committeesection@southend.gov.uk

A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 17th September 2015 (Pages 1 - 10)**
- 4 Petition Requesting Parking Controls - Bridgwater Drive (Pages 11 - 14)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place attached
- 5 Petition Requesting Additional Residents Parking Bays - Colchester Road (Pages 15 - 18)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place attached
- 6 Member's Requests List (Pages 19 - 30)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place attached
- 7 Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders (Pages 31 - 34)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place attached
- 8 Traffic & Parking Working Group Recommendations (Pages 35 - 52)**
Report of Corporate Director for Place attached
- a) **Reference Back - Minute 235 of Cabinet Committee held on 17th September 2015 re Members' Request No. 15/13 (Pages 53 - 58)**
Minute Excerpts and Members' Request attached.

Members:

Cllr Terry (Chair), Cllr Norman MBE (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Betson

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Cabinet Committee

Date: Thursday, 17th September, 2015

Place: Jubilee Room, Civic 1, Victoria Avenue, Southend

3

Present: Councillor M W Terry (Chairman),
Councillors D A Norman MBE (Vice-Chairman) and G E Longley

In Attendance: Councillors M Assenheim, T K Byford, T Callaghan, J I Courtenay, T Cox,
A Crystall, J M Garston, J L Lamb, J McMahon, M Stafford, L P Salter, C
W Walker
P Geraghty, Z Ali, C Hindle-Terry, T Row

Start/End Time: 6.00 p.m./9.25 p.m.

**** **Part I**

226 Apologies and substitutions.

There were no apologies for absence.

227 Declarations of interest.

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Callaghan - Agenda item no. 6 (Petition - Residents only Parking Zones for Redstock Road and adjoining streets/roads) - Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(b) Councillor Cox - Agenda Item 10 (Request ref no. 15/13) - Non-pecuniary interest: Chair of Rochford & Southend East Conservative Association and the MP lives in Fermoy Road;

(c) Councillor J Garston - Agenda item No. 10 (Request ref no. 15/13) - Non-pecuniary interest: MP lives in Fermoy Road;

(d) Councillor J Garston - Agenda item no. 11 (Broadway West) - Disclosable non-pecuniary interest (withdrew);

(e) Councillor Longley - Agenda item no. 4 (The Maze) - Non-pecuniary interest;

(e) Mr T Row - Agenda item no. 5 (Petition Requesting Parking Controls - Benvenue Avenue) - Non-pecuniary interest: knows someone who lives in the road.

228 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 25th June, 2015

Resolved:

That, subject to the amendment of Minute 78(b) as detailed below, the Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 25th June 2015 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed:

"(b) Councillor J Garston - Agenda Item No. 8 - Petition: Salisbury Road - Non-pecuniary interest: Brother lives in the road."

229 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations

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

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

Resolved:

That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to confirm the traffic regulation orders in respect of the locations listed in Appendix 1 of the report as advertised without amendments.

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

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

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

230 Petition Requesting Parking Controls - Benvenue Avenue

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a petition comprising 31 signatures from the residents in Benvenue Avenue. The petition sought the introduction of parking controls between 08:15 and 9:15 and 14:30 to 15:30 term time only in the road which had an access to the Heycroft Primary School. Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party, it was:

Resolved:

1. That the petition be noted
2. That any proposals be deferred pending the outcome of the strategic approach to reduce speed, improve road safety and address parking issues within residential areas.

Reasons for Decision

To reflect the request from residents while meeting the aspirations of Members to adopt area wide measures.

Other Options

Agree to the request. Dealing with issues in individual locations tends to displace rather than resolve parking. Officer time is then utilised in resolving issues in other roads that have been created by addressing one road or problem.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

231 Petition - Residents only Parking Zones for Redstock Road and adjoining streets/roads

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a petition comprising 60 signatures requesting the possible introduction of resident only parking controls.

Resolved:

1. That the petition be noted.
2. That officers assist Ward Councillors to identify a suitable geographical area and appropriate questions to enable Members to undertake a survey of residents in accordance with the Parking Management Scheme policy.
3. That, in the event that the requisite numbers of residents respond to the survey and the majority of respondents support the suggestion, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to commence the formal process for the introduction of a Permit Parking Area.

Reasons for Decision

To reflect the request from residents.

Other Options

Take no further action. The Council is required to consider petitions related to parking controls. While budgets may be limited, undertaking the associated surveys will ensure a prioritisation of works is targeted at areas where support for controls is evident.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

232 Petition - Traffic Calming Measures in Tunbridge Road and Penhurst Avenue

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning a petition comprising 73 signatures requesting an amendment to the current junction layout at Carnarvon Road and Victoria Avenue to accommodate a right turn manoeuvre into Victoria Avenue from Carnarvon Road.

Resolved:

1. That the petition be noted.
2. That it be noted that investigations are being undertaken with regard to the existing manoeuvres and traffic flows at this location as part of development potential on the west side of Victoria Avenue.
3. Upon completion of the investigation and designs have been created, the Corporate Director be authorised to advertise any required Traffic Regulation Order amendments relating to traffic flow.
4. In the event that no objections are received to the proposals, the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to confirm the Traffic Regulation Order(s).

Reasons for Decision

To gather information related to the traffic movements and create an appropriate proposal designed to manage the anticipated traffic flows.

Other Options

Take no further action. The Council will be investigating traffic flows at this location and as such, the petitioners request can be considered.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

233 Leighville Grove and Southsea Avenue

Further to Minute 90 of its last meeting, the Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place concerning the introduction of one way traffic flows in Leighville Grove and Southsea Avenue and part day/part week waiting restrictions in Southsea Avenue. Having considered the views of the Traffic & Parking Working Party it was:

Resolved:

1. That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the relevant amendments to the traffic regulation orders to introduce one way traffic flows as follows, and subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the order to be confirmed:

Leighville Grove - southbound
Southsea Avenue - northbound

2. That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to make the necessary order to give permanent effect to the current experimental waiting restrictions in Southsea Drive.

Reasons for Decision

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

Other Options

Take no further action. Significant time has been allocated to this project since 2013 and while the majority of residents support proposals, several Committee meetings have resulted in further information being required. To take no action would negatively impact on the purpose of consultations as resident support is evident.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

234 Outcome of Consultation on a Residents' Parking Scheme in Queensway East Area

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that appraised Members of the outcomes of a recent consultation on a possible residents' only parking scheme in the roads bounding Queensway, Southchurch Road and Southchurch Avenue (the Queensway East Area).

Resolved:

1. That the outcomes of the public consultation be noted.
2. That the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise the proposals in accordance with statutory requirements. The times of operation of the scheme to be 9.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m. daily to account for the variation in non-residential parking.
3. That, subject to there being no objections received to the statutory notices, the Corporate Director be authorised to confirm the necessary orders and implement the scheme.

Reasons for Decision

To improve parking priority for residents, to improve highway safety and to reduce congestion, which were the concerns leading to the proposals.

Other Options

Do nothing. This option prevents the opportunity to make improvements to the existing restrictions in the area.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

***235 Members' Requests List**

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

Resolved:

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

15/06 - Installation of pedestrian crossing, North Shoebury Road near to Shoebury Park;

15/12 - Introduction of 24 hour waiting restriction on north side and waiting restriction operating from 1pm to 3pm Monday to Friday. in Burges Road between Thorpe Hall Avenue and Colbert Avenue;

15/24 - Introduction of 24 hour waiting restriction in Colbert Avenue on east and north side by bend.

