

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

**Traffic and Parking Working Party**

**Date: Thursday, 13th September, 2018**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

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

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

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

**AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 21st June 2018 (Pages 1 - 4)**
- 4 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 5th July, 2018 (Pages 5 - 6)**
- 5 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders (Pages 7 - 16)**
- 6 Members Requests List (Pages 17 - 30)**
- 7 Extension of Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Area (Pages 31 - 46)**
- 8 Request for Waiting Restrictions - Earls Hall Avenue (Pages 47 - 54)**
- 9 Hospital Area Controlled Parking Zone (Pages 55 - 64)**
- 10 Holland Road Area - Permit Parking Proposal (Pages 65 - 72)**
- 11 Oakwood Avenue - Request for Speed Control and Other Suggested Amendments to the Road Layout (Pages 73 - 80)**
- 12 Requests for Waiting Restrictions (Pages 81 - 86)**

**Members:**

Cllr A Moring (Chair), Cllr T Cox (Vice-Chair), Cllr A Dear, Cllr M Flewitt, Cllr D Garne, Cllr H McDonald, Cllr P Van Looy and Cllr C Willis

This page is intentionally left blank

# Public Document Pack

## SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party

**Date:** Thursday, 21st June, 2018  
**Place:** Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite

3

**Present:** Councillor A Moring (Chair)  
Councillors A Dear, M Flewitt, D Garne, L Salter\*, P Van Looy,  
J Ware-Lane\* and C Willis

\*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.

**In Attendance:** Councillors S Aylen, S Buckley, A Chalk, D McGlone and R Hadley  
C Hindle-Terry N Hunwicks, B Frost and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 pm - 7.00 pm

#### 1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cox (substitute: Councillor Salter) and McDonald (substitute: Councillor Ware-Lane).

#### 2 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Aylen – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Belfairs Park Drive) – Non-pecuniary interest: Friends live in the area;

(b) Councillor Chalk – Agenda Item No. 5 (Requests for Traffic Restrictions – Gunners Road, Shoeburyness) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(c) Councillor Dear – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Belfairs Park Drive) – Non-pecuniary interest: Friends live in the neighbouring roads;

(d) Councillor Flewitt – Agenda Item No. 5 (Requests for Traffic Restrictions - Eastwoodbury Crescent) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has been lobbied in respect of this matter;

(e) Councillor Van Looy – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Ambleside Drive) – Friends and relatives live in the area; and

(f) Councillor Ware-Lane – Agenda Item No. 4 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Windsor Road and Osborne Road) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the area.

### **3 Minutes of the special meeting held on 20th February 2018**

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Special Meeting held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

### **4 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 8th March, 2018**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

### **5 Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that appraised Members of the representations that had been received in response to the statutory consultation for proposed Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals within the Borough. These included:

- (i) the introduction of junction protection in the roads adjoining Ambleside Drive
- (ii) the introduction of one-way traffic flows and the removal of alternate monthly parking in Windsor Road and Osborne Road;
- (iii) the introduction of a prohibition of waiting on Mondays to Fridays 10.00 a.m. to 12.00 noon in Belfairs Park Drive.

The report also sought an appropriate recommendation to the Cabinet Committee on the way forward in respect of all of these proposals, after having considered all of the representations that had been received in writing and at the meeting. Large scale plans of the proposals were displayed at the meeting.

With reference to the proposals relating to Windsor Roads and Osborne Road, it was noted that the possible introduction of a residents parking permit scheme was being investigated.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

1. That Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones)(Consolidation) Order 2016 (Amendment No. 5) Order 2018, subject to the reduction of the restrictions from 10 metres to 5 metres in the following sections of the roads:

Kensington Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Brunswick Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Sandringham Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Marlborough Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Huntingdon Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Rutland Avenue – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards

Honiton Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Cheltenham Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards  
Leamington Road – From its junction with Ambleside Drive southwards

2 That Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to confirm the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Consolidation of Moving Traffic and Speed Limit) Order 2006 (as amended) (Amendment No 3) Order 2018 as advertised.

3. That no further action be taken in respect of the proposed revocation of the alternative monthly waiting restrictions in Osborne Road and Windsor Road.

4. That the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (Various Roads) (Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Permit Parking Zones)(Consolidation) Order 2016 (Amendment No. 6) Order 2018 not be confirmed and the proposals not be implemented.

## **6 Requests for Traffic Restrictions**

The Working Party received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that sought Members' approval to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new waiting restrictions at the locations indicated in Appendix 1 to the report, in accordance with the statutory processes and, subject to there being no objections received following statutory advertisement, to arrange for the relevant orders to be sealed and implement the proposals.

Resolved:

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

- (i) Gunners Road, Shoeburyness – Amend existing limited waiting bays to 1 hour no return in 4 hours;
- (ii) Eastwoodbury Crescent Service Road – Introduce permit parking; and
- (iii) Chancellor Road – the revocation of the prohibition of a right turn manoeuvre from Chancellor Road into Church Road.

This page is intentionally left blank

# **SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **Meeting of Traffic and Parking Working Party**

**Date: Thursday, 5th July, 2018**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**4**

**Present:** Councillor A Moring (Chair)  
Councillors T Cox (Vice-Chair), A Dear, M Flewitt, D Garne,  
H McDonald, P Van Looy and C Willis

**In Attendance:** C Hindle-Terry, N Hunwicks, B Frost and T Row

**Start/End Time:** 6.30 pm - 7.15 pm

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Flewitt – Agenda Item No. 4 (Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) - Exceptional Circumstances Application(s) – Application No. 17/00112) – Applicant's mother is known to him; and

(b) Councillor McDonald – Agenda Item No. 4 (Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) - Exceptional Circumstances Application(s) – Application No. 17/00112) – Applicant's mother is known to her.

### **3 Exclusion of the Public**

Resolved:-

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

### **4 Permanent Vehicular Crossing (PVX) Exceptional Circumstances Applications**

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

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

With reference to Application Ref. No. 17/00112, it was noted that a new plan had been submitted which indicated that the frontage of the property now complied with the required measurements set out in the policy. This however, included an area of land that was not currently in sole ownership of the applicant.

Resolved:-

That the Cabinet Committee be recommended:

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

Application Ref. No. 18/00087

Application Ref No. 18/00133

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

Application Ref. No. 18/00058

Application Ref. No. 18/00087

3. That consideration of Application Ref. No. 17/00112 be deferred to enable the applicant to resolve the issues regarding the ownership of the land adjacent to the applicant's hardstanding.



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

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

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

---

## **Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

**Cabinet Member : Councillor Moring**  
**Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

---

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

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider details of the objections to advertised Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals across the borough.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 **That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the objections to the proposed Orders and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:**

- (a) **Implement the proposals without amendment; or,**  
(b) **Implement the proposals with amendment; or,**  
(c) **Take no further action**

- 2.2 **That the Cabinet Committee consider the views of the Traffic and Parking Working Party, following consideration of the representations received and agree the appropriate course of action.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The Cabinet Committee periodically agrees to advertise proposals to implement waiting restrictions in various areas as a result of requests from Councillors and members of the public based upon an assessment against the Council's current policies.
- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached **Appendix 1** were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make

representations in respect of the proposals. This process has resulted in the objections detailed in **Appendix 1** of this report. Officers have considered these objections and where possible tried to resolve them. Observations are provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.

