

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

**Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Monday, 6th January, 2020  
Time: 6.00 pm  
Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

**Contact: Tim Row - Principal Democratic Services Officer  
Email: [committeesection@southend.gov.uk](mailto:committeesection@southend.gov.uk)**

**A G E N D A**

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 4th November 2019 (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 4 Traffic Regulation Orders Objections & Amendments (Pages 7 - 22)**
- 5 Requests for Amendments to Parking Areas (Pages 23 - 32)**
- 6 Requests for Traffic and Parking Items (Pages 33 - 40)**
- 7 Petition Report - Mariner House Southend-on-Sea (Pages 41 - 44)**
- 8 Update of Traffic Flows, Oakwood Avenue (Pages 45 - 50)**

**Members:**

Cllr R Woodley (Chair), Cllr K Robinson (Vice-Chair) and Cllr M Terry

This page is intentionally left blank

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Cabinet Committee

**Date: Monday, 4th November, 2019**  
**Place: Committee Room 1 - Civic Suite**

# 3

**Present:** Councillor R Woodley (Chair)  
Councillors K Robinson (Vice-Chair) and M Terry

**In Attendance:** Councillors K Buck, P Collins, D Cowan, T Cox, D Jarvis,  
H McDonald, A Moring, D Nelson and S Wakefield  
S Harrington, C Hindle-Terry, T Row and B Frost

**Start/End Time:** 6.00 pm - 7.35 pm

### **499 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **500 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillors Buck, Cowan, McDonald – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Clarence Road/Clarence Street) – Non-pecuniary interest: Member of Licensing Committee which deals with Hackney Carriage Stands;

(b) Councillor Collins – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Clarence Road/Clarence Street) – Non-pecuniary interest: Son is a blue badge holder;

(c) Councillors Jarvis and Terry – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Civic Centre Underground Car Park) – Non-pecuniary interest: Use the car park at weekends;

(d) Councillor McDonald – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Clarence Road/Clarence Street) – Non-pecuniary interest: Workplace is in Clarence Road;

(e) Councillor McDonald – Agenda Item No. 8 (Reference back of Minute 308 of Cabinet Committee held on Thursday 12th September 2019 - Requests for Waiting Restrictions: Introduction of speed humps in Thorpe Bay Gardens) – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the vicinity;

(f) Councillor Robinson – Agenda Item No. 5 (Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Osborne Road) – Pecuniary interest: Workplace is in next road and was mentioned in a resident's representation (withdrew);

(g) Councillor Terry – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Eastern Esplanade – Non-pecuniary interest: Lives in the road; and

(h) Councillor Wakefield – Agenda Item No. 6 (Requests for Waiting Restrictions – Clarence Road/Clarence Street) – Non-pecuniary interest: Shop is in the vicinity.

**501 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 12th September, 2019**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 12<sup>th</sup> September 2019 be received, confirmed as a correct record and signed.

**502 Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 24th September 2019**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

**503 Traffic Regulation Orders Objections and Amendments**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that presented the representations that had been received in response to the statutory consultation for a traffic regulation order, the effect of which would, amongst other things, revoke the existing provisions for parking on opposite sides of the road on alternate months in Albion Road and Osborne Road, Westcliff-on-Sea.

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

Resolved:-

1. That the proposed revocation of the existing provisions for parking on opposite sides of the road on alternate months in Albion Road not be progressed.

2. That, subject to the exclusion of the proposals regarding Albion Road detailed in resolution 1 above, 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. 7) Order 2019 be confirmed as advertised.

3. That the changes to the restrictions on vehicular movements around the travel centre, Southend-on-Sea in Church Road (between Chancellor Road and Heygate Avenue), Heygate Avenue (between Chichester Road and Church Road) and Chichester Road between (Heygate Avenue and York Road), to allow all vehicles to proceed in both directions be supported.

Reason for Decision

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

## Other Options

To confirm the order as advertised – this could result in road safety and access issues.