2. That no further action be taken in respect of the following requests for the reasons stated in the report and that the request be removed from the list:

14/20 - Provision of waiting restrictions in Riviera Drive, eastern extremity;

14/24 - Increase existing 5m of junction protection Cottesmore Gardens, Quorn Gardens, and Tattersall Gardens, junctions with Western Road;

14/38 - Introduction of waiting restrictions Eastern Close;

14/44 - Introduction of yellow lines to help improve visibility at a busy entrance/exit to a commercial parking forecourt (Woodgrove Walk);

14/45 - Removal of waiting restrictions 22 to 46 The Fairway;

15/13 - Introduction of waiting restriction operating from 11am to noon in St James Avenue and Marcus Avenue between Fermoy to Johnstone Road and removal of existing waiting restriction in Fermoy Road, Marcus Avenue to St James Avenue on alternating sides to provide staggered parking to compensate for new waiting restrictions;

15/17 - Provision of bollards in Byfield to prevent footway parking.

3. That request Ref No. 14/15 regarding the widening of the pedestrian refuge Ness Road, Shoeburyness be retained on the list and clarification of the matter be investigated.

4. That the following requests be investigated as part of area wide measures being considered by the Traffic & Parking Working Party:

14/23 - Provision of 1 hour parking prohibition and junction protection in Dale Road, Dynevor Gardens, Crescent Road and Western Road with longer term request to treat all of area (Tattersall Gardens to Hadleigh Road – South of London Road);

15/09 - Amendment of traffic flow in Westcliff Parade to one-way, east to west.

5. That the following requests be retained on the list for investigation:

15/01 - Amend priority North, South and Central Avenues;

15/07 - Installation of a pedestrian crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive;

15/08 - Hardening of verge at eastern end of Riviera Drive;

15/10 - Introduction of double yellow lines along the length of the wall opposite 26-30 Ashes Road;

15/14 - Introduction of resident parking controls in Station Avenue but exclude flats at northern extremity;

15/15 - Provision of waiting restrictions, Rayleigh Road to protect driveways;

15/16 - Provision of limited waiting parking restrictions, to deter non-residents parking in Brooklands Avenue and Eastwood Park;

15/18 - Formalisation of parking areas in and around Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue;

15/19 - Introduction of one way traffic flow in Saxon Gardens;

15/20 - Extension of double yellow lines at the junction of Church Road with Ness Road;

15/22 - Traffic management in Campfield Road and Ness Road;

15/23 - Introduction of double yellow lines on Delaware Road at Delaware Crescent.

6. That the request ref no. 15/21 regarding the speeds of vehicles in Bunters Avenue be considered as part of the in-depth scrutiny project being undertaken by the Place Scrutiny Committee into 20mph speed limits in residential streets and that a T-sign be added to the street name board at Bunters Avenue to indicate the road is a cul-de-sac.

Reasons for Decision:

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

Other Options

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

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

***Called in to:- Place Scrutiny Committee**

236 Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for 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.

The Cabinet Committee also received a supplementary request that had been received, the details of which were circulated at the meeting.

Resolved:

1. That following recommendations of officers in respect of the requests as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Corporate Director for Place be approved and that the Corporate Director for Place be authorised to advertise any necessary traffic regulation orders as appropriate in relation to the following proposals and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the orders to be sealed and the proposals implemented:

West Road, Westcliff-on-Sea - installation of a pedestrian crossing near Westborough Road;

Harp House Roundabout - installation of 2 Toucan crossings and carriageway widening to the airport access road;

Shoebury Library, Leisure Centre and Youth Centre - introduction of waiting restrictions in car parks;

Western Road - reduction of junction protection near tom property at 124 Western Road and other locations where an excessive length is provided;

Broadway West - amendment of existing parking bay layout to accommodate vehicular access created as part of a development.

2. That the Corporate Director for Place, in consultation with the relevant portfolio holders be authorised, to determine the timing and length of any waiting restrictions in the car parks of the Shoebury Library, Leisure Centre and Youth Centre.

Reasons 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 Terry

237 Traffic Regulation Orders - Suspension of Works

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Corporate Director for Place that sought Members' support to the suspension of all works related to Traffic Regulation Orders for up to 16 weeks until the completion of a Borough-wide inventory and updating of software to capture all current Traffic Regulation Orders in plan form ,along with consolidation of all amendments undertaken since 2006. This would exclude any works related to Parking Schemes as these have been digitised.

Resolved:

That the request to suspend all works to Traffic Regulation Orders related to waiting restrictions be endorsed.

Reason for Decision

To allow the efficient completion of data capture and entry resulting in correct information.

Other Options

Continue amending existing TRO's while the project is on-going. This significantly introduces the risk that the completed project could include out of date or inaccurate information.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

***238 Members Requests List**

The Cabinet Committee reconsidered Minute 701 of its meeting held on 12th March 2015 in respect of Members Request ref no. 14/45(b), which sought the removal of the speed cushions in Bournemouth Park Road. This matter had been referred back for re-consideration by the Place Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 13th April 2015 (Minute 794 refers). The Cabinet Committee had before it the

relevant extract from report of the Corporate Director for Place and the excerpts from the Minutes.

Resolved:

That consideration of the request be deferred pending the outcome of the in-depth scrutiny project regarding the introduction of 20mph in residential streets.

Note:- This is an Executive Function

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

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

Chairman: _____

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

4

Report of Corporate Director for Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**
On
4th January 2016

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

Petition Requesting Parking Controls Bridgwater Drive

Executive Councillor: Councillor Martin Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received from 12 residents of Bridgwater Drive parking controls be considered for one hour during the morning and afternoon.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

a) Note the petition and thank the residents for taking the time to compile the petition; and agree to;

b) Agree to the advertisement of a daytime waiting restriction to prevent parking and if approved, further agree that if no objections are received, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed. In an event of any unresolved objections, the proposal is to be submitted to the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.

c) Note that officers will refer the matter of vehicles crossing the footway to the Environmental Care Team.

d) Decline the request to install guardrail, in accordance with the agreed Design and Townscape Guide.

3. Background

- 3.1 Bridgwater Drive is a distributor route subject to heavy traffic flow during peak periods and a regular bus service throughout the day.
- 3.2 Its proximity to the hospital and a large local employer does result in parking at the southernmost section of the road.

- 3.3 Residents have complained of associated parking and other issues related to vehicles parking on waiting restrictions adjacent to a local general store and that customers/staff/delivery vehicles are crossing the footway to access the shop frontage.
- 3.4 This Committee previously agreed to propose waiting restrictions in Bridgwater Drive however residents were not supportive of the proposal and no further action was taken.
- 3.5 As a distributor route, the request meets the agreed criteria relating to waiting restrictions however, as the route is heavily used throughout the daytime, a daytime restriction will ensure the area is free of parking throughout the period whereas a one hour restriction AM and PM would still permit parking and congestion may still occur. It is therefore recommended that any restrictions are operational throughout the day.
- 3.6 The junction of Mannering Gardens is currently protected by waiting restrictions. Therefore any vehicles parking in the location are liable to receive a Penalty Charge Notice. Officer will ensure parking contractor is made aware of the need for better enforcement in the area. The installation of guardrail is both contrary to the agreed Design and Townscape Guide and current Government requirements to reduce street clutter. In addition, the use of guardrail to prevent parking is not appropriate.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Take no further action is not an option. The Council is required to consider petitions related to parking controls and as this location is a distributor route, the agreed criteria is met.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To reflect the request from residents and maintain adequate traffic flow particularly as the set criterion is met.

6. Corporate Implications

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

- 6.1.1 The recommendation meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of being a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

- 6.2.1 The estimated cost of the proposal is £4000. It is proposed that the scheme is added to the current work programme and implemented through the existing budgets.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

- 6.3.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken.

6.4 *People Implications*

- 6.4.1 Any works will be undertaken with existing resources.

6.5 *Property Implications*

- 6.5.1 None.