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

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

#### **5. Corporate Implications**

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

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking and traffic is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles and general traffic flow. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

##### **5.2 Financial Implications**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 5.5.1 None

##### **5.6 Consultation**

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

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

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

## **5.8 Risk Assessment**

- 5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve the operation of the parking scheme while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

## **5.9 Value for Money**

- 5.9.1 Works associated with the schemes listed in **Appendix 1** will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

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

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

- 6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

- 7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of representations received and Officer Observations.

| Road                  | Proposed By | Proposal   | Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|-----------------------|-------------|--|--|---|
| Southchurch Boulevard | Members     | Introduce Limited Waiting 3 Hrs No Return in 4 Hrs   | 1 letter of objection received from the bridge club asking that the waiting time is increased to 4 hours as many of the members are over 80- years of age and a typical game lasts 3 ½ hrs and would result in them being unable to park outside the hall  | <p>The proposal was requested to deter all day parking and accommodating the users of a nearby facility will not detract from this purpose. The proposal would require re-advertisement if Members wish to accede to the objectors suggestion.</p> <p><b>Recommend to re-advertise amended proposal allowing parking for up to 4 hours.</b></p> |
| St Lukes Road         | Officer     | Introduce No Waiting at Any Time in St Lukes Rd at its junct with Ely Road                                     | <b>1 letter of objection received</b> – would not be able to park in front of property (though proposals are opposite the property); For many years the road has been fine as it is; would also mean neighbours would no longer be able to park in front of their properties; would not be enhancing but causing disruption to the people who reside in the area; If have to park elsewhere would cause friction with others | <p>St Lukes Road is now one-way eastwards and vehicles require visibility of oncoming traffic. The proposal formalises guidance within the Highway Code to not park within 10 metres of a junction.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposals.</b></p>   |
| Eastwood Road North   | Member      | Introduce No Waiting at Any Time In Eastwood Rd North 15 & 12m either side of junction with Kenholme           | <p><b>2 letters of objection and 1 letter of support received.</b> Letter of support thinks it's an excellent idea</p> <p><b>2 letters of objection</b> – has not seen it as an issue turning in and out of Kenholme; thinks lengths proposed are excessive 2m would be ok; will force cars to other side of road which will make passing more difficult especially for buses; has never seen problems at this junction;</p> | <p>The proposal is designed to provide adequate visibility for vehicles exiting Kenholme.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with an amended proposal of 10 metres of junction protection along Eastwood Road North and 5 metres in Kenholme.</b></p>   |
| Riviera Drive         | Member      | Introduce No Waiting 11.00 am – 12.00 pm on south side between No. 76 and 8m west of junction with Dalmatia Rd | <b>1 letter of objection received</b> – not allowing parking for one hour a day is beyond ridiculous; are residents going to be issued with parking permits to negate the issue  | <p>While the proposal is designed to deter all day parking in these newly created parking bays, residents will no longer be able to benefit from parking unless they are able to move their vehicle during the prohibited time.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>  |

| Road   | Proposed By | Proposal   | Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|--|-------------|--|--|---|
| Hartington Road Area Parking Management Scheme | Member      | Waiting Restrictions, Parking Places & Permit Parking Zone | <p><b>1 letter of objection 31 letters of support</b></p> <p><b>Letter of objection</b> – feels that the criteria for a scheme needs amending as only 40% voted for the proposal; small guest house with no off street parking as criteria changed for crossover so has to park on road and walk supplies in; would not get a residents permit as not actual residence and would place business in jeopardy; Area is designated as “seafront visitor area” and supported by council rather than to discourage; why are smaller guest houses penalised against a larger guest houses, the criteria should be changed so it is resident and/or owner can apply for permits</p> <p><b>Letters of support</b> – needs to be sorted out especially since Seaway is going; welcome residents parking as carer/friends will be able to park; residents parking is needed as cannot park when coming home from work; will relieve the parking problems; please proceed with this; totally in favour; Definitely need Pleasant Road included in the scheme to allow residents to park; needed as surround areas have permit parking; glad we are introducing scheme; please fix the problems by introducing the scheme; full and total agreement to the scheme; highly in favour; will have a huge positive impact on lives; will make life so much easier;</p> | <p>The permit parking proposal resulted from a successful survey undertaken by the ward Member and residents demonstrating the required levels of support for controls to be proposed.</p> <p>While the comments from the objector are understood, this is a primarily residential area where the majority of residents have to rely on parking on the street as little off street parking potential is available. Any owner occupiers of guest houses in the streets will be eligible for resident permits and for non-resident owners, a business permit could be purchased to enable parking.</p> <p>The proposal does include a small area of shared permit and pay and display parking and the introduction of the scheme will coincide with an additional 20 pay and display bays being provided in Lucy Road within the former taxi rank with this area reverting to a taxi rank late at night when the area is busy due to the proximity of the clubs in this street.</p> <p><b>Given the levels of support expressed, recommend to proceed with the advertised proposal.</b></p> |
| Station Road Westcliff-on-Sea                  | Officer     | Introduce Limited Waiting 1 Hr No Return in 4 Hrs          | <p><b>3 letters received 1 support –since the Cliffs scheme came in there has been a downturn in business, so this proposal will help the shops in the vicinity of the proposed bay.</b></p> <p><b>2 objection – lives above shops and uses the bay for parking as there is no other parking area available.</b></p>   | <p>The proposal is designed to provide customer parking. both objectors are eligible for permits in the scheme should they wish to apply.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal.</b></p>  |

| Road  | Proposed By           | Proposal  | Comments  | Officer Comment   |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| Bailey Road<br>Area<br>Residents<br>Parking<br>Scheme | Residents<br>Petition | Prohibition Of<br>Waiting at junctions<br>introduction of<br>Permit Parking<br>Controls | <p><b>34 letters of objection and 1 Petition from local Solicitor with 577 signatures</b> – 15 of the representations list their main concern as the viability of businesses in the area. There is limited parking on London Road and therefore employers and customers often use the side roads for parking. They also state that many properties have adequate off-street parking.</p> <p>5 letters have been received from flats above the shops in London Road; they have no off-street parking and therefore rely on the side roads for parking.</p> <p>3 letters mention the difficulties the scheme will cause to patients at a large Doctors surgery and Dentist in London Road. There is insufficient off-street spaces within the Doctors practice and the Dentist has little or no customer parking.</p> <p>Other comments mention that the scheme will cause a knock on effect to roads south of London Road which are already suffering parking stress and other areas are more deserving.</p> <p>The area should be extended to the east to deal with the problems caused by staff of Belfairs Academy and 5 letters offer no perceived problems or no comments</p> | <p>The proposal is a result of a successful resident led survey requesting parking controls to remove all day parking from their streets. While the majority of residents do have off street parking provision, many families have more than one car and rely on parking on street and this can be difficult given all day parking by local workers. Along with permit parking controls, proposals to provide waiting restrictions at a number of currently unprotected junctions was also included within the proposal.</p> <p>Significant opposition has been received to the permit parking proposals however, the petition submitted appears to include high levels of staff from a number of businesses who likely utilise the side streets for all day parking as well as signatures from businesses some distance from the proposal. as residents demonstrated support for parking controls,</p> <p>Photographs of the streets are shown below and demonstrate the levels of parking in these streets. Members are asked to consider to ;</p> <p><b>Agree the proposed parking controls and junction protection measures as advertised.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Agree to the implementation of waiting restrictions around currently unprotected junctions only</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Take no further action on any of the proposals</b></p> |

Eaton Road



Barnard Road



Bailey Road



Sydney Road



Gordon Road





Stirling Ave



Olive Ave



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

6

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

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty  
Director of Planning and Transport

---

## **Members Requests List**

**Cabinet Member – Councillor Moring**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

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

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

### **2. Recommendation**

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

### **3. Background**

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

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

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

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

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

- 6.1 Contribution to Council’s Vision & Corporate Priorities

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

#### **6.2 Financial Implications**

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

#### **6.3 Legal Implications**

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

#### **6.4 People Implications**

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

#### **6.5 Property Implications**

None

#### **6.6 Consultation**

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

#### **7. Background Papers**

None

#### **8 Appendices**

##### **8.1 Appendix 1 - list of current requests**

**Appendix 2 – Maya Close update**

**Appendix 3 – Maya Close independent safety audit report**

This page is intentionally left blank

-----

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

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

### **Waiting Restrictions**

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

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

| Reference Number | Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year) | Ward Member          | Subject of Request   | Update  |
|------------------|--|----------------------|--|---|
| 17/35            | October 2017                               | Cllrs Cox And Jarvis | Introduce accident prevention measures Maya Close and Ness Road  | Considered in March 2018, update provide d at Appendices 2 and 3  |
| 17/46            | Mar 2018                                   | Cllr Philips         | One Hour Waiting restrictions in Thames Close to deter commuter parking – request supported by all residents of Thames Close | <p>Does not meet criteria relating to waiting restrictions or parking controls to deter non- residential parking. The request is contrary to the agreed policy regarding the introduction of waiting restrictions and could lead to displaced parking. Parking controls designed to deter non-resident parking should be part of an area wide solution to avoid moving vehicles into adjacent roads.</p> <p><b>Recommend officers support ward members to undertake the necessary surveys within the wider area.</b></p> <p><b>September 2018 update. Ward Members are considering surveys in the wider area encompassing two wards. Further discussion is planned.</b></p> |
| 18/01            | May 2018                                   | Cllr Woodley         | Introduce waiting restrictions Colbert Avenue opposite junctions.  | <p>This request is similar to previous requests over the last two years which have resulted in no further action following consultation with residents. Waiting restrictions opposite a junction are not provided unless the road is exceptionally narrow and affects turning manoeuvres out of the junction. The road is a standard width and manoeuvring should not be an issue.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>  |