Note: This is an Executive function  
Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee  
Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley

## 504 Requests for Waiting Restrictions

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) that sought approval to authorise the advertisement of the amendments and/or new waiting restrictions at the locations indicated in the submitted 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. Plans of the proposals were displayed at the meeting.

With reference to the proposed scheme in Clarence Road/Clarence Street, the Cabinet Committee was reminded that the appointment of taxi stands would need to be referred to the Licensing Sub Committee for consideration.

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

Resolved:-

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

(i) the removal approximately 17 metres of no waiting at any time on the north-east side outside Nos.4 and 5 Runwell Terrace and replace with 3 pay and display bays;

(ii) to provide additional on-street pay and display parking at various locations in Western Esplanade Eastern Esplanade as set out in Appendix 2 to the submitted report;

(iii) the amendment to the existing waiting restrictions in Ambleside Drive in the vicinity of the Adult Community College (in the meantime, the Interim Group Manager Traffic & Highways undertook to install an “H-bar” marking on the highway at this location to protect the “pram ramp” in the vicinity of 105-107 Ambleside Drive;

(iv) the reduction of the existing junction protection in Leighville Grove, Leigh-on-Sea at its junction with Rectory Grove by 5 metres each side;

(v) the removal of the limited waiting bay outside Nos.151 and 153 Kings Road, Westcliff-on-Sea; and

(vi) the removal of the junction protection waiting restrictions on the north side of Sunningdale Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea that was originally introduced as a temporary basis during construction of the flat development on the corner.

2. That consideration of the review of parking in Clarence Road, Clarence Street and Weston Road, Southend-on-Sea, which forms part of an ongoing town centre review, to create additional parking within this area by the redeployment of some disabled bays, loading facilities and creation of additional spaces, be deferred and that officers be requested to investigate more appropriate locations of the disabled parking bays and investigate the feasibility of introducing some parking bays with a maximum stay of 15 minutes free of charge within the proposed scheme.

3. That the proposed revocation of the current off street parking places Traffic Regulation Order to remove public parking at weekends in the Civic Centre Underground Car Park not be progressed.

Reason for Decision

As set out in the submitted report

Other Options

As set out in the submitted report

Note: This is an Executive function

**\*Called in to Place Scrutiny Committee**

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley

**505 Reference back of Minute 308 of Cabinet Committee held on Thursday 12th September 2019 - Requests for Waiting Restrictions: Introduction of speed humps in Thorpe Bay Gardens**

The Cabinet Committee reconsidered Minute 308 of its meeting held on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2019, in relation to the proposed installation of speed humps in Thorpe Bay Gardens, which had been referred back by the Council at its meeting held on Thursday, 24<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The Committee also had before it a copy of the report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place), together with a briefing note which provided further details on this matter. This included speed data that had been collated following the installation of speed monitoring equipment in the road between 21<sup>st</sup> June and 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019.

Resolved:-

That, in the light of the additional information received since the last meeting, the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) be authorised to publish the statutory notices and undertake the statutory consultation for the installation of speed humps in Thorpe Bay Gardens, Southend-on-Sea in accordance with the proposals submitted to the Cabinet Committee and Traffic Regulations Working Party at its last meeting.

Reasons for Decision

To address the problems of anti-social behaviour in the form of speeding and ensuring road safety.

Other Options

Do nothing – problems would likely continue

Note: This is an Executive function

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

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley

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

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

4

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulation Working Party  
and Cabinet Committee**

on

**6<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

Report prepared by Sharon Harrington,  
Interim Group Manager Highways & Traffic Network

---

## Traffic Regulation Orders Objections & Amendments

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

---

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

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

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 **That the Traffic Regulation Working Party consider the objections and amendments to the 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 Regulation 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 the Southend 2050 Road Map.**

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. Costs for traffic calming measures are funded by the accident remedial budget with the Local Transport Plan funding.