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

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

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 N/A

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 Waiting restrictions are proposed to reduce accidents or improve traffic flows. The objectives of improving safety takes account of implications for community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None

7. Background Papers

7.1 None

8. Appendices

8.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

5

Report of Corporate Director for Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**
On
4th January 2016

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

**Petition Requesting Additional Residents Parking Bays
Colchester Road**

Executive Councillor: Councillor Martin Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received from 33 residents of Colchester Road requesting additional parking bays be provided for residents.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- a) Note the petition and thank the residents for taking the time to compile the petition; and,**
- b) Agree to advertise a proposal to remove one area of waiting restrictions to provide three additional parking bays**
- c) Agree to remove the existing barrier, remove existing waiting restrictions and replace with an additional eight parking bays,**
- d) If recommendations b and c are agreed note that resource permitting, these will be implemented during the financial year 2016/17**

3. Background

- 3.1 Colchester Road is part of a Controlled Parking Zone adjacent to Victoria Avenue, extending westwards to (but not including) North Road.
- 3.2 All existing parking bays in the road (50 bays) are dedicated for resident use including several parking bays provided for disabled residents. Due to the width of the road, the parking bays are placed partially on the footway.

- 3.3 Colchester Road is currently a no through route, two areas of waiting restrictions have been maintained to provide an area for traffic to pass and also for servicing (such as deliveries and waste collections) to be accommodated. The petitioners are requesting these areas be removed to provide additional bays however at least one area should be maintained to provide a passing place and an area for deliveries/servicing vehicles.
- 3.5 The current layout consists of a physical barrier across the road which was initially installed to deter inappropriate levels of traffic attempting to find parking in the road. As the parking is now controlled, the barrier may be removed along with the implementation of the associated waiting restrictions to provide turning areas. This would release space for an additional ten parking spaces.
- 3.4 In addition, the petitioners are complaining that the area is used by worshippers visiting the local Mosque and Church and have access to free permits. Both premises are within the controlled Zone and entitled to purchase permits for their visitors. Members are asked to note that neither establishment receive any free permits, therefore no action is proposed on this issue.
- 3.5 A further issue raised by residents is disabled drivers parking on disabled parking bays; however this would not be considered as a parking contravention as vehicles parked in these bays must display both a resident permit and a blue disabled drivers badge therefore no action is proposed on this issue.
- 3.6 The complaint also includes the inability to park in Colchester Close however this small close is of insufficient width to accommodate any parking. No residents of the Close have signed the petition and therefore no action is proposed on this issue.
- 3.7 The timing of the parking restrictions is also highlighted as an issue as the controls end at 6.30pm. Amendments to the times would require consultation within the entire area, officers are not aware of complaints in other areas of the Zone therefore no action is proposed on this matter.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Take no further action. The Council is required to consider petitions related to parking controls and the recommendation is designed to meet the needs of residents where possible.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To reflect the request from residents.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 The recommendation meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of being a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

6.2.1 Any costs are met through existing budgets.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken if the requisite levels of support is achieved.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 Any works will be undertaken with existing resources.

6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None.

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 Statutory consultation will be undertaken.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 Parking restrictions are proposed to manage parking. The objectives of managing parking takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities and childcare responsibilities.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 N/A

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 Parking restrictions are proposed to manage parking. The objectives of managing parking takes account of implications for community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None

7. Background Papers

7.1 None

8. Appendices

8.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
4th January 2016

Agenda
Item No.



Report prepared by: Zulfiqar Ali, Group Manager, Highways
and Traffic Group

Member's Requests List

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Martin Terry
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 take no further action.**
 - c) **That all agreed actions will be added to the existing work programme 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.

5. Corporate Implications

- 5.1 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 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.

5.4 **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.

5.5 **Property Implications**

None

5.6 **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.

6. **Background Papers**

None

7 **Appendices**

7.1 Appendix 1.

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS REQUESTS LIST FOR HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING SCHEMES

Note: Cabinet Committee in July 2011 agreed the following criterion for dealing with requests of waiting restrictions:-

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.
- (e) At a junction (agreed Jan 13)

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
14/15	March 14	Cllr Assenheim	Widen pedestrian refuge, Ness Road	<p>Widening the refuge on the northern side would involve significant alterations to existing kerbline in order to maintain existing carriageway width. Costs would be significant as area would have to be excavated and formed into carriageway standard surface, requiring suitable drains and relocation of the existing utility equipment. There is no accident history at this location.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised that buses over run the kerb however no issues identified on site visit.</p> <p>Recommend no further action and remove from list.</p>

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
14/23	May 14	Cllr Lamb	Provide 1 hour parking prohibition and junction protection. Dale Road, Dynevor Gardens, Crescent Road and Western Road with longer term request to treat all of area (Tattersall Gardens to Hadleigh Road – South of London Road)	<p>Members agreed to maintain on list Does not meet criteria, recent introduction of prohibition in Marine Parade and Marine Close has further displaced parking in this area.</p> <p>Ward Members provided with a suitable area and information required to undertake consultation. Recommend remove from list as any consultation results will be referred to this Committee for consideration.</p>
15/01 24	March 15	Cllrs Ayling and VanLooy	Amend priority North, South and Central Avenues	Investigation on-going. Outcome to be reported in due course.
15/07	June 15	Cllr Salter	Consider pedestrian crossing Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive.	To be investigated when resources allow during financial year 2016/17.
15/08	July 15	Cllr Holland	Consider hardening of verge, eastern end of Riviera Drive	<p>Majority of properties have no off street parking and frontages not adequate to allow for off street parking to be provided.</p> <p>Recommend residents consulted to assess support and reported back to this committee for consideration.</p>

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/10	July 15	Cllr Hadley	Ashes Road in Shoeburyness is very narrow and in certain parts when cars are parked opposite the houses residents in those houses have difficulty in exiting their driveways. Request for double yellow lines along the length of the wall opposite 26-30 Ashes Road. Difficult for residents opposite to exit their drives.	Does not meet criteria. No accidents recorded, the Fire Service has been asked their view but have not responded. It is generally the case that the Fire Service will notify us only if there are access issues of this nature. Recommend no further action and remove from list.
15/11 25	July 15	Cllr Woodley	Amend operational hours of existing waiting restriction in Tyrone Road and Fermoy Road. Currently operational from 2pm to 3pm, request for amendment in operational hours to 11am to noon.	Criteria not applicable. Recommend to advertise proposals
15/14	August 15	Cllr Ayling	Propose resident parking controls Station Avenue but exclude flats at northern extremity.	Members have undertaken consultation Resident parking areas should be area wide however members have suggested an area of East Street is included. Officers have advised ward Members of boundary and suggested questions. Ward Members provided with area and information required to undertake consultation. Recommend remove from list as consultation results will be referred to this Committee for consideration.

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/15	August 15	Cllr Walker	Provide waiting restrictions, Rayleigh Road to protect driveways.	Does not meet criteria. Waiting restrictions cannot be provided for the purpose of protecting private driveways. Recommend- no further action and remove from list.
15/16	August 15	Cllr Walker	Provide limited waiting parking restrictions, to deter non residents parking Brooklands Avenue and Eastwood Park.	Concerns noted. Ward Members are required to undertake initial surveys in accordance with the agreed policy. Officers have assisted Ward Members with suggested questions in order for them to undertake initial assessment. Recommend remove from list until surveys undertaken and results reported.
15/18 95	August 15	Cllr Jarvis	Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue. Residents are parking on green areas and have requested that this is formalised by additional parking being created. There are also areas of waiting restrictions which require investigation for removal or reduction.	When resources allow, a review will be undertaken to determine any locations where waiting restrictions can be amended to provide additional parking. There is a recommendation elsewhere on the committee's agenda in this regard. Report will be submitted to this committee detailing results. Recommend this request investigated at this time. The three streets are subject to parking pressure however property frontages are of adequate size to facilitate off street parking and residents should pursue the option to provide this. Where the properties are flats, discussion should be held with South Essex Homes as to potential remedies. Recommend no further action and remove from list .