| Reference Number | Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year) | Ward Member    | Subject of Request   | Update   |
|------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| 18/02            | May 2018                                   | Cllr Habermel  | Introduce waiting restriction in Crosby Road to reduce congestion.   | <p>Crosby Road is an east to west route from Crowstone Road terminating at a signal controlled crossroad junction at Chalkwell Avenue. The road is of sufficient width to accommodate two side parking but this arrangement results in single file traffic only. While the street is not designated as a distributor route, the levels of traffic using the street results in vehicles having to find sufficient roadside space to pull over and allow oncoming traffic to pass. The majority of the parking is attributed to commuters using the railway station.</p> <p>While the request does not meet the agreed criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions, the levels of traffic using the street and the resulting congestion is of concern. The provision of waiting restrictions will allow for passing places and reduce congestion.</p> <p><b>Recommend Members consider the request as an exception to the agreed criteria due to the congestion and potential emissions resulting from traffic having to give way.</b></p> |
| 18/03            | May 2018                                   | Cllr Arscott   | Amend waiting restrictions Victoria Road Leigh, reduce junction protection and alter one side restriction to opposite side | <p>The proposal is designed to create additional parking in this area subject to high parking demands and is not subject to the agreed criteria.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise the proposal.</b></p>  |
| 18/04            | May 2018                                   | Cllr Van Looey | Box Junction Cokefield Avenue/Hamstel Road   | <p>No rationale for the request has been provided however, box junctions are suitable for use at signal controlled junctions or where heavy traffic flows are present on both arms of the junction. Cokefield Avenue is a minor route joining Hamstel Road which is designated as a distributor route. Traffic on a distributor route should have priority over traffic from minor routes.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>  |

| Reference Number | Date 1 <sup>st</sup> Reported (Month/Year) | Ward Member        | Subject of Request   | Update   |
|------------------|--|--------------------|--|--|
| 18/05            | June 2018                                  | West Leigh Members | London Road, Boundary to Highlands Boulevard. Amend limited waiting time to 2 hours.   | <p><b>The current waiting limit is 1 hour and some business could attract customers requiring a longer stay. No criteria required to amend waiting times in existing limited waiting parking areas.</b></p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposal.</b></p>   |
| 18/06            | June 2018                                  | West Leigh Members | Highlands Boulevard/Herschell Road junction with London Road. Provide peak hour restriction on one side of the road to deter congestion at the junction. | <p>The junction does become congested and the very small area of unrestricted parking on the west side of the street exacerbates this.</p> <p><b>Recommend Members consider the request as an exception to the agreed criteria due to the congestion and agree to propose peak hour waiting restrictions on the west side of the road.</b></p>   |
| 18/07<br>24      | July 2018                                  | Cllr Woodley       | Provide SLOW signs, The Broadway.  | <p>SLOW road markings are provided in The Broadway approaching each junction. Signage with the wording "SLOW" is not a permitted traffic sign and therefore not authorised to be placed on the traffic network.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action.</b></p>   |
| 18/08            | July 2018                                  | Cllr Woodley       | Provide at any time waiting restrictions, Thorpe Hall Avenue, Acacia Drive.  | <p>Does not meet criteria. At any time waiting restrictions are provided around the junction for a distance of 22 metres from the extended kerbline of Acacia Drive. A waiting restriction operational from 2pm to 3pm Monday to Friday is in place to deter all day parking. There is no reported congestion at the junction due to parked vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommend that the location be monitored periodically and if congestion at the junction is witnessed, the existing waiting restriction prohibiting parking at any time be extended for 10 metres northwards.</b></p> |

## Southend on Sea Borough Council

---

### Department for Place – Analysis of Members Request

#### Appendix 3 Members Request List

##### **Maya Close**

##### **Background**

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

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

##### **Observations**

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

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

##### **Recommendation**

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

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

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

## Appendix 3 – Members Request List

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

### **September 2018 Update**

The site has been assessed by an independent road safety auditor with a recommendation to ;

***Provide junction ahead warning signs (staggered) on both approaches to the junction in conjunction with 'SLOW' road markings. Provide a build-out to bring forward the give-way line for Maya Close. Support these remedial measures with relocating the bin, trimming the vegetation and monitoring the non-compliance with parking restrictions.***

The full report is provided.

# Technical note

|                 |                                       |              |                 |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Project:</b> | Southend-on-Sea Road Safety Services  | <b>To:</b>   | Adrian Watling  |
| <b>Subject:</b> | Maya Road junction with A13 Ness Road | <b>From:</b> | Samantha Moores |
| <b>Date:</b>    | 5 Apr 2018                            | <b>cc:</b>   | Mark Gregory    |

## **MAYA CLOSE / WATERLOO ROAD JUNCTION WITH A13 NESS ROAD, SHOE BURYNNESS**

### **Introduction**

Atkins were requested to undertake an accident investigation of the A13 Ness Road / Maya Close junction following a fatal accident in 2015 and local concerns.

### **Accident Summary:**

Search period – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2007 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017

During the 10-year study period 3 personal injury accidents occurred within a 50m radius of the junction of Maya Close with A13 Ness Road (which consequently includes the junction with Waterloo Road).

These accidents resulted in 1 fatal accident, 1 serious injury accident and 1 slight injury accident, giving a severity ratio of 66.6%.

All 3 accidents occurred on a dry road surface and during the hours of daylight.

Two of the accidents involved motorcyclists.

One accident occurred in 2009, 1 in 2012 and 1 in 2015.

### **Accident details:**

1. Accident occurred on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2009 at 07:10 and resulted in slight injury. A car turned out of Waterloo Road across the path of a motorcyclist who was travelling north on Ness Road. There was another car parked on the west kerb of Ness Road which reportedly obstructed the visibility between the car and the motorcyclist. The motorcyclist incurred slight injuries.
2. Accident occurred on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012 at 16:00 and resulted in serious injury. A car was travelling southbound on Ness Road when a child pedestrian (age 10) ran into the road from the east kerb and was hit by the car. The pedestrian sustained serious injury.
3. Accident occurred on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2015 at 13:35 and resulted in a fatality. A car turned right out of Maya Close onto Ness Road and hit a motorcyclist who was travelling southbound on Ness Road.

### **Site visit observations:**

The site was visited on Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018 at approximately 10:00. Multiple vehicles were observed parking on the double yellow lines to the north of Maya Close on the eastern side of Ness Road during the site visit. This restricted visibility to the right for road users exiting Maya Close. This visibility was further reduced by the right-hand bend and the litter bin located next to the brick built planted area.

# Technical note

Visibility to the left was restricted to some extent by parked vehicles. Some of Ness Road to the south of Maya Close was coned off meaning that visibility was slightly better than might otherwise be expected.

The images below show the view to the right when exiting Maya Close restricted by parked vehicles, the bin and planting and also the view southbound on Ness Road approaching Maya Close.



Image 1 – view to right exiting Maya Close



Image 2 – view southbound along Ness Road approaching Maya Close

# Technical note

## Options for remedial measures:

The following options have been considered for this junction. Each measure has been briefly assessed in terms of potential accident savings, cost and suitability for the junction in question.

1. Junction ahead warning signs – provide a staggered junction ahead warning sign on each approach to the junction on Ness Road. This measure would be relatively low cost and relevant to accidents 1 and 3.
2. Build-out at junction – provide a build-out to bring forward the give-way line from Maya Close to improve visibility. This measure would be relevant to accidents 2 and 3.
3. Ban right turn from Maya Close – this measure would be difficult to enforce and there are no opportunities nearby for road users to safely undertake a U-turn which would further reduce the compliance with the banned manoeuvre. This measure would be relevant to accident 3 only. Furthermore, the straight-ahead movement would not be banned and two-wheeled vehicles could still be hit road users travelling from Maya Close to Waterloo Road in a similar fashion to motorcyclist.
4. Provide mini-roundabout – would require more extensive changes to the road layout at higher cost, relevant to accidents 1 and 3. Four-arm mini-roundabouts tend to have high accident rates so accident savings may not be obtained.
5. 'SLOW' road markings – provide 'SLOW' road markings adjacent to the junction ahead warning signs. This measure would be relatively low cost and would support the signing.
6. Parking enforcement – monitor non-compliance of parking restrictions in the vicinity of Maya Close / Waterloo Road. Provide enforcement to deter unsafe parking.
7. Relocate street furniture – relocate the litter bin to the other side of the brick built planter to improve visibility to the right from Maya Close. This measure would be low cost and relevant to accident 3.
8. Trim vegetation in planter – at the time of the site visit (early spring) the vegetation in the planter did not restrict visibility from the junction. However, with spring /summer growth this could also impinge visibility. This measure is low cost and relevant to accident 3.
9. Add 'Think Bike' Posters for road users leaving Maya Close for a limited period.