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

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

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

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

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

5.5.1 None

##### **5.6 Consultation**

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

## **5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

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

## **5.8 Risk Assessment**

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

## **5.9 Value for Money**

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

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

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

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of representations received and Officer Observations.  
**Appendix 2** -Details of responses received

**Appendix 1**  
**Details of representations received and Officer Observations relating to the**  
**Report on Traffic Regulation Orders**

Item	1
<b>Location</b>	Hadleigh Road Leigh on Sea
<b>Proposed by</b>	Members
<b>What is this request for</b>	Traffic calming measures
<b>Proposal</b>	Introduce traffic calming features, a raised pedestrian crossing and amend an existing crossing to feature a raised table
<b>Current Restrictions (if any)</b>	Various unrelated to the proposal
<b>Consultation dates</b>	From 07/11/19 to 28/11/19
<b>Number of properties consulted</b>	Approximately 230 and notices erected to advise all road users.
<b>Stakeholder feedback</b>	St Michael's School support the proposals, Leigh on Sea Town Council support the new pedestrian crossing but felt the speed humps/cushions were excessive and would lead to increased pollution with vehicles accelerating between features. In addition, Hadleigh Road is a distributor route therefore buses and larger vehicles should be considered
<b>Consultation feedback</b>	<p>169 comments were received. The comments received are detailed in Appendix 2 and Members of the Committee have had access to all responses.</p> <p>Appendix 2 identifies responses from residents of affected streets, local residents, parents with children at one of the nearby schools and general comments received from respondents who did not identify their address.</p> <p>In summary, 125 comments support the proposals but have also included comments such as ;  Too many humps  Measures should also be in adjacent streets  Support the general idea but do not agree with all the proposed measures.  Do not want a hump near the driveway</p> <p>44 comments were received which do not support the proposals.</p> <p>33 respondents fully object to the proposals and 11 respondents object to part of the proposals or comment that other streets should be included in the overall scheme.</p>

<b>Response rate</b>	<p>74% however, difficult to fully identify as approximately 230 residents were advised of the proposals by letter, all other road users were advised of the proposals by notice and many comments do not include an address.</p> <p>73 comments were from residents of directly affected streets indicating a response rate of 31.7%</p>
<b>% for / against</b>	<p>Cannot identify the percentages as many responses support or object to the general idea of reducing speeds but are not fully supportive of the actual proposals.</p>
<b>Officer Comments</b>	<p>The estimated costs of the works is £150,000.00.</p> <p>While the consultation has resulted in a level of support for the proposals, comments also feature negative points relating to the proposals in their current form.</p> <p>Speed monitoring undertaken in September 2018 and there is a dramatic decrease in the speeds recorded over the last six years.</p> <p>While 4% of vehicles are exceeding the speed limit, the 85<sup>th</sup>ile speed is 26mph and the average speed is 22mph. This places Hadleigh Road outside of the 50 roads subject to excessive speeds. The list is contained in Appendix 3 to this report for information.</p> <p>The collision history of any collisions resulting personal injury has been investigated with two collisions recorded from September 2016 to September 2019. 1 collision was attributed to dazzling sun,</p> <p>1 collision was attributed to faulty brakes, the collision reported an inappropriate speed to be linked to this collision but indicates the driver was not driving in accordance with the conditions rather than the speed limit.</p> <p>We are aware of other collisions resulting in damage to property, however, as these collisions did not result in personal injury, they are not formally recorded on the national database.</p> <p>The speed monitoring has not evidenced speeds higher than other streets subject to complaint and the collision history does not evidence speed as a factor in four or more collisions resulting in personal injury over the last three years.</p> <p>The agreed working practices of this Committee (November 2018) states at point 10 (i) the criteria for consideration of traffic calming measures;</p>

	<p><i>the number of recorded injury accidents at the location in the last three years (at least three with treatable contributory factors).</i></p> <p><i>(This criteria was agreed after this proposal was initially progressed for design and consultation)</i></p>
<b>Officer Recommendations</b>	<p>The speed monitoring does not indicate high levels of excessive speeds (in comparison to other streets monitored), speeds are decreasing compared to six years ago and the history of collisions resulting personal injury do not evidence a level of collisions related to speed as set out in the agreed working practices.</p> <p>Residents from properties near to the proposed crossing at the school are objecting to the proposal and residents of nearby streets feel the measures will merely displace traffic onto other streets.</p> <p>Recommend no further action.</p>
<b>Any other information</b>	<p>While it is accepted that excessive speed has previously been evidenced in Hadleigh Road, speeds have decreased. The number of vehicles travelling at excessive speeds are considerably less than a large number of other streets where no action is being considered.</p> <p>As the Committee has developed an agreed working practice in relation to traffic calming and this street does not meet the agreed intervention levels of three collisions in three years, officers are required to recommend no action.</p>