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/19	August 15	Cllr Jarvis	One Way system in Saxon Gardens. This is associated with the above request and has been motivated by the success of the Delaware Crescent scheme.	One-way traffic flow may be beneficial, geometry of road is likely to prevent any potential speed increase which can be a general feature of one-way traffic flows. Amendment of flow will result in possible removal of some existing waiting restrictions. Recommend ward Members undertake survey of residents to assess preferred direction of flow, Committee is requested to authorise the advertisement of resulting proposals.
15/20 27	August 15	Cllr Jarvis	Extended double yellow lines at the junction of Church Road with Ness Road.	Junction currently unprotected in Church Road. Recommend junction protection proposal advertised.
15/22	August 15	Cllr Jarvis	Campfield Road and Ness Road which is in need of attention due to the increased traffic to and from Morrisons and Sainsburys and the planned development of 170 new homes on the old Gunners park site.	Officers have met with ward Members to discuss issues, proposals will be considered as part of any development agreements. Recommend defer any considerations pending a development application.
15/23	August 15	Cllr Jarvis	Request for extension of existing restrictions on Delaware Road at eastern junction of Delaware Crescent .	Junction currently protected with appropriate length of restrictions. Recommend no further action.
15/24	September 15	Cllr Hadley	Remove loading facility and limited waiting areas in Dane Street	Not subject to criteria Recommend proceed with advertisement

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/24	September 15	Cllr Walker	Implement speed reduction measures, Green Lane	Petition now received – to be reported later as considerations are still on-going as to borough wide/area wide treatments with regard to traffic and parking matters and general speed reduction Monitoring of existing speeds will be undertaken and if excessive speeds evidenced, the matter will be referred to the Police for their consideration as to any action.
15/25	November 15	Cllrs Habermel and Folkard	Extend existing junction protection, Alleyn Place j/w Crowstone Road. To extend onto road hump.	Does not meet criteria however existing restrictions less than 10 metres, suggest increase onto hump area. Recommend proceed with advertisement
15/26 28	November 15	Cllr Mulroneu	Provide waiting restrictions, access Monometer House Grange Road	Does not meet criteria. Restrictions for the purpose of protecting private accesses is not a permitted use of the powers delegated to the highway authority. Recommend no action
15/27	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Plas Newydd Remove summer restriction on east side and replace with limited waiting bays	Criteria not applicable Recommend proceed with advertisement.
15/28	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Eastern Esplanade/Thorpe Esplanade Realign/remove parking bays at various junctions to improve sight lines.	Criteria not applicable Recommend proceed with advertisement.
15/29	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Burgess Terrace Extend junction protection, remove seasonal restriction on one side of the road.	Junction protection adequate, no accidents recorded Recommend no further action. Removal of seasonal restriction not subject to criteria. Recommend proceed with advertisement.

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/30	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Lynton Road, remove seasonal restriction on eastern side of the road.	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria. Recommend proceed with advertisement.
15/31	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Walton Road, remove seasonal restriction western side, to Roslin access	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria. Recommend proceed with advertisement.
15/32 29	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Walton Road and Clievdn Road, install build out or left turn/tight turn only sign at access for Roslin Hotel to force traffic to seafront route	Hotel has already been asked by officer to amend their entry/exit layout to force drivers to enter/exist towards seafront. A further solution could be to ask the hotel to provide signage on their property which is likely to encourage compliance without the need for illumination, Traffic Orders or physical measures. Officers to approach the hotel and discuss.
15/33	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Clieveden Road remove seasonal restriction on eastern side	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria. Recommend proceed with advertisement.
15/34	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Warwick Road remove waiting restrictions on western kerb line	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria. Recommend proceed with advertisement
15/35	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Elizabeth Road remove waiting restrictions on western kerb line	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria however this would impact on existing sight lines for access. Recommend no further action.

Reference Number	Date Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/36	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Chester Avenue Road remove area of waiting restrictions on western kerb line	Removal of restrictions not subject to criteria however this would impact on existing sight lines for access. Recommend no further action
15/37	November 2015	St Laurence Councillors	Hornby Avenue, reconsider removal of school keep clear marking	School keep clear markings are provided for the specific purpose of protecting pedestrian access points. The school access arrangements have changed and the markings amended accordingly. Recommend officers meet with Members to ascertain issues and if proposals meet the criteria, proceed with an advertisement.
15/38	November 2015	Cllr Woodley	Propose permit parking controls Greenways School area	Officers have assisted by providing a suggested area along with questions to be asked and will analyse all results. Note ward Members are undertaking a consultation in accordance with the revised policy to be discussed at this Committee.
15/39	November 2015	Cllr Terry	Propose verge hardening, Brunswick Road and Rutland Avenue	Off street parking is possible in both streets therefore limited benefit due to large number of driveways. Brunswick Road Residents were consulted during 2015, results indicated no support for proposal. Recommend no further action.
15/40	December 2015	Cllr Woodley	Propose 20mph speed limit trial in Burges Road and Barnstaple Road	Current scrutiny project underway to investigate 20mph speed limits. Request may be beneficial to assess potential impact.
15/41	December 2015	Cllr Woodley	Johnstone Road/Parkanaur Avenue, extend existing junction protection	Junction protection in place for 15 metres. Recommend officers work with ward councillor to assess the parking situation and deal with this request under the revised policy (another agenda item)

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

7

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic & Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**

on
4th January 2016

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

Requests for New or Amended Traffic Regulation Orders
Portfolio Holder – Councillor Martin Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new restrictions 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 and Cabinet Committee 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 agreed criteria contained in Appendix 1 to this report which was approved by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee at their meeting in July 2011.

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

Nil

8. Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of requests and comments

APPENDIX 1 – WAITING RESTRICTIONS REQUESTS

AGREED CRITERIA FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS(JULY 2011)

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.
- (e) The location is a junction.

Location	Request Details	Requested By	Relevant Criteria Points	Officer comments
Burdett Avenue	Propose extension of existing restrictions by adjacent to junction with London Road	Officers	E	Existing restrictions reduced by approximately 40 meters as a result of a Member request. Following removal, issues with loading have been identified and existing restrictions need extending by approximately 15 meters to resolve issues. Recommend advertise proposals.
Belle Vue Road	Extend existing waiting restrictions junction with Southchurch Road.	Officers	E	The restrictions were reduced in an attempt to provide additional parking however parked vehicles are impeding traffic flow around the junction leading to delays on Southchurch Road. Recommend advertise proposals.

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

8

Report of Corporate Director for Place
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**
On
4th January 2016

Report prepared by:
Zulfiqar Ali- Group Manager- Traffic Management & Highway
Network

Traffic & Parking Working Group recommendations
Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To report back from meetings of the Traffic & Parking Working Group and seek approval for changes to the existing policies, processes and terms of the references.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- a) **Note the contents of the report;**
- b) **Consider and approve revised policies, processes and procedures as set out in Appendix 1 of the report;**
- c) **Recommends the Council approves the amended terms of reference for the Traffic & Parking Working Party and the delegation of functions to the Cabinet Committee, together with the new protocol for public speaking at the meetings of the Traffic & Parking Working Party, as attached at Appendix 2 of the report;**
- d) **Recommends that proviso (b) under Council Procedure Rule 37.2 should also apply to Working Parties; and**
- e) **Instruct Officers to follow the revised policies for all future consideration of traffic & parking requests.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At its meeting on 26th September 2015, the Traffic & Parking Working Party agreed to set up a Working Group to review existing policies, processes and practices, to ensure all Members Requests and traffic/parking investigations are undertaken in an efficient and most cost effective manner delivering value for money.

3.2 The membership of the Working group comprised of Cllr Terry, Cllr Norman, Cllr Longley, Cllr J Garston, Cllr Cox, Cllr Courtenay, Cllr Van Looy and Cllr Callaghan. The Group has met twice since and there have been in-depth discussions of the existing policies, criterion, procedures, processes and functioning of the Traffic & Parking Working Party. Consideration has also been given to the statutory requirements, national good practice and the impact that the ever increasing workload has on limited staffing and budgetary resources.