## Conclusions

The Ness Road/Maya Close/Waterloo Road junction had a low accident rate (0.3 per year) but high severity (two of the three accidents had killed or seriously injured casualties). Two of the three accidents involved motorcyclists. An analysis of the accidents together with a site visit has determined various options.

## Recommended package of remedial measures:

Provide junction ahead warning signs (staggered) on both approaches to the junction in conjunction with 'SLOW' road markings. Provide a build-out to bring forward the give-way line for Maya Close. Support these remedial measures with relocating the bin, trimming the vegetation and monitoring the non-compliance with parking restrictions.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

7

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

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

---

## **Cliffs Pavilion Extension**

### **Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring** **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 amendments to the existing Permit Parking Area to the east of the Cliffs Pavilion.

#### **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) Consider the requests to advertise the amendments to the existing Traffic Regulation Order;**
- b) If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed;**
- c) Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration.**

#### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The Permit Parking Area to the east of the Cliffs Pavilion was implemented in May 2018 and while it is generally recommended that a review of parking arrangements be undertaken after 6 months of operation, there are large areas of under-utilised parking within the area which could accommodate visitors to the Theatre and other attractions nearby. While parking is available in the nearby Shorefield Road Car Park, this is often full early in the evening if a popular show is playing. Western Esplanade generally has spaces available but involves us of the stairs and path up to the Cliffs Pavilion.

- 3.2 At present, the parking is set out to include designated areas of Permit Holder parking bays only and these areas accommodate residents, limited numbers of businesses and hotel guest parking with controls operating from 11am to 9pm daily.
- 3.3 As daytime parking has decreased with commuters and town centre workers no longer parking in the area and preventing residents from parking near to their homes, areas of parking availability remain empty. The purpose of the project was to ensure residents have priority over parking within the area and this has been achieved but leaving large areas unoccupied is displacing parking into adjacent streets.
- 3.4 This parking pressure can be reduced by allowing non-resident parking in some of the streets within the area. This parking could accommodate visitors to the Theatre.
- 3.5 The area has been monitored and the areas shown at Appendix 1 to this report identifies these under used areas.
- 3.6 It is recommended that these areas are proposed to be shared pay and display parking areas or resident permit holders and subject to the charges set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
- 3.7 This would not apply to all parking availability in the streets detailed but a proportion only to ensure residents are not disadvantaged.
- 3.8 In addition, the south side of Clifftown Parade is currently subject to a waiting restriction prohibiting waiting from March to October. Outside of these times, the area is available for parking and could therefore be utilised year round as a shared area.
- 3.9 In the short term, the recommended payment method is pay by phone only. Usage and any resulting issues will be assessed and if justified, pay and display machines can be provided at a cost of £5,500.00 each provided and installed.

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

- 4.1 Retain the current arrangements. This option would retain under-utilised areas of the streets while parking pressure is placed on adjacent areas. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

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

- 5.1 To accommodate non-resident parking in a popular area which appears to be under-utilised by residents.

## **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 The source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate. Income will be generated from this proposal however, there is a high likelihood that a majority of spaces will be utilised by blue badge holders and therefore minimal.

### **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 required to organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals.

### **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 providing additional parking 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 The proposal is designed to allocate additional public parking which contributes to community safety by increasing footfall in an area.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

- 6.11.1 Additional parking bays on street can reduce the requirement for vehicles to travel repeatedly along the roads seeking parking. This will reduce congestion and emissions within the area.

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Plan of areas identified as under-utilised

Appendix 2 Proposed charging structure

## Appendix 1

The area was monitored on several occasions on a weekday and weekend during the afternoon and early evening.

The spaces in each street have been calculated and vehicles counted, the column showing the number of vehicles parked details the highest number of vehicles seen in the street on the days the area was monitored during July and August.

Vehicles parked included;

Residents with permits  
Hotel Guests using the hotel permits  
Blue Badge Holders on yellow lines

| Street   | Spaces | Used | Available |
|--|--------|------|-----------|
| Westcliff Parade   | 98     | 71   | 27        |
| Scratton Road  | 18     | 9    | 9         |
| Cambridge Road   | 63     | 27   | 36        |
| Clifftown Parade (Prittlewell Square westwards)                                | 41     | 27   | 14        |
| Clifftown Parade (Prittlewell Square westwards)<br>removing single yellow line | 40     | 0    | 40        |

Additional 126 parking spaces identified.



## Appendix 2

### Price Comparisons

| Town Centre/Clifftown Area |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| 9am to 6pm                 |        |
| up to 30 minutes           | £1.00  |
| up to 1 hour               | £1.70  |
| up to 2 hours              | £3.30  |
| up to 3 hours              | £5.00  |
| up to 4 hours              | £6.50  |
| up to 5 hours              | £8.30  |
| up to 6 hours              | £10.00 |
| up to 7 hours              | £11.50 |
| up to 8 hours              | £13.20 |
| 8 + hours                  | £14.20 |

| Shorefield Road Car Park |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| 9am to 9pm               |       |
| up to 2 hours            | £2.00 |
| up to 4 hours            | £4.50 |
| up to 6 hours            | £6.60 |
| over 6 hours             | £8.00 |

| Cliffs Pavilion Car Park |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| 7am to 7pm               |       |
| 30 Mins                  | 20p   |
| 2 Hrs                    | £1.50 |
| 3 Hrs                    | £4.00 |
| 4 Hrs                    | £4.80 |
| 5 Hrs +                  | £8.00 |

In order to not encourage migration from car parks nearby by providing cheaper parking, it is suggested that we provide 3 payment bands ;

|               |        |
|---------------|--------|
| up to 3 hours | £4.00  |
| up to 6 hours | £7.00  |
| over 6 hours  | £10.00 |

income potential is difficult to identify as the area will likely be heavily used by badge holders who park free of charge.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

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

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

---

## **Cliffs Pavilion Extension**

### **Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring** **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 amendments to the existing Permit Parking Area to the east of the Cliffs Pavilion.

#### **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) Consider the requests to advertise the amendments to the existing Traffic Regulation Order;**
- b) If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed;**
- c) Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration.**

#### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The Permit Parking Area to the east of the Cliffs Pavilion was implemented in May 2018 and while it is generally recommended that a review of parking arrangements be undertaken after 6 months of operation, there are large areas of under-utilised parking within the area which could accommodate visitors to the Theatre and other attractions nearby. While parking is available in the nearby Shorefield Road Car Park, this is often full early in the evening if a popular show is playing. Western Esplanade generally has spaces available but involves us of the stairs and path up to the Cliffs Pavilion.

- 3.2 At present, the parking is set out to include designated areas of Permit Holder parking bays only and these areas accommodate residents, limited numbers of businesses and hotel guest parking with controls operating from 11am to 9pm daily.
- 3.3 As daytime parking has decreased with commuters and town centre workers no longer parking in the area and preventing residents from parking near to their homes, areas of parking availability remain empty. The purpose of the project was to ensure residents have priority over parking within the area and this has been achieved but leaving large areas unoccupied is displacing parking into adjacent streets.
- 3.4 This parking pressure can be reduced by allowing non-resident parking in some of the streets within the area. This parking could accommodate visitors to the Theatre.
- 3.5 The area has been monitored and the areas shown at Appendix 1 to this report identifies these under used areas.
- 3.6 It is recommended that these areas are proposed to be shared pay and display parking areas or resident permit holders and subject to the charges set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
- 3.7 This would not apply to all parking availability in the streets detailed but a proportion only to ensure residents are not disadvantaged.
- 3.8 In addition, the south side of Clifftown Parade is currently subject to a waiting restriction prohibiting waiting from March to October. Outside of these times, the area is available for parking and could therefore be utilised year round as a shared area.
- 3.9 In the short term, the recommended payment method is pay by phone only. Usage and any resulting issues will be assessed and if justified, pay and display machines can be provided at a cost of £5,500.00 each provided and installed.

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

- 4.1 Retain the current arrangements. This option would retain under-utilised areas of the streets while parking pressure is placed on adjacent areas. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

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

- 5.1 To accommodate non-resident parking in a popular area which appears to be under-utilised by residents.