<b>Item</b>	2
<b>Location</b>	Maya Close / Ness Road - Shoeburyness
<b>Proposed by</b>	Members
<b>What is this request for</b>	Improve visibility at the junction
<b>Proposal</b>	Introduce waiting and loading restrictions, including a built out kerblin.
<b>Current Restrictions (if any)</b>	Junction protection
<b>Consultation dates</b>	From 07/11/19 to 28/11/19
<b>Number of properties consulted</b>	89 and notices erected to advise all road users.
<b>Stakeholder feedback</b>	None

<b>Consultation feedback</b>	<p>5 comments were received.</p> <p>3 comments support the proposals.</p> <p>1 comment did not support the proposals. The resident is looking at applying for a PVX in 2020 and the proposed 20 minute parking bays would affect this as it extends across the frontage. They suggest reducing the 20 minute parking bays be reduced to stop at the boundary of 21/23.</p> <p>1 response made comments regarding the proposals. These were, if the committee are in the opinion that the 20 minute parking bays and the no loading or waiting are to be put in place then consideration has to be given to putting no parking restrictions Mon Fri 9-5 on the North Side of Maya Close, from the corner junction up to the delivery area at the back of the shop. This would allow access for delivery vehicles during the day and allow residents to park during the evenings and weekends.</p> <p>Other comments related to car dealer vehicles parking around the junction. One suggestion of a zebra crossing by the shop. Alternative routes be considered to exit the Close.</p> <p>Two comments suggested the street bin is relocated and one for a build out on the corner. Both of these are included in the proposals.</p>
<b>Response rate</b>	5.6%
<b>% for / against</b>	<p>3.3% For</p> <p>1.1% Against</p> <p>1.1% Neither For / Against</p>
<b>Officer Comments</b>	<p>The collision history of any collisions resulting personal injury has been investigated with 2 collisions recorded in the past 3 years.</p> <p>1 in 2018 involved serious injuries. 1 collision in 2015 was fatal</p> <p>Both involved vehicles pulling out from Maya Close. with visibility limited by parked vehicles stopping for short periods on the double yellow lines to visit a shop.</p> <p>The proposal is for 4 bays (approximately 22m) of 20 minute parking bays on Ness Road. The resident fronting this section is to apply for a PVX in 2020, however, as Ness Road is a classified street, the frontage should be at least 8m x 8m to allow for a vehicle to enter and leave the property in a forward gear. An initial inspection suggests the frontage does</p>

	<p>not meet this requirement.</p> <p>There is a suggestion to provide waiting restrictions on the north side of Maya Close adjacent to the corner shop delivery area to facilitate deliveries. Parked vehicles prevent use of the area as manoeuvring for larger vehicles is difficult.</p>
<b>Officer Recommendations</b>	<p>To agree to the proposals as advertised.</p> <p>To provide a driveway protection marking at the access to the shop delivery area and monitor delivery activity in consultation with the shop. If required, propose further waiting restrictions to facilitate access with any objections being referred to the committee for consideration.</p>
<b>Any other information</b>	<p>Maya Close is on the inside of the bend in Ness Road and visibility can be difficult for vehicles exiting. This is especially the case if vehicles are parked on the double yellow lines at the junction. This is a common occurrence which can be resolved by these measures. The costs of the works is estimated at £10,000.00.</p>