4. Proposals

4.1 Following deliberations at the Working Group meetings, officers have produced a set of revised policies which are shown in Appendix 1 of the report for Members' consideration.

4.2 It is also recommended that the terms of reference of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet be amended to reflect the proposals identified by the Working Group

5. Other Options

5.1 If the proposals contained in this report are not agreed then the existing policies and procedures will remain applicable.

6. Reasons for Recommendations

6.1 To enable the Traffic & Parking Working Party to work more efficiently and effectively to maximise benefits of limited resources to deal with its workload priorities and to ensure policies reflect local needs.

7. Corporate Implications

7.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

7.1.1 The recommendation meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of being a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

7.2 Financial Implications

7.2.1 All schemes approved through the Working Party are funded through LTP and/or Council's own revenue budgets.

7.3 Legal Implications

7.3.1 Statutory processes are always followed as necessary before implementing any schemes.

7.4 People Implications

7.4.1 Every effort is made to undertake design and consultation works within the existing resources.

7.5 Property Implications

7.5.1 None.

7.6 Consultation

7.6.1 Statutory consultation is always undertaken as necessary before implementing any schemes.

7.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

7.7.1 The objectives of improving safety take account of all users of the public highway including those disabled and vulnerable.

7.8 *Risk Assessment*

7.8.1 None.

7.9 *Value for Money*

7.9.1 As part of individual scheme report, a value for money assessment will be undertaken to demonstrate efficient use of resources.

7.10 *Community Safety Implications*

7.10.1 The objectives of improving safety and accessibility take account of implications for community safety.

7.11 *Environmental Impact*

7.11.1 Improving quality of local environment is an integral part of traffic & parking policies and schemes' design.

8. Background Papers

8.1 None

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1 - Proposed policies, process and procedures for Traffic & parking investigations

9.2 Appendix 2 – Proposed new Terms of Reference for the Traffic & Parking Working Party and delegations to the Cabinet Committee and the new protocol for public speaking at meetings of the Working Party

Appendix 1

Proposed policies, process and procedures for Traffic & Parking investigations

Subject Area/Policy Area	Proposed Changes/addition
(1) Terms of the references and role of Members	<p>In addition to the existing Terms of Reference, agree the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All new Members of the Traffic & Parking Working Party must undergo relevant training prior to attending meetings. 2) There will be one spokesperson representing each group of attendees. Each group is to be given maximum of three minutes. 3) Only ward Members are to be given the right to speak, again for a maximum period of 3 minutes. 4) Any Member of the Council can speak for 3 minutes if it is a Boroughwide or major issue. 5) A summary of the objections is to be added to each report and a copy of objections made available to Members of the Working Party in Members room. 6) Speaking rights are only for advertised TROs; 7) Committee must give due regard to national and legislative requirements. Where departing from recommendation based on existing policies, Members must record their reasons for departure from policy. 8) Decisions must be based on evidence, facts and statistics and cost & benefit analysis not the perceptions. 9) All Members to be emailed the date of the meeting, referring to online availability of the agenda items and reports.
2) Parking in roads in the vicinity of schools	<p>Ensuring the safety of children attending schools is a top priority. The Council is committed to meeting the national targets of reducing the number of child casualties and this is a key priority of the Council. One of the main ways in which the council can reduce the number of accidents involving children is to ensure that areas close to schools are kept clear of parked vehicles. This ensures that passing vehicles can see children wishing to cross the road.</p> <p>In this regard, the School 'keep clear' markings, or zigzags, provide a clear indication of where parking is banned outside schools during their hours of operation. Stopping is not allowed on zigzags, even to pick up or drop off children. The council will also ensure that these restrictions are vigorously enforced.</p> <p>In addition, the council will consider other measures to support safety and may:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parking controls and residents permit schemes can be introduced in single road or immediate area where school parking presents serious danger to children and parents. Such schemes are only to be implemented on an exceptional basis with the agreement of all ward councillors who will ascertain

degree of support for such scheme that meets the policy thresholds for the Parking Management Schemes. The impact of any displaced parking in neighbouring roads will be a consideration for ward Members. Safety restrictions of this nature may also be developed if there are at least three personal injury accidents within the proximity of school caused by parked vehicles.

- 2) Provide other parking restrictions such as single or double yellow lines. However, the periods during which the two sets of restriction are in force may differ. Care must be taken to ensure that drivers comply with both sets of restrictions. To clarify the situation to motorists the Council will mark the additional restriction behind the zig zags and erect a waiting restriction time plate within the area designated with school keep clear markings. However, waiting restrictions do not prohibit dropping off or picking up passengers, loading, disabled drivers parking.
- 3) All keep clear markings outside of schools will operate during school opening and closing hours and beyond should this be justified by parking situation and to cater for additional activities outside school hours. the times of operations will be determined in consultation with the school.
- 4) The enforcement of keep clear markings will be relaxed during school holidays, subject to there being no events taking place at the school.
- 5) The council's overall approach is to encourage people to consider safe alternatives to the car for the journey to school or nursery. This is beneficial for the child's health and physical wellbeing as well as the local environment around nurseries and schools. It is also an effective means of reducing traffic volumes and tackling traffic congestion during peak periods. To this end, the council is working with schools to assist them develop their School Travel Plans.
- 6) People escorting their child into school or nursery must be encouraged to walk to school and if driving park their vehicles legally.
- 7) The Council will actively seek to introduce measures to physically deter driving to schools. In doing so, the Council will introduce experimental school time closure of roads, by TRO and placing electronic or manual bollards in roads and undertake parking enforcement;
- 8) Work with schools to delegate greater authority and place responsibility to deal with the issues around their school through greater engagement of parents, teachers and other staff.

	<p>9) The Council will deploy CCTV car to enforce zig zag markings and other restrictions based on priority.</p> <p>10) Consideration will be given to purchasing CCTV cameras to undertake remote enforcement during school opening and closing hours to deal with all contraventions including double parking.</p>
<p>3) Members Enquiries</p>	<p>Improvements in this regard are intended to enable a consistent approach to Members Requests, enabling efficiency in processing these against the set policies.</p> <p>1) All Members requested to be submitted on standard form(to be made available online) providing details of the nature of the problem, what are the issues, what is being asked for, what are the likely effects, level of support and to what extent any proposals will displace traffic?</p> <p>2) Any proposals in this regard should have at least two ward member's agreement.</p> <p>3) All such requests are to be submitted at least eight weeks prior to the next available T & P meeting. This will allow officers to undertake necessary initial investigations to check compliance with the policies.</p> <p>4) All requests are to be investigated on the basis of first come first served basis, unless there is justification agreed by the Portfolio holder.</p> <p>5) Officers are to be given delegated authority to assess all Members Request for yellow lines, disabled bays and other minor traffic regulation requests against the set policy criterion. All minor schemes/requests that meet the policy criterion will be progressed through advertisement and implemented if there are no objections. If objected all such schemes are to be reported to the Committee.</p> <p>6) Large schemes such as Residents Parking Schemes/ major traffic management schemes or projects of more than local relevance are to go to T & P for considerations.</p> <p>7) The schemes that do not meet the set policy requirements, officers will inform appropriate ward councillors in writing, giving details of why it does not meet the criterion and where possible assist in providing details of other options that may be of assistance)(i.e. road safety education, training & promotion etc.).</p> <p>8) A monthly list of requests received is to be produced for circulation to Members of the Traffic & Parking showing status.</p> <p>9) All Members request that do not progress through the initial stage are to be reported as an information item to the T & P on six monthly basis.</p> <p>10) All reports to show estimated cost of the scheme and an assessment of the benefits that it may result, demonstrate value for money and assist in prioritisation.</p>