## **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 The source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate. Income will be generated from this proposal however, there is a high likelihood that a majority of spaces will be utilised by blue badge holders and therefore minimal.

### **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 required to organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals.

### **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 providing additional parking 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 The proposal is designed to allocate additional public parking which contributes to community safety by increasing footfall in an area.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

- 6.11.1 Additional parking bays on street can reduce the requirement for vehicles to travel repeatedly along the roads seeking parking. This will reduce congestion and emissions within the area.

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Plan of areas identified as under-utilised

Appendix 2 Proposed charging structure

## Appendix 1

The area was monitored on several occasions on a weekday and weekend during the afternoon and early evening.

The spaces in each street have been calculated and vehicles counted, the column showing the number of vehicles parked details the highest number of vehicles seen in the street on the days the area was monitored during July and August.

Vehicles parked included;

Residents with permits  
Hotel Guests using the hotel permits  
Blue Badge Holders on yellow lines

| Street   | Spaces | Used | Available |
|--|--------|------|-----------|
| Westcliff Parade   | 98     | 71   | 27        |
| Scratton Road  | 18     | 9    | 9         |
| Cambridge Road   | 63     | 27   | 36        |
| Clifftown Parade (Prittlewell Square westwards)                                | 41     | 27   | 14        |
| Clifftown Parade (Prittlewell Square westwards)<br>removing single yellow line | 40     | 0    | 40        |

Additional 126 parking spaces identified.



## Appendix 2

### Price Comparisons

| Town Centre/Clifftown Area |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| 9am to 6pm                 |        |
| up to 30 minutes           | £1.00  |
| up to 1 hour               | £1.70  |
| up to 2 hours              | £3.30  |
| up to 3 hours              | £5.00  |
| up to 4 hours              | £6.50  |
| up to 5 hours              | £8.30  |
| up to 6 hours              | £10.00 |
| up to 7 hours              | £11.50 |
| up to 8 hours              | £13.20 |
| 8 + hours                  | £14.20 |

| Shorefield Road Car Park |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| 9am to 9pm               |       |
| up to 2 hours            | £2.00 |
| up to 4 hours            | £4.50 |
| up to 6 hours            | £6.60 |
| over 6 hours             | £8.00 |

| Cliffs Pavilion Car Park |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| 7am to 7pm               |       |
| 30 Mins                  | 20p   |
| 2 Hrs                    | £1.50 |
| 3 Hrs                    | £4.00 |
| 4 Hrs                    | £4.80 |
| 5 Hrs +                  | £8.00 |

In order to not encourage migration from car parks nearby by providing cheaper parking, it is suggested that we provide 3 payment bands ;

|               |        |
|---------------|--------|
| up to 3 hours | £4.00  |
| up to 6 hours | £7.00  |
| over 6 hours  | £10.00 |

income potential is difficult to identify as the area will likely be heavily used by badge holders who park free of charge.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

8

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

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

---

**Request for Waiting Restrictions**  
**Earls Hall Avenue.**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring**  
**Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider a petition from residents of Earls Hall Avenue and Mayfield Avenue requesting a waiting restriction prohibiting parking at any time on the south side of Earls Hall Avenue from the access gates to the school to the driveway of No. 46 Earls Hall Avenue.

**2. Recommendation**

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

- a) Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition and;**
- b) Agree to take no further action in regard to the other requested works.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Earls Hall Avenue runs from Victoria Avenue to Mayfield Avenue to the rear of Southend High School for Boys. The road is approximately 670 metres in length featuring residential premises, access to the school and school playing fields.
- 3.2 The street is subject to a speed limit of 30mph and waiting restrictions are provided as shown on the plan at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 3.3 The request does not meet the criteria adopted by this Committee as no collisions resulting in personal injury have been recorded. Officers have been unable to assess traffic flows and congestion as the petition was submitted to the Council meeting of 19<sup>th</sup> July 2018,

shortly before the commencement of the school holidays. Parking and traffic flows around schools are lower during school holidays therefore any surveys undertaken may not be representatives of a normal school day. A photograph submitted on the petition has been provided in Appendix 2 to this report.

- 3.4 The area in which the waiting restrictions have been requested does feature a slight bend however, the extent of the restrictions requested, as shown in Appendix 1 to this report, appear to be commence a considerable distance from the bend in both directions.
- 3.5 It is understood that residents may be frustrated by the school parking, the school has a popular sixth form unit and with the growing numbers of sixth form pupils along with the increasing likelihood of young drivers choosing to drive to school, parking is likely to be pressured.
- 3.6 There is a concern that prohibiting parking to the extent requested will likely result in these vehicles being displaced into neighbouring streets resulting in additional requests.
- 3.7 In the event Members wish to take action, it is suggested that the resulting proposal should be shortened considerably from that requested.

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

- 4.1 Agree to the waiting restriction as requested. As no evidence is available to ensure the request meets the criteria set by this committee. Making changes to a road layout or reducing the speed should be considered in the context of a benefit and dis-benefits. How does the financial costs to implement such measures compare to costs being incurred due to collisions, traffic delays or other factors. Any resulting negative impact on adjacent streets or areas should also be a factor. Implementing waiting restrictions on an individual basis does not remove the issue but merely moves it in the next street or area.

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

- 5.1 To ensure any action is appropriate to the issue and results in a beneficial impact without negatively impacting on adjacent streets.

#### **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 The source of funding for minor maintenance will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.

### 6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

### 6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 Staff time will be required to organise the maintenance.

### 6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None

### 6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 None.

### 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 Any highway maintenance is provided for the benefit of all road users and takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

### 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 The requests have been assessed against collision data and vehicle monitoring data.

### 6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 All highway works are undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process.

### 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 The requests were assessed against collision and monitoring data.

### 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None, however, should the recommendation not be agreed and Members decide to proceed with speed reduction measures, increased congestion and pollution can be increased by reducing speeds.

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**


Appendix 1 – Street Plan

Appendix 2 – Resident's Petition - photograph

This page is intentionally left blank



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.  
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council  
Licence No: 100019680 2016

|   |  |  |             |            |
|---|--|--|-------------|------------|
|  | PROPOSED NO WAITING AT ANY TIME<br>EARLS HALL AVENUE |  | SCALE       | 1 : 1250   |
|   |  |  | DATE        | 22/08/2018 |
|   |  |  | DRAWING No. |            |
|   |  |  | DRAWN BY    |            |

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

From Councillor: Meg Davidson

Address: Members Office, Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue  
Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS2 6ER

Telephone: 01702 212351

E-mail: [cllrdavidson@southend.gov.uk](mailto:cllrdavidson@southend.gov.uk)

Date: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018



Colin Gamble  
Group Manager  
Democratic Services

Dear Colin

## Residents' petition to Council

Please find enclosed a petition totalling 102 signatures from residents of Earls Hall Avenue, Mayfield Avenue and elsewhere. The residents are requesting that the Council introduces a double yellow line parking restriction on the blind bend on the south side of Earls Hall Avenue, extending from the edge of the emergency access gates to Southend High School for Boys (opposite 25 Earls Hall Avenue) to the edge of the driveway of 46 Earls Hall Avenue.

The petition organiser is Mr            Smith of            .

Yours sincerely

*Meg Davidson*

Meg Davidson

Councillor for Prittlewell Ward



## RESIDENTS' PETITION – EARLS HALL AVENUE

**We, the undersigned, request Southend-on-Sea Borough Council to introduce a double yellow line parking restriction on the blind bend on the south side of Earls Hall Avenue, extending from the edge of the emergency access gates to Southend High School for Boys (opposite 25 Earls Hall Avenue) to the edge of the driveway of 46 Earls Hall Avenue.**

Earls Hall Avenue is a residential road which runs from Victoria Avenue to Hobblythick Lane/Bell junction via Mayfield Avenue. There are double yellow lines at each intersection and at the sharp bend near the rear entrance to Southend High School for Boys. Most of the road has unrestricted parking.

Mayfield Avenue, which adjoins Earls Hall Avenue, has a similar blind bend. This is covered by a double yellow line parking restriction, so there is a precedent in the vicinity for a parking restriction on a bend in a residential street.

We are requesting a double yellow line parking restriction on this short stretch of Earls Hall Avenue for the following reasons:

**1) To ease the worst pinch point on Earls Hall Avenue**

When there are vehicles parked on both sides of the road on this bend, as is often the case during the day, this is the worst pinch point in the road. Large vehicles, especially refuse lorries have difficulty driving through. There has been at least one incident when a fire engine on an emergency call had to turn around and go another route because the gap between parked cars at this point on Earls Hall Avenue was too narrow to get through.