## Appendix 2

Email no.		Resident	Parent	Local	OBJECTION	SUPPORT	COMMENTS
1	1	1				1	
1	2	1				1	Would like flashing speed warning signs too. Manly concerned about commuter speeds 06.00 - 09.00 & late afternoon
1	3	1			1		No need for the proposals as parking in Hadleigh Rd narrows and acts to calm traffic speeds. Narrowing near school and Bus Stand will cause mayhem. The measures will add to pollution and noise. Puffin works perfectly well, no merit installing a raised table.
2	4		1			1	
2	5	1				1	
3	6	1				1	Suggest installing a mini roundabout at junction of Hadleigh Road / Marine Parade / Belton Way East. Also Rectory Grove / Grange Road / Hadleigh Road
4	7			1		1	
4	8			1		1	
4	9	1				1	
4	10					1	
5	11					1	
5	12		1			1	
5	13		1			1	Letter shows concern for safety asking asks for safety measures to be considered
5	14	1	1			1	
5	15		1			1	
5	16		1			1	
6	17	1	1			1	
6	18		1			1	
6	19		1			1	Has experienced close encounters with vehicles herself. Vehicles caught up near the London Road end or junction accelerate when the road is clear which is the section by the school.
6	20		1	1		1	
6	21					1	
6	22		1	1		1	
6	23					1	
6	24	1	1			1	
6	25		1	1		1	
6	26	1				1	Witnesses the speeding first hand. Considers its due to it being a long straight road. Western Road has the same issue. This will benefit children of Westleigh

							School and Belfairs Academy
6	27		1			1	
6	28	1					Supports the crossing outside St Michaels school but is against the speed bumps or altering the road layout. Considers these are more dangerous with drivers speeding between them. Concerned for added pollution with constant speeding up & slowing down.
7	29		1			1	
7	30					1	
7	31			1		1	
7	32	1					Agrees with the tabled crossings but questions the necessity for the 7 pairs of cushions. Says the traffic calming will cause congestion especially during rush hours. Suggests a speed limit of 20mph be installed. Suggests one side parking either alternate months or part day restrictions as commuters are being displaced to Hadleigh Road from other roads with these restrictions.
7	33					1	
7	34			1		1	
7	35	1	1			1	
7	36					1	
8	37	1				1	
8	38	1				1	
8	39					1	
8	40					1	
8	41					1	
8	42	1					Generally supportive of the proposals. Concerned about the cushions proposed outside their house could make it more difficult to entering or exiting. Says cars cannot easily speed at this location and they speed up once past the parked cars and nearer the school. Suggest the cushions are moved nearer Vernon Road by the school.
8	43	1				1	
8	44	1				1	
8	45	1				1	
9	46	1				1	
9	47	1				1	
9	48	1				1	
9	49	1				1	
9	50					1	

9	51	1				1	Would Hope the same could be done in Western Road
9	52					1	
9	53	1				1	
9	54	1				1	
10	55	1				1	
10	56					1	
10	57	1				1	
10	58	1				1	
10	59	1				1	With the raised area at the junction of Salisbury Road / Glendale Gardens would ask for the pedestrian dropped crossing to be realigned so they are in line with each other.
10	60		1			1	
10	61	1				1	
11	62	1				1	
11	63		1			1	
11	64					1	
11-12	65	1			1		Welcomes the situation is under review but objects on the grounds that the inadequate and do not effectively deal with the main problem threatening safety, namely speed. Concerned for safety of all road users around teh area. Specifically raises concern about the 5 way junction at Hadleigh Rd/Salisbury Rd/Glendale Gds, its close proximity to Hadleigh Rd/Western Rd and the increasing number of vehciles using these roads.
11	66			1		1	
11-12	67		1			1	
12	68					1	
12	69			1		1	
12	70					1	
12	71	1				1	
12	72			1		1	Hopefully the Council will look at measures for other parts of Leigh.
13	73	1				1	
13	74			1			Concerned how the proposals may affect the no. 21 Bus Service.
14	75	1				1	Would prefer full width humps rather than cushions. Would like additional humps in Western Road
15	76			1		1	
15	77			1		1	
15	78	1				1	
15	79	1				1	
15	80	1				1	
15	81	1				1	
15	82	1				1	