	<p>11) All Members requests and other items reported to T & P where not approved are not to be resubmitted/ reconsidered within two years unless on substantial safety grounds demonstrated through accident analysis.</p> <p>12) All Members' requests agreed by the committee are to be added at the bottom of the work programme unless the committee agrees a different priority which needs to be recorded on decision.</p> <p>13) All schemes on work programme are to be progressed with the impact on safety as a primary consideration to justify the use of the limited budgetary resources. Some schemes may slip from one financial year to another depending on the resources, both staffing and financial or may be delayed due to other high priority schemes agreed by the T & P.</p> <p>14) Where departing from recommendation based on existing policies, Members to record their reasons for departure from the policy at the time of their decision.</p>
<p>4)Pedestrian Crossings(Zebra or signalled crossings)</p>	<p>Each request is to be examined on its individual merits. Many requests are not justified because of low levels of pedestrian movement.</p> <p>The following factors are taken into consideration in assessing the need for a crossing.</p> <p>The following must be met for the proposals to progress through delegated authority for officers to progress to initial design and advertising and implementing should there be no objections.-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the recorded personal injury accidents involving pedestrians(at least 3 in last three years). 2) the volumes of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and the potential for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, meets the national PV square criterion. <p>If none of the above criterion is met, the following must also be present:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Difficulty that pedestrians face from traffic speed and volumes. The length of time pedestrians have to wait before they can cross. 2) Proximity of locations which attract pedestrian activity through the day , e.g. proximity to stations, schools, hospital and shops 3) The age/vulnerability of the pedestrians

	<p>It is recommended that all such requests are considered on a six monthly basis and a list is then drawn up in order of priority with the worst site(based on the above criterion) for pedestrians at the top of the list for assessment</p>
<p>5) Verge Hardening</p>	<p>The following consideration need to apply:- Hardening will deliver significant safety benefits for road users as part of a package of measures. It is proposed that verge hardening is considered where:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It has been requested by the emergency services or utility providers as there is evidence of emergency vehicles being obstructed? 2) Enforcement of the status quo would not resolve the problem amicably? 3) Enforcement of new parking restrictions cannot serve the desire objectives. 4) Is off street parking available or is it an option for resolving the problem? 5) Is there scope for creating additional parking capacity to ease existing parking pressure? 6) Is there evidence that such a scheme will be supported by most residents (consider applying same criterion as PMS)? 7) Agree no bollards are to be placed on verges, as new or replacement and all enforcement signs should be on existing street furniture nearby as appropriate to implement government’s policy on de-clutter. 8) All verge hardening proposals must be supported by all ward councillors
<p>6)Footway Parking</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Permitting of footway parking will not reduce footway to less than 1.8m (1.2 in isolated pinch points) and will be marked. 2) Carriageway width is insufficient to allow parking fully in the carriageway while maintaining adequate running lane. 3) Properties have limited or no off street parking. 4) It has been requested by the emergency services or utility providers as there is evidence of emergency vehicles being obstructed 5) Enforcement of new parking restrictions cannot serve the desired objectives (where justified). 6) Is there scope for creating additional parking capacity to ease existing parking pressure? 7) Agree no bollards are to be placed on footways, as new or replacement and all enforcement signs should be on existing street furniture nearby as appropriate. <p>It is also proposed that Members suspend consideration of prohibiting footway parking until outcome of the Private Members Bill which is currently going through second reading at the Commons.</p>

7) Parking Management Schemes

1. Principle

The introduction of parking management schemes, in not carefully thought through can lead to displacement of parking in the adjoining streets, increase unnecessary demand in these areas for extension of controls. It is important that in managing parking, we do not simply transfer the problems elsewhere. As such an areawide approach is suggested for dealing with parking problems in a holistic manner.

Where area wide parking management cannot be justified, unrestricted parking should be allowed where it does not:

- 1) Compromise road safety;
- 2) Cause an obstruction to traffic flow or access for emergency, service or public transport vehicles;
- 3) Block pedestrian footpaths and footways (particularly where this would adversely affect disabled members of our community) or cycle lanes and paths;
- 4) Undermine policies or initiatives to encourage use of public transport or other alternatives to single occupancy car use; and
- 5) Prevent residents, who have no alternative off street parking, from parking on street.

2. Procedure for assessing and addressing parking issues in residential streets.

This remains the same in terms of the initial consultation being undertaken by ward councillors to establish level of support. Officers to assist Members in defining the extent of the area to be covered and drafting consultation leaflet. All questionnaires are to be returned to the Officers through post by the stakeholders. Officers will analyse the returns to assess compliance with the agreed policy requirements and report to T & P if policy thresholds are met. If unmet, all ward councillors will be informed of the outcome in accordance with the procedure set out in "Members Request" section.

Parking schemes should only be investigated after consideration has been given to changing any existing parking restrictions that are not needed for reasons of safety, to reduce congestion or to protect the residents from inappropriate parking. It is proposed to divide these in two types of schemes:

Type A

- These are areas or streets where existing parking restrictions are believed to be unduly restrictive on the residents of the area and the orders can be changed to be of greater benefit to the residents. This may include the introduction of residents' permits.
- For example, parking is restricted to two hours to allow access to local facilities but prevent all day parking.

However, no or little long stay parking is available for residents.

Type B

- Areas or streets where the demand for parking, by the residents and/or other visitors to the area, is greater than the number of potential spaces and restrictions are required to provide a better opportunity for residents to park within the area.

Criteria for residents parking schemes

Residents Parking permit schemes will only be considered where:

- 1) The assessment suggests that a residents parking permit scheme would help solve the identified problem/issue.
- 2) There is a clearly defined area with natural boundaries such as major highways or physical features serving easy access to other residential areas. It is recommended that a RPS area should at least have 8 streets unless there are natural boundaries that enable consideration of a smaller area with demonstrable evidence that there will be no impact on the adjoining streets by the displaced parking.
- 3) The roads within the defined area are adopted highway managed and maintained by the Council.
- 4) Over 40% of affected dwellings (households) in the affected area respond to the consultation and at least 70% of dwellings (households) responding to a consultation agree in principle to a residents parking permit scheme. A petition cannot be included for this purpose.
- 5) The identified parking issues are not simply related to normal school pick up and drop off times where there is a school in the vicinity of the clearly defined area (this is dealt with in section relating to schools).
- 6) Normally, 50% of dwellings have no off street parking i.e. a garage and/or driveway available for one or more vehicles.

If the location is likely to meet all above criteria 1 to 6, then residents will be consulted on the scheme options/design and:-

- 1) The above consultation thresholds and the results of a consultation should be judged on an area rather than on a street-by-street basis. Historically, a street (or even part of a street) has been excluded from PMS proposals following active lobbying, only for local people to change their views once the rest of a zone has been implemented, mainly due to displaced parking.
- 2) Where representations are received after approval to implement a scheme, these will be considered during the six months review process after the zone has become operational. Again, any resulting changes will take full account of the results of the consultation process.
- 3) All new PMS will be reviewed by the Local Councillors and Officers at the end of 6 months of their operational date with

	<p>a view to judging how this has worked for the local community, and subject to funding and the necessary approvals, to implement any changes as considered necessary. Any further changes will only be considered if there a material changes in local circumstances.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) PMS would not be introduced where the majority of residents have off street parking or where there is sufficient on-street space to accommodate both residential and non-residential parking. 5) Generally schemes should not be introduced to manage parking in situations where the problem is linked to over demand from residents for on-street spaces. 6) No scheme is to be reconsidered for a period of at least 4 years unless:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme forms part of a wider integrated traffic/parking management scheme. • There are road safety problems demonstrated through accident analysis. • The parking impact from development in residential areas would be adverse.(Need to speak to Dean re parking policies) <p>It is further proposed that no more than 3 Residents Parking Schemes are to be investigated per annum.</p>
8)Junction Protection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 10m* of yellow lines at junctions to improve safety, accessibility of the emergency vehicles and compliance with the Highways Code. 2) The function has already been delegated to officers by the T & P 3) Proposal – To extend this delegation to all junction protections based on officer professional judgement in terms of the length which may vary from location to location.*it may be practical to reduce the length at some junctions while increasing at particularly wide bell mouths. 4) Ward members to be informed in advance of implementation
9)Waiting Restrictions	<p>These will only be considered if one of the following criteria is met;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Where a road safety problem has been identified by collision studies (3Pia in 3 years) and it is clear that an actual reduction in collisions may follow the introduction of such an Order. 2) Where evidence of the obstruction of the highway or visibility at junctions occurs on a frequent and severe basis, causing particular difficulties for emergency service vehicles and/or public transport. 3) Where commerce and industry are seriously affected by presence of parked vehicles. 4) Where the installation of TROs is essential to provide maximum benefit from capital investment.