**2) To improve visibility and safety for drivers**

Drivers approaching the blind bend from either direction often have to overtake a long line of parked cars. This is a hazardous manoeuvre as the bend in the road makes it impossible to see oncoming traffic.  
*(Right: view of bend for vehicles travelling west from Victoria Avenue)*



**3) To prevent traffic gridlock at busy times.**

Earls Hall Avenue is adjacent to Southend High School for Boys and there is a high volume of traffic at the start and end of the school day. At busy times it is very difficult for drivers to reverse out of the way should they meet oncoming traffic at this bend, especially with a queue of traffic behind them.



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

9

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

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

---

## **Hospital Area Controlled Parking Zone**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring  
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 amendments to the existing Controlled Parking Zone around Southend Hospital.

### **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Consider the requests to advertise the amendments to the existing Traffic Regulation Order;**
- b) **If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed;**
- c) **Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic and Parking Working Party for consideration.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The Controlled Parking Scheme in operation around Southend Hospital has been in place since 2011. Minor amendments have been made since this time to increase parking bay numbers and make improvements but due to ever increasing parking demands, a comprehensive change to the operation of the scheme is justified.

- 3.2 At present, the parking is set out to include designated areas of;

Resident Permit Holder parking bays  
Pay And Display parking bays  
Limited Waiting parking bays  
Business Permit Holder parking bays  
Controls operate from 9.30am to 4.30pm Monday to Friday.

3.3 As demand increases, there are often vehicles driving around the area attempting to locate available Pay and Display parking bays while plentiful Resident Permit Holder bays are available. This behaviour increases congestion and vehicle emissions around the area which is detrimental to residents and road users.

3.4 Resident Permit Holder Bays appear to be used primarily in the early mornings and again in the late afternoons, presumably this is due to residents who may only require parking near to their home before and after work. Results of an occupancy survey undertaken is at Appendix 1 to this report.

3.5 Use of Resident Permit Holder Bays as a shared resource between 9.30am to 4.30pm could reduce congestion in the area. Amendment of the operational hours of the scheme could then protect residents at the times when these bays may be required for their sole use, for example

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| 8am to 9.30am    | Resident Permit Holder Only               |
| 9.30am to 4.30pm | Resident Permit Holder or Pay and Display |
| 4.30pm to 6pm    | Resident Permit Holder Only               |

3.6 A further requested change is to ensure any parking charges reflect the hospital car park charge, this will avoid the streets being used in preference to the hospital car park. The car park charges are;

|               |        |
|---------------|--------|
| Up to 3 hours | £3.10  |
| Up to 6 Hours | £4.00  |
| 6 to 11 hours | £6.00  |
| 12 hours      | £10.00 |

Our current charges for the parking bays on street are;

|               |       |
|---------------|-------|
| Up to 2 hours | £2.10 |
| Up to 4 hours | £2.80 |

This could be encouraging use of the on street parking bays over the car park for those wishing to stay more than 3 hours.

3.7 To deter this, it is suggested that our charging structure is amended to ;

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Up to 3 hours | £3.50         |
| Up to 6 Hours | £4.50 Maximum |

## 4. Other Options

4.1 Retain existing operational rules and charges. This will not reduce congestion in the area with hospital users seeking parking on street. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

## **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 5.1 To reduce congestion and emissions while creating additional parking capacity during the daytime.

## **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 This will require £85,680 of funding to install pay and display machines, signage and installation costs. No provision has been made for this and a bid would be required from capital funding.

### *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 required to organise the advertisement procedures and monitor the progress of the proposals.

### *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 providing additional parking and reducing congestion and emissions 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 The proposal is designed to allocate additional public parking, reducing vehicle movements and contributing to the overall safety within the area.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 Additional parking bays on street can reduce the requirement for vehicles to travel repeatedly along the roads seeking parking. This will reduce congestion and emissions within the area.

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – results of occupancy survey

Appendix 2 – plan of area

## Appendix 1

Surveys undertaken mid-morning on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and early afternoon on 16<sup>th</sup> August

| Location          | Total Capacity | Total Number of Vehicles |    |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----|
|                   |                | AM                       | PM |
| Prittlewell Chase | 17             | 7                        | 7  |
| Cardigan Avenue   | 13             | 3                        | 3  |
| Carlingford Drive | 35             | 8                        | 13 |
| Hillborough Road  | 18             | 10                       | 8  |
| Carlton Drive     | 56             | 24                       | 26 |
| Lavender Grove    | 10             | 3                        | 4  |

Total Number of Empty Resident Only Spaces


AM 94

PM 88

This page is intentionally left blank






|   |   |
|---|---|
|  <div>Selected map area</div> <div>HOSPITAL AREA CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - BAY LOCATION PLAN</div> | <div>This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.<br/>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council<br/>Licence No: 100019680 2016</div> <div>SCALE1 : 1420</div> <div>DATE20/08/2018</div> <div>DRAWING No.</div> <div>DRAWN BY</div> |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |
|   |   |






|   |  |  |             |            |
|---|--|--|-------------|------------|
|  <div>Selected map area</div> <div>HOSPITAL AREA CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - BAY LOCATION PLAN</div> | This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.<br>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council<br>Licence No: 100019680 2016 |  | SCALE       | 1 : 1420   |
|   |  |  | DATE        | 20/08/2018 |
|   |  |  | DRAWING No. |            |
|   |  |  | DRAWN BY    |            |
|   |  |  |             |            |





|   |   |             |            |
|---|---|-------------|------------|
|  <div>Selected map area</div> <div>HOSPITAL AREA CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - BAY LOCATION PLAN</div> | <div>This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.<br/>Southend-on-Sea Borough Council<br/>Licence No: 100019680 2016</div> | SCALE       | 1 : 3200   |
|   |   | DATE        | 20/08/2018 |
|   |   | DRAWING No. |            |
|   |   | DRAWN BY    |            |
|   |   |             |            |



This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

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

Report prepared by: Peter Geraghty  
Director for Planning and Transport

**Agenda  
Item No.**

**10**

---

## **Holland Road Area - Permit Parking Proposal**

**Cabinet Member : Cllr Moring**

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

---

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

- 1.1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider the results of a consultation led by residents in Holland Road and Palmeira Avenue.

### **2. Recommendation**

**2.1 That the Traffic and Parking Working Party consider the results presented and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to:**

**(a) Thank the residents for taking the time to undertake the surveys.**

**(b) Agree to a proposal for a Permit Parking Area to be introduced into the streets by extending the Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Area.**

**(b) Authorise the advertisement of the proposals and further authorise that in the event of there being no unresolved objections, confirm the Order as necessary and undertake the works.**

**(c) Note that any unresolved objections will be referred to a future meeting for consideration.**

### **2. Background**

- 3.1 At a meeting attended by officers and Members, local residents expressed concerns over the level of parking in Holland Road and Palmeira Avenue. The roads appear to be used by commuters, seafront visitors and theatre customers, often displacing residents and increasing traffic as motorists attempt to find a parking space.
- 3.2 Members and officers provided information on the level of support required, questions residents should be asked and offered to analyse all results received.
- 3.3 Residents have delivered a questionnaire to all properties in Holland Road and Palmeira Avenue and received responses equating to 70% of those

asked. After analysis, the results show 92% of residents responding are in support of parking controls.

- 3.4 As the level of support has reached the set criteria, officers recommend the proposals be formally advertised but the area should also include Station Road from San Remo Parade to Holland Road within the proposals. Residents of this particular section of Station Road have expressed their concerns that they are not part of the existing Permit Parking Area and not eligible to purchase permits. Including this area will resolve this and provide additional parking availability for all residents.
- 3.5 Station Road is currently subject to waiting restrictions which prohibit parking at any time in some areas and from 9am to 6pm in the remaining areas. The road is sufficiently wide at 9.3 to 9.8 metres to accommodate parking on one side of the road as well as two way traffic flows. This measure will also contribute to reducing speeds in the street.
- 3.6 The streets are close to the existing Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Area with streets further westwards providing little on street parking availability due to the presence of driveways. These streets are unlikely to suffer with any displaced parking due to the numbers of driveways. Shorefield Road, sited between the existing Permit Parking Area and Palmeira Avenue has been subject to a prohibition of waiting for a considerable number of years and as such, is unaffected.

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

- 4.1 To reflect the residents request and subsequent success in demonstrating support for parking controls.