15	83	1				1	
							Concern about the proposed Bus Stand and build out by the crossing reducing on street parking availability for residents without off street parking.
15	84	1					
15	85	1				1	
16	86	1	1			1	
16	87	1				1	
16	88			1		1	
							Suggests part day restrictions to prevent commuter parking or restrict parking to one side only which would ease congestion.
16	89	1					
16	90					1	
16	91		1	1		1	
16	92		1	1		1	
16-17	93			1		1	Would suggest the same for Marine Parade
							Considers Western Road may get more traffic due to the measures & would like this to be addressed too.
17	94	1				1	
			1	1			Considers traffic calming should be extended along Glendale Gardens and around Westleigh School
17	95		1	1		1	
17	96			1		1	
17	97					1	
17	98			1		1	
							Would like to see measures in other roads too
17	99	1	1			1	
							Considers Western Road may get more traffic due to the measures. Given that humps cause pollution would request speed cameras are installed in Western Road
17	100	1					
				1	1		Object as the plans will push more traffic on to smaller side streets.
17	101						Considers the proposals are a sledgehammer to crack a nut. With the parking considers it is difficult to get up any particular speed and the humps will create pollution. Concern the proposals will push more traffic on to smaller side streets. Supports the tabled crossings.
17-18	102	1		1			
18	103	1				1	
			1				Co-ordinator of Schools Walk on Wednesday which starts from Salisbury Rd/Glendale Rd junction
18	104					1	
18	105	1				1	Asks for the measures to be extended in to Western Road
18	106	1				1	
							The humps do nothing to slow 4x4s if fact encouraging people to buy bigger cars. Its practically impossible to speed around Leigh with narrow roads and parking both side. Would prefer speed cameras.
19	107					1	

19	108			1			Would like to know why all of Western Road has not been included
19	109					1	
19	110	1				1	The proposals will increase pollution & congestion with cars stopping & starting for the crossing and the road will become a car park during school start/finish times. Pollution should be key for a Council that praises eco-friendly environment and sustainable areas. Concerned how the proposed crossing will affect the oak tree in StMichaels School grounds. Concerned the proposed crossing will affect access / egress from their driveways.
19	111			1			Supports the introduction of traffic calming but would prefer chicanes or cameras. Concerned humps cause damage to vehicles over time and would push traffic to quieter residential roads
19	112		1	1		1	
19	113		1	1		1	
19	114	1				1	
19	115	1				1	
19	116	1				1	
19	117			1		1	
20	118			1		1	
21	119			1		1	
21	120		1	1		1	
21	121	1				1	
22	122		1			1	
22	123			1		1	
22	124	1				1	
23	125	1				1	
23	126	1				1	
23	127	1				1	
24	128			1	1		Agrees there is a speeding issue but does not support one road being treated which will push traffic on to other roads. Would like to know why all of Western Road has not been included. Thinks the whole of the Marine estate should have measure installed eg. 20mph or cameras.
24	129		1	1		1	
24	130			1	1		Agrees there is a speeding issue but does not support one road being treated which will push traffic on to other roads. Would like to know why all of Western Road has not been included. Thinks the whole of the Marine estate should have measure installed eg. 20mph or cameras.
24	131	1				1	

24	132			1		1	Suggests the cushions at the London Road end are not needed as little opportunity to speed there. Suggests starting them further along.
24	133			1		1	
24	134	1				1	
25	135			1		1	
25	136	1				1	
25	137	1	1			1	
25	138			1		1	
25	139	1	1			1	
25	140			1		1	
25	141			1		1	
25	142	1					Agrees speeding has got worse but concerned about vibration & possible structural damage from the proposed measures. Would ask other measures are considered such as Siemens Safe Zone speed control cameras.
25	143					1	Concerned the humps will push traffic elsewhere. Agrees something needs to be done in Hadleigh Road but humps are not the answer.
25	144			1	1		She owns a small car and says small cars are unable to sustain many speed bumps, it will break the car. Says humps will spoil the road and disagrees with them.
25	145					1	
26	146						They felt there is a need for traffic calming but object to number of proposed humps/cushions. Hadleigh Road is a distributor road used by large vehicles and buses and with the number of humps/cushions proposed would create pollution. They fully support the proposed zebra crossing on a raised table by the school.
27	147	1				1	Concerned we are proposing to excavate near a tree when they were turned down for a pvx by the same tree due to the root protection zone. The tree has a TPO on it too. They are also concerned about having a zebra crossing outside their house as it will only be used at school times and unlikely to be used other than that. Loss of parking for visitors.
27	148			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	149					1	Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	150			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	151			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	152			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	153			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	154			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing

27	155	1			1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	156	1			1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	157			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	158			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	159			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	160			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	161			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	162			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	163			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	164			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	165			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	166			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	167			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	168			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	169			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
27	170			1	1		Against the proposed zebra crossing
28	171	1				1	
		<b>73</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>126</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank



# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.  
**5**

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet  
Committee**

on

**6<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,  
Interim Group Manager Highways & Traffic Network

---

## Requests for Amendments to Parking Areas

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

---

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

- 1.1.1 For the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider a number of parking related requests submitted by Councillor Wakefield.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. **That the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee:-**
- a) **Agree the recommendations related to each of the requests.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 A list of requests related to parking areas was received from Councillor Wakefield.
- 3.2 Each of the requests have been assessed and comments provided, however, in accordance with the decision taken by the Portfolio Holder to only progress requests which relate to traffic flows or safety, none of the requests are recommended for progression at this time.
- 3.3 A number of the requests have previously been assessed and are currently being progressed. Other requests require significant investment, planning consent or relate to the loss of amenity area for parking where there is little demand. A number of the requests are recommended for progression at a time when the current workload allows.

- 3.4 Members are aware that the service is currently working on the development of a parking strategy, until the strategy is created, consulted on and approved, spending considerable funds on items which may or may not meet the aims of a future strategy is not recommended.

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

- 4.1 Each request has been assessed and where appropriate, a recommendation to progress at a later date provided. Any alternative recommendation would result in a reprioritising of the work programme.

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

- 5.1 The majority of recommendations relate to parking availability and while increasing parking is generally welcomed, where it is unsafe, impractical or unlikely to be used, the recommendation reflects this.

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

- 6.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

- 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 proposals in the local press and on the street as appropriate.

## 6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 the majority of the requests relate to the increase of parking, all assessments have been undertaken considering potential safety implications for all highway users including those with disabilities.

## 6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 Neutral.

## 6.9 *Value for Money*

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

## 6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 Any 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

Item	Findings	Recommendation	Costs
			(estimated)
Arnold Avenue, move parking from east to west side	Although the suggestion would increase parking availability, the current arrangements with unrestricted parking on the east side of the street (where the properties are located) allow residents to park over their own driveways. A proposal to amend the current arrangements was objected to in March 2019 resulting in a decision by this Committee to take no further action.	<b>No Further action</b> as the suggestion has been progressed within the last two years and was not supported by local residents.	£0
Lucy Road, amend taxi rank to shared taxi rank/parking area	This work is underway but requires formal approval by the Licensing Committee who will meet and discuss the provision of a rank shortly.	<b>No Further Action</b> as the request has been previously submitted and is being progressed	£0
Eastern Esplanade Provide diagonal parking to increase spaces	Two options have been considered.  <b>Option 1</b> gaining 18 bays requires construction of a build out, works to the Gasworks entry and removal of the existing pedestrian refuge island. Manoeuvres for large vehicles into the car park would be problematic and the existing hatched area used as a right turn lane serving the car park and Forge Way would require removal, potentially affecting traffic flow on Eastern Esplanade and all vehicles entering and existing Forge Way.  Coaches attempting to enter the car park from the eastbound lane, may need to swing into the westbound lane to complete the manoeuvre.	<b>Option 1 - no further Action</b> due to the adverse impact on access arrangements into the car park and Forge Way, potential impact on traffic flow, increased risk that road traffic collisions may result from vehicles reversing into two way traffic from the parking bays with limited visibility and loss of pedestrian facility.	<b>Option 1</b>  £24,000  For the build out, works to the car park entrance, burning off hatching and existing bay markings, removal of pedestrian refuge and lining works.

		<b>Option 2 no further action</b> due to the potential risk that vehicles will overhang the footway which can be an issue for pedestrians and the increased risk that road traffic collisions may result from vehicles reversing into two way traffic from the parking bays with limited visibility.	£6,000 to remove bay markings, centre hatching and mark new bays
Western Esplanade Provide diagonal bays south side outside Adventure Island to provide a further 10 bays	Amendment to the existing layout would provide an additional 6 parking bays. The area is subject to one way traffic therefore the increased risk of collisions due to limited visibility is low and with an exceptionally wide footway, the risk of vehicles overhanging the footway and impacting on pedestrian movement is unlikely.	<b>Recommend no further action at this time</b> as the request is not related to safety or traffic flow.	£1000 for burning off existing markings and providing new markings.
Shoebury Common South Extend parking towards Maplin Way install 2 extra machines	There is little demand for additional parking with the existing parking areas rarely utilised to capacity. Overspill parking is provided at Shoebury Common North.	<b>No further action</b>	£12,000 for new machines and ground works
Shoebury Common South Install play equipment and harden parking area	The provision of a playground is not a traffic related request and cannot be considered by the Traffic and Highways group. Planning consent would be required for any surfacing works as the area is in a designated flood risk area.	<b>No further action</b> as the request for a play area is not within the terms of reference for this Committee. Colleagues who manage the land are aware of the request and have been asked to update the Councillor.	£0

<p>Shoebury Common North move parking area to the west and increase parking area, reposition entrance.</p>	<p>There is little demand for additional parking in this area which is primarily an overspill for Shoebury Common South. In June, July and August 2019, 166 transactions were made in this area generating £462.00. this indicates no requirement for additional parking.</p>	<p><b>No further action</b></p>	<p>£6,000 to reposition entry would also require planning consent to relocate entrance as this would be considered a commercial vehicle crossing</p>
<p>Blackgate Road Remove verge and lay out diagonal parking chargeable from 10.30am weekends and bank holidays</p>	<p>The area is primarily used during the week by commuters. Additional weekend and bank holiday parking is rarely required as East Beach has a large car park and overspill area. The verge would need to be excavated and hardened. Drainage provided and a new shared footway/cycleway created. The cost is estimated as a more detailed estimate would require in depth investigation as to utilities and drainage provision.</p>	<p><b>No further action</b></p>	<p>£100,000 to remove verge, provide new shared footway cycle way as the existing footway would be used to accommodate parking while maintaining a running lane into the car park. Costs may escalate as utility covers are in the verge indicating services may be located here and these would need relocating.</p>
<p>Prittlewell Chase, Fairfax Drive end Charge for parking between Hospital area and Fairfax Drive</p>	<p>Without protecting the adjacent residential streets, this will displace parking. Charging for parking can be beneficial but if surrounding streets are not protected (for example with permit controls), the existing parking will migrate to these areas.</p>	<p><b>No further action without protection of adjacent streets.</b></p>	<p>£25,000 to progress Traffic Regulation Order and provide payment machines.</p>

<p>Prittlewell Chase Provide parking in central reservation for hospital staff</p>	<p>The central reservation is grassed with significant number of trees. To provide parking would require the levelling of the area as there is significant level changes between the south and north carriageways. Drainage would need to be provided and utilities relocated with costs likely to be in excess of £500,000. Significant design and investigations would be required to provide an estimate of costs.</p> <p>The area also provides natural drainage and removal of the area could result in increased flood risk.</p> <p>The committee has previously approved a consultation with residents and road users of the area to convert some of the resident only bays into shared resident and pay and display bays. this work has not been progressed as yet due to resourcing issues.</p>	<p><b>No further action</b></p>	<p>&gt;£500,000</p>
<p>Station Road Westcliff, Cliffs Pavilion