	<p>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.</p> <p>6) Cost of schemes and likely savings through accident reduction need to be part of priority consideration.</p> <p>There are historic waiting restrictions which have been there for many years and need to be reviewed to assess their continued need at various locations. It is recommended that no more new restrictions are considered for a period of six months unless in exceptional and emergency situations pending review of the existing. The new ParkMap system will have the upto date details of all such restrictions once completed in January, providing an opportunity to do this.</p>
10)Speed limits/Zones	Defer all such request pending the recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel which is due to report back to the Council early in financial year 2016/17.
11)Traffic Investigations and Areawide Traffic Calming/ Management	<p>Assessment of each request is made against the key objectives of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Improving Road Safety b) Reducing Congestion c) Improving Accessibility d) Improving Air Quality <p>These key objectives form the basis of the Local Transport Plan. This formal approach is needed to ensure a fairer, comparative method of assessment, reducing subjectivity. Generally priority is given to introducing measures to resolve, or substantially reduce, traffic related problems in areas where such problems are significant. Measures that simply transfer problems from one location to another will not normally be progressed. The issue of Road Safety is paramount when investigating a scheme. Other issues including traffic speed and congestion, particularly around schools, are other important factors. Where parking is the main issue then the reasons as to why that parking is taking place should also be borne in mind, e.g. schools, commuter or shopping. The criteria for rating are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improving Road Safety - <i>casualty reduction</i> - the number of recorded injury accidents at the location in the last three years(at least three with treatable contributory factors). 2) Traffic speed, volume and road geometry resulting in significant danger if school or other high pedestrian generating facility in the area 3) Reducing Congestion - reducing the adverse impact of traffic, encouraging walking, cycling and the greater use of public transport. 4) Improving Accessibility - access for emergency vehicles, refuse collection and access to individual properties.

	<p>(Combined with Reducing Congestion these two items aid the Improvement in Air Quality</p> <p>5) Improve Economic Vitality – by managing traffic appropriately (e.g. limiting parking to short stay) local businesses can benefit from a higher turnover of customers. This may also be a solution to or consequence of Improving Accessibility</p> <p>Assessment in these criteria is to be rated high/medium/low/neutral/negative as to whether any measures have a positive or negative impact on the area. In those areas where traffic speed is an issue the sites will be included within the programme for the installation of the Council's Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs).</p> <p>On the basis of this assessment, one of three actions will be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The problem is recorded but no further action at this time. 2. Further investigations are carried out to see if there are practical proposals that we can address. 3. The matter is included in the list of proposals for inclusion in our works programme and reported to T & P.
12)Speed Indicator Devices(SIDs)	<p>These are to be prioritised on the basis of :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Casualties over a three-year period, with emphasis being placed on the number of people Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) where speed has been a contributory factor 2) Review the collision details to assess the likelihood of the provision of speed enforcement actively addressing any collision pattern that may have formed. 3) Review the speeds that vehicles are travelling along the road. To meet the criterion, the 85th percentile speed must exceed the speed limit by 10% plus 2mph. This threshold is set by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). 4) Finally a practical assessment to ascertain if it is physically possible to install a sign in the desired location.
13)Traffic Island and central reserves	<p>Where a formal pedestrian crossing is not justified these can be installed. They assist pedestrians by letting them cross the road in two stages. The restriction to the use of this measure is the width of the carriageway. It must be at least 7.8m wide to allow for the island and two lanes of traffic.</p>
14)Environmental Weight Restrictions	<p>These will be considered to overcome problems regarding the use of unsuitable roads by HGVs, provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A restricted area can be defined which does not transfer the problem from one area to another. 2) A suitable alternative route exists which does not create such a major increase in route mileage for operators such that their economic viability would be seriously affected 3) does not result in increased highway maintenance costs

	<p>4) does not increase safety issues.</p> <p>5) is supported by the Police (who are responsible for enforcement activity)</p> <p>All Freight routes are to be designated under LTP and signed accordingly. Any further applications to be delegated to officers.</p>
<p>15)One Way Systems</p>	<p>One –way systems should be considered where there evidence of the presence of the following factors:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The sufficient availability of the available road width” (the width of road remaining once parking has been subtracted- 2) Environment Type (i.e. school, residential or business, as part of Safer Routes to Schools or introduced as part of areawide traffic management/calming measures), 3) Accident History (for latest three-year period) 4) Whether there is evidence of the road being used as a rat-run. In dense urban areas one way street may be considered where significant improvements can be achieved in safety or capacity, without creating safety or access problems. 6) There are to be at least two suitable streets to create complementary flows. 7) One way streets will not be considered in any areas where:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) An increase in traffic speeds may generate collisions ii) Significant access difficulties would be created iii) Transferred traffic would create problems elsewhere on the network.

2.6 Delegation of Executive Functions

(b) Cabinet Committee

There shall be a **Cabinet Committee** consisting of 3 Executive Councillors appointed by the Leader to carry out the following executive functions in respect of traffic regulation Orders and to consider the comments and recommendations made by the Traffic & Parking Working Party on the highways issues referred to it by the Corporate Director for Place:

- In cases where the Cabinet has not already resolved to publish a proposed traffic regulation Order¹, then the Cabinet Committee will consider an Officer report together with any recommendations of the Traffic & Parking Working Party on the subject and make a decision on whether to publish a proposed Order. This decision will be published in a Digest and will be available for call-in.
- If such a proposal is published on the authority of the Cabinet Committee and no objections are received, then the Cabinet Committee may proceed to make the Order (unless the Committee has delegated the function to the Corporate Director for Place).
- If objections are received to any proposed traffic regulation Order, then the Traffic & Parking Working Party (whose membership shall include the 3 Executive Councillors who sit on the Cabinet Committee) will meet to consider those objections, and also to hear oral representations by objectors and supporters (if any)².
- After considering all the representations, the Traffic and Parking Working Party will make a recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on the matter.
- The Cabinet Committee will immediately consider the Traffic & Parking Working Party's recommendation and to decide whether to authorise the Corporate Director for Place to make the Order (with or without modification) or to decide that the Order be not made. This decision will be published in a Digest and will be available for call-in.

Substitutes

Permitted in accordance with Standing Order 31.7

Quorum

The quorum of the Cabinet Committee shall be 2

¹ When the Cabinet approves a highway project or scheme, it may also authorise the publication of proposed traffic regulation orders.

² See Section 6D of Part 4(a) of the Council's Constitution regarding public speaking on traffic regulation orders

2.7 Status of Meetings

Open to the public

2.8 Reports To

The Council

3.6 Traffic and Parking Working Party

3.6.1 Membership

8 Members of the Council³, comprising the 3 Executive Councillors who sit on the Cabinet Committee (one of whom shall be appointed Chairman) and 5 non-executive Councillors

Substitutes: Permitted in accordance with Standing Order 31

Proportionality: By convention political proportionality shall apply to the 5 non-executive Councillors

3.6.2 Quorum

3 (including at least 2 of the Executive Councillors)

3.6.3 Terms of Reference

(a) To consider written objections and also to hear oral representations by objectors and supporters (if any) to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders and to make a recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on such proposed Orders (see Section 6D of Part 4(a) of the Council's Constitution regarding public speaking on traffic regulation orders.)