#### **Corporate Implications**

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

- 5.1.1 Ensuring parking is managed to the maximum benefit is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

##### **5.2 Financial Implications**

- 5.2.1 Costs for progression of the works if approved, can be met from existing budgets.

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

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

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

- 5.4.1 Works required to progress the proposals and any resulting works will be undertaken by existing staff resources.

## **5.5 Property Implications**

5.5.1 None

## **5.6 Consultation**

5.6.1 This report requests authority to commence the statutory consultation process and is a direct result of a resident led consultation demonstrating support for parking controls.

## **5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

5.7.1 Parking controls ensure management of any parking availability along with maintaining safety for all road users.

## **5.8 Risk Assessment**

5.8.1 The proposals will be designed to improve the operation of the parking scheme while maintaining highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

## **5.9 Value for Money**

5.9.1 Works associated with the proposal will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

5.10.1 The proposals if implemented will lead to improved community safety by reducing non-resident parking and giving residents the opportunity to park near to their homes.

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of affected streets and results of the informal consultation.  
**Appendix 2** – plan of proposed area to be incorporated into the existing Permit Parking Area.



## Appendix 1

### Details of streets consulted and responses

| Road            | No of Properties | No. returned | Percentage returned | No in support | No. opposed | Percentage in support |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Holland Road*   | 200              | 100          | 50%                 | 99            | 1           | 99%                   |
| Palmeira Avenue | 50               | 44           | 88%                 | 41            | 3 abstained | 86%                   |

\*Includes 130 occupied properties in Homecove House

This page is intentionally left blank





This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

11

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

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

---

**Oakwood Avenue**  
**Request for Speed Control and Other Suggested Amendments**  
**to the Road Layout.**  
**Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring**  
**Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider a petition from residents of Oakwood Avenue requesting measures to reduce the levels of traffic using the road and to reduce the current speed limit to 20mph.

**2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition and;**
- b) **Agree the findings of the investigation and take no further action in regard to the request for a 20mph speed limit to be introduced at this time.**
- c) **Agree to take no further action in regard to the other requested works.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Oakwood Avenue is street running from the A127 to Eastwood Road North and is approximately 315 metres in length.
- 3.2 The street is subject to a speed limit of 30mph and this is signposted at the junction of the A127 to advise motorists they are leaving a 40mph speed limit. A sign facing motorists leaving Oakwood Avenue to enter the A127 and a 40mph sign limit is also provided along with a sign advising motorists they are entering a street subject to a no stopping requirement (clearway).
- 3.3 The speed limit signage is currently positioned beneath signage advising that a clearway starts and ends, to maximise the presence of a speed limit sign, these should be positioned at the uppermost of any signage array.

- 3.4 The street comprises residential properties, the majority of which have off street parking provision. The street is also an access to Leighwood Avenue Briarwood Drive and Shirley Road.
- 3.5 Line markings are provided at the junctions of Briarwood Drive (2 approaches) and Shirley Road advising motorists that they are required to give way to traffic on Oakwood Avenue.
- 3.6 Monitoring equipment was installed in the street from 27<sup>th</sup> July 2018 until 8<sup>th</sup> August 2018. The equipment records all vehicle movements, lengths and speeds continuously while in position.
- 3.7 It should be noted that south to north traffic flow figures are highly likely to be distorted as motorists attempt to avoid the Kent Elms junction to access the London Bound carriageway during ongoing works.
- 3.7 The equipment recorded the following information during the monitoring period;
- 36,481 vehicle movements  
29,688 movements northbound  
6,513 movements southbound
- 3040 average vehicle movements per day
- Average speeds of 24mph
- 12% of vehicles exceeding 30mph  
7.4% of vehicles travelling between 30mph and 32mph  
2.6% of vehicles travelling between 33mph and 34 mph  
2.1% of vehicles travelling in excess of 35mph (enforceable limit)
- 3.8 The monitoring has identified that the number of vehicles using the street each day is higher than expected however, this is believed to be due to the numbers of motorists attempting to avoid Kent Elms junction during works. Monitoring undertaken in January 2014 identified average vehicle movements of 1885 per day.
- 3.9 Speeds have reduced since the monitoring in 2014 when average speeds of 27mph and 35% of vehicles travelling over 30mph were recorded. While current speeds are undesirable, this is not excessively high in comparison to other street monitored this calendar year.
- 3.10 As part of the investigation, collision data was analysed. Members are aware that collisions resulting in personal injury are recorded with the attending Police Officer providing an assessment of the road conditions, any driver related issues or any other information they feel is likely to have contributed to the collision occurring.
- 3.11 Since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 (the data currently available), 3 collisions have occurred resulting in personal injury. The details of these collisions are described below along with the attending officers observations and comments as

to likely cause. Speed has not been considered as a contributory factor as to the cause of these collisions.

- 3.11 As speed has not been considered as contributing to any of the collisions detailed, lowering the current speed limit would have little beneficial impact on reducing collisions.
- 3.12 The data gathered shows that the majority of vehicles are travelling at or under the speed limit with a low percentage (in comparison to other streets in the borough) exceeding this speed at a level the Police would take action against.

| Date       | Location  | Description  | Contributory Factors                     |
|------------|---|--|--|
| 25/03/2015 | Oakwood Avenue near Shirley Road                      | Vehicle on Oakwood Avenue turning into Shirley Road strikes pedestrian crossing on Shirley Road                    | Vehicle failed to judge pedestrians path |
| 27/03/2017 | Oakwood Avenue near junction with Eastwood Road North | Vehicle travelling south, swerves to avoid an animal, hits the kerb flipping vehicle and hits two parked vehicles. | swerving to avoid animal on carriageway  |
| 01/12/2017 | Briarwood Drive junction with Oakwood Avenue          | vehicle exiting Briarwood Drive fails to give way to vehicle travelling on Oakwood Avenue                          | failing/disobeying give way              |

- 3.13 Our remedial budgets are targeted at those locations where collisions resulting in injury are recorded and where engineering measures will reduce the likelihood of similar collisions occurring. Where a location features three collisions likely to have caused by three distinct factors, it is difficult to identify what measures are appropriate and whether the implementation of these will result in a benefit.
- 3.14 The collisions have resulted from error on the part of the driver in two of the instances with an unavoidable situation occurring to cause the third collision, a reduced speed limit is unlikely to have prevented these collisions occurring.
- 3.15 Reduced speeds can result in reduced collisions as drivers may have additional time to react accordingly with any resulting collisions likely to result in lesser injury, however, dealing with a single street in isolation is unlikely to achieve widespread benefit.
- 3.16 Monitoring of speeds throughout the borough is undertaken on a request basis, details of the streets monitored so far this calendar year are provided in Appendix 1 to this report and highlights the number of street where speeds are travelled in excess of the speed limit.
- 3.17 To provide speed reducing measures in this street ahead of other areas where higher speeds are evidenced results in no fair and transparent system of addressing these issues. It is therefore suggested that in the event of Members wish to address speeding issues, a ranking list of streets with evidenced speeding issues along with the related collision data and an estimated cost to

introduce speed reducing measures is prepared. The list can then be considered on a priority ranking basis and capital funding sought to address this issue.

- 3.18 It is therefore recommended to take no further action in relation to a reduced speed limit at this location pending the compilation of a priority ranking list being created and requisite funding being available.
- 3.19 Officers will rearrange the signage array at the junction with the A127 to place the speed limit signage appropriately.
- 3.20 The petitioner has also requested the following measures/combination of measures;
1. A keep left bollard at the junction of Eastwood Road North.
  2. Width restrictions to prevent large vehicles using the road.
  3. Make the road no entry from Eastwood Road North.
  4. Close the road at the junction with the A127.
  5. Extend the existing yellow lines from the A127 to Briarwood Drive to protect the S bend.
- 3.21 Officers have considered these requests and have the following observations;
1. There is no evidence to suggest vehicles are making dangerous manoeuvres at this location (cutting across the junction) and therefore little benefit could be achieved by this measure.
  2. There is no indication that excessive numbers of large vehicles are using the road. The monitoring showed 80 large vehicles using the road (0.2%) whereas in 2014, 1359 long vehicles were recorded (9%) which evidences a reduction in the use of the road by large vehicles.
  3. Making the road no entry would require residents to use either the A127 to access the road or utilise other residential streets to access their properties, this would increase vehicle movements in adjacent streets.
  4. This measure would require residents to utilise other streets to access the A127 therefore increasing vehicle movements in adjacent streets.
  5. The existing yellow lines currently extend from the junction of the A127 to Shirley Road a distance of approximately 80 metres. No accidents are recorded in this section of the street. The bend is not extreme and provides a natural traffic calming feature, removing parking from this area could result in higher speeds.
- 3.22. The Department for Transport (DfT) are yet to release their findings as to the reduction of speed limits in urban areas. Members are reminded that an In-Depth Scrutiny Project undertaken in 2016 and designed to consider a borough wide reduced speed limits in the majority of residential streets deferred any decision pending the outcome of the DfT's work.

- 3.22 In conclusion, there are concerns related to vehicle movements and speeds travelled however, traffic patterns are highly likely to be affected by ongoing works at Kent Elms junction and to react at this time may not be justified as these patterns may well change once works are completed. The DfT may also consider measures to reduce speeds nationwide and it is recommended that no action be taken at this time to reduce the speed limit and provide traffic calming measures.

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

- 4.1 Agree to all or some of the requested measures. Making changes to a road layout or reducing the speed should be considered in the context of the benefits and dis-benefits. How does the financial costs to implement such measures compare to costs being incurred due to collisions, traffic delays or other factors. Any resulting negative impact on adjacent streets or areas should also be a factor. Road amendments carried out on an individual basis does not remove the issue but merely moves it the next street or area.

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

- 5.1 To ensure any action is appropriate to the issue and results in a beneficial impact without negatively impacting on adjacent streets.

#### **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 The source of funding for minor maintenance will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.

##### *6.3 Legal Implications*

- 6.3.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

##### *6.4 People Implications*

- 6.4.1 Staff time will be required to organise the maintenance.

##### *6.5 Property Implications*

- 6.5.1 None

##### *6.6 Consultation*

- 6.6.1 None.

## 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 Any highway maintenance is provided for the benefit of all road users and takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 The requests have been assessed against collision data and vehicle monitoring data.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

6.9.1 All highway works are undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process.

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 The requests were assessed against collision and monitoring data.

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None, however, should the recommendation not be agreed and Members decide to proceed with speed reduction measures, increased congestion and pollution can be increased by reducing speeds.

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

List of streets monitored during the preceding 12 months.



## Appendix 1

| Road                                | Number of vehicles | % exceeding limit |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| <b>St Laurence Way *</b>            | 154294             | 57.00%            |
| <b>Eastern Esplanade/Thorpe Esp</b> | 109345             | 55.40%            |
| <b>Marine Parade, Leigh</b>         | 52699              | 35.60%            |
| <b>Gravel Road</b>                  | 17081              | 35.00%            |
| <b>Hampton Gardens</b>              | 8015               | 29.90%            |
| <b>The Fairway</b>                  | 184343             | 28.40%            |
| <b>Central Avenue</b>               | 34922              | 26.20%            |
| <b>Hornby Avenue</b>                | 12023              | 24.80%            |
| <b>Priory Crescent</b>              | 48612              | 24.10%            |
| <b>Kings Road</b>                   | 48927              | 22.80%            |
| <b>The Fairway</b>                  | 129316             | 21.80%            |
| <b>Kings Road</b>                   | 49687              | 21.30%            |
| <b>Royston Avenue</b>               | 33491              | 21.20%            |
| <b>Marlborough Road</b>             | 6401               | 17.00%            |
| <b>Nelson Road, Leigh</b>           | 42543              | 16.20%            |
| <b>Leighwood Avenue</b>             | 10686              | 15.70%            |
| <b>Rutland Avenue</b>               | 5981               | 15.20%            |
| <b>Poynters Lane</b>                | 74489              | 14.90%            |
| <b>Manchester Drive</b>             | 42406              | 13.10%            |
| <b>Oakwood Avenue</b>               | 36481              | 12.70%            |
| <b>Scratton Road</b>                | 36822              | 11.60%            |
| <b>Cambridge road</b>               | 36907              | 11.50%            |
| <b>Maldon Road</b>                  | 5977               | 11.40%            |
| <b>Eastwood Rise</b>                | 29693              | 11.10%            |
| <b>Marine Parade, Leigh</b>         | 42315              | 10.30%            |
| <b>Cranleigh Drive</b>              | 17035              | 10.00%            |
| <b>Hampton Gardens</b>              | 13915              | 10.00%            |
| <b>Hamstel Road</b>                 | 160404             | 9.90%             |
| <b>Marguerite Drive</b>             | 5006               | 9.00%             |
| <b>Leigh Hall Road</b>              | 13294              | 8.90%             |
| <b>Rochester Drive</b>              | 15956              | 8.80%             |
| <b>Argyll Road</b>                  | 9167               | 8.00%             |
| <b>Poynings avenue</b>              | 33388              | 7.60%             |
| <b>Midhurst Avenue</b>              | 14685              | 7.50%             |
| <b>Colemans Avenue</b>              | 16503              | 7.20%             |
| <b>Picketts Ave</b>                 | 3850               | 6.50%             |

|  |        |       |
|--|--------|-------|
| <b>Baxter Avenue</b>                                 | 12561  | 6.20% |
| <b>St Johns Road</b>                                 | 7211   | 5.70% |
| <b>Royston Avenue</b>                                | 36598  | 5.30% |
| <b>Richmond Drive</b>                                | 3435   | 5.00% |
| <b>London Road</b>                                   | 184733 | 4.30% |
| <b>Kensington Road</b>                               | 7104   | 3.90% |
| <b>Glendale Gardens</b>                              | 23427  | 3.30% |
| <b>Southsea Avenue</b>                               | 11110  | 2.10% |
| <b>Wells Avenue</b>                                  | 7400   | 2.10% |
| <b>Glenhurst Road</b>                                | 5309   | 1.80% |
| <b>Broadway</b>                                      | 117572 | 1.70% |
| <b>Lymington Avenue</b>                              | 4262   | 1.40% |
| <b>Grand Parade</b>                                  | 85521  | 0.90% |
| <b>Blyth Avenue</b>                                  | 5455   | 0.70% |
| <b>Fairview Drive/Thear Close</b>                    | 4028   | 0.50% |
| <b>Cambridge road</b>                                | 28695  | 0.40% |
| <b>Henley Crescent</b>                               | 1606   | 0.10% |
| <b>Thornford Gardens</b>                             | 10846  | 0.00% |
| <b>Thornford Gardens</b>                             | 3881   | 0.00% |
| <b>Hadleigh Road - south section from Leigh Park</b> | 1754   | 0.00% |

- St Laurence Way figures potentially due to an appropriate speed limit. No properties and minimal pedestrian traffic gives the indication it is a higher speed limit than 30mph.

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

12

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)  
to  
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet  
Committee**  
on

**13<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

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

---

## **Requests for Waiting Restrictions**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Moring**  
**Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

---

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

- 1.1 For the Traffic and Parking Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new restrictions/traffic Regulation Orders in accordance with the statutory processes.

### **2. Recommendation**

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

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

### **3. Background**

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

### **4. Other Options**

- 4.1 Each request needs to be considered on its individual merits and their impact on public safety, traffic flows or parking and wider impact on the surrounding

network. Members may consider taking no further action if they feel it is appropriate.

## **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

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

## **6. Corporate Implications**

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

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

### *6.2 Financial Implications*

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

### *6.3 Legal Implications*

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

### *6.4 People Implications*

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

### *6.5 Property Implications*

- 6.5.1 None

### *6.6 Consultation*

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

### *6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications*

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

### *6.8 Risk Assessment*

- 6.8.1 Neutral.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

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

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

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

## 6.11 *Environmental Impact*

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

## 7. **Background papers**

None

## 8. **Appendices**

**Appendix 1** – List of requests and comments



## APPENDIX 1 – TRO CHANGES/WAITING RESTRICTIONS REQUESTS

| Location                            | Request Details  | Request ed By | Relevant Criteria Points   | Officer comments  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|--|---|
| Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone | Amend existing waiting restrictions and loading bays to create additional pay and display parking. | Officers      | NA   | <p>Following development of a number of premises within the town centre area, there is an opportunity to review existing areas of waiting restrictions and loading facilities to create additional pay and display parking.</p> <p><b>Recommend to advertise proposals.</b></p> |
| Old School Court                    | Propose waiting restrictions in turning area   | Officers      | Planning consent requirement prior to adoption as publicly maintainable highway. | <p>Works to prohibit parking at the dead end of the cul-de-sac prior to adoption of the street in accordance with the planning consent granted. All works are to be funded by the developer.</p> <p><b>Recommend that the proposal be advertised.</b></p>                       |

This page is intentionally left blank