(b) To consider and comment on the details of traffic, transportation and highway issues, schemes, projects and requests for traffic regulation orders referred to the Working Party by the Council, Cabinet or the Corporate Director for Place and make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet Committee on those schemes and requests.

3.6.4 Status of Meetings

Open to the public

3.6.5 Reports to

The Cabinet

³ **NOTE:** No Member shall sit on the Traffic & Parking Working Party (whether for the first time or returning to the Working Party after a period of absence), including as a substitute Member, without having first attended a training session on the principles of traffic regulation orders.

6D. Public Participation in Respect of Traffic Regulation Orders⁴

(a) Where objections have been received to an advertised traffic regulation order and are being considered by the Traffic & Parking Working Party, an objector⁵ may address the Working Party in person in respect of that traffic regulation order. He or she must give written notice of that request by 12.00 noon on the last working day before the relevant meeting of the Working Party.

(b) A supporter will only be allowed to address the relevant meeting if an objector is being given the opportunity to do so.

(c) Where more than one person wants to speak for or against a traffic regulation order, then a spokesperson must be appointed. Where a spokesperson cannot be agreed, then the Chairman will decide who shall speak.

(d) Speakers will be limited to a maximum period of three minutes and only one speaker for and one speaker against the proposed traffic regulation order will be permitted to address the meeting.

(e) Speakers will not be allowed to ask a supplementary question or make a supplementary statement and will not be cross-examined. The Chairman may however, seek clarification of any points made by any speaker.

(f) The use of visual aids will not be permitted and copies of speakers' comments, additional written information cannot be circulated at the meeting.

⁴ **NOTE:** This section relates only to those objections to traffic regulation orders which are not regulated under the requirements of section 10 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England) Regulations 2012.

⁵ The requirements of Council Procedure Rule 37 shall apply to any Councillor who is not a member of the Traffic & Parking Working Party and wishes to speak in respect of a traffic regulation order.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Excerpt from Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet Committee

Date: Thursday, 17th September, 2015

Place: Jubilee Room, Civic 1, Victoria Avenue, Southend

8a

*235 Members' Requests List

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

Resolved:

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

15/06 - Installation of pedestrian crossing, North Shoebury Road near to Shoebury Park;

15/12 - Introduction of 24 hour waiting restriction on north side and waiting restriction operating from 1pm to 3pm Monday to Friday. in Burges Road between Thorpe Hall Avenue and Colbert Avenue;

15/24 - Introduction of 24 hour waiting restriction in Colbert Avenue on east and north side by bend.

2. That no further action be taken in respect of the following requests for the reasons stated in the report and that the request be removed from the list:

14/20 - Provision of waiting restrictions in Riviera Drive, eastern extremity;

14/24 - Increase existing 5m of junction protection Cottessmore Gardens, Quorn Gardens, and Tattersall Gardens, junctions with Western Road;

14/38 - Introduction of waiting restrictions Eastern Close;

14/44 - Introduction of yellow lines to help improve visibility at a busy entrance/exit to a commercial parking forecourt (Woodgrove Walk);

14/45 - Removal of waiting restrictions 22 to 46 The Fairway;

15/13 - Introduction of waiting restriction operating from 11am to noon in St James Avenue and Marcus Avenue between Fermoy to Johnstone Road and removal of existing waiting restriction in Fermoy Road, Marcus Avenue to St James Avenue on alternating sides to provide staggered parking to compensate for new waiting restrictions;

15/17 - Provision of bollards in Byfield to prevent footway parking.

3. That request Ref No. 14/15 regarding the widening of the pedestrian refuge Ness Road, Shoeburyness be retained on the list and clarification of the matter be investigated.

4. That the following requests be investigated as part of area wide measures being considered by the Traffic & Parking Working Party:

14/23 - Provision of 1 hour parking prohibition and junction protection in Dale Road, Dynevor Gardens, Crescent Road and Western Road with longer term request to treat all of area (Tattersall Gardens to Hadleigh Road – South of London Road);

15/09 - Amendment of traffic flow in Westcliff Parade to one-way, east to west.

5. That the following requests be retained on the list for investigation:

15/01 - Amend priority North, South and Central Avenues;

15/07 - Installation of a pedestrian crossing in Elmsleigh Drive near Rayleigh Drive;

15/08 - Hardening of verge at eastern end of Riviera Drive;

15/10 - Introduction of double yellow lines along the length of the wall opposite 26-30 Ashes Road;

15/14 - Introduction of resident parking controls in Station Avenue but exclude flats at northern extremity;

15/15 - Provision of waiting restrictions, Rayleigh Road to protect driveways;

15/16 - Provision of limited waiting parking restrictions, to deter non-residents parking in Brooklands Avenue and Eastwood Park;

15/18 - Formalisation of parking areas in and around Saxon Gardens, Delaware Crescent, Blyth Avenue and Bunters Avenue;

15/19 - Introduction of one way traffic flow in Saxon Gardens;

15/20 - Extension of double yellow lines at the junction of Church Road with Ness Road;

15/22 - Traffic management in Campfield Road and Ness Road;

15/23 - Introduction of double yellow lines on Delaware Road at Delaware Crescent.

6. That the request ref no. 15/21 regarding the speeds of vehicles in Bunters Avenue be considered as part of the in-depth scrutiny project being undertaken by the Place Scrutiny Committee into 20mph speed limits in residential streets and that a T-sign be added to the street name board at Bunters Avenue to indicate the road is a cul-de-sac.

Reasons for Decision:

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

Other Options

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

Note:- This is an Executive Function

Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee:

Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry

***Called in to:- Place Scrutiny Committee**

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Place Scrutiny Committee

Date: Monday, 12th October, 2015

Place: Jubilee Room, Civic Centre, Southend-on-Sea

310 Members' Requests List

The Committee considered Minute 235 of Cabinet Committee held on 17th September 2015, together with the relevant excerpt from the report of the Corporate Director for Place regarding the Member's Request ref no.15/13 seeking the introduction of waiting restrictions, operating from 11am to noon, in St James Avenue and Marcus Avenue between Fermoy to Johnstone Road, together with the removal of existing waiting restriction in Fermoy Road, Marcus Avenue to St James Avenue on alternating sides to provide staggered parking to compensate for the new waiting restrictions.

Resolved:-

That Minute 235, in respect of the Member's Request ref no. 15/13, be referred back to the Cabinet Committee for reconsideration.

Note:- This is an Executive Function
Executive Councillor:- Terry

This page is intentionally left blank

EXCERPT FROM MEMBERS REQUESTS LIST FOR HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING SCHEMES

Note: Cabinet Committee in July 2011 agreed the following criterion for dealing with requests of waiting restrictions:-

- (a) Such restrictions may only be considered along roads with road classification including and above local distributor routes, as defined in Appendix 2 of the report (as taken from the Local Transport Plan);
- (b) There is demonstrable evidence through accident analysis that there have been at least 3 personal injury accidents during the last three years resulting from adverse and/or indiscriminate parking in the vicinity.
- (c) Waiting and loading restrictions may not be introduced in isolated residential streets unless there are pedestrian and traffic safety issues demonstrated through the accident statistics (as in (b) above).
- (d) Where high traffic volume and flow is affected by parked vehicles.
- (e) At a junction (agreed Jan 13)

Reference Number	Date 1 st Reported (Month/Year)	Ward Member	Subject of Request	Update
15/13	July 15	Cllr Woodley	<p>St James Avenue and Marcus Avenue – Fermoy to Johnstone. Propose waiting restriction operating from 11am to noon.</p> <p>Remove existing waiting restriction in Fermoy Road, Marcus to St James on alternating sides to provide staggered parking to compensate for new restriction above.</p>	<p>Does not meet criteria.</p> <p>Recommend no further action</p> <p>Criteria not applicable</p> <p>Recommend to advertise proposals if the committee decide to proceed with the above proposal only.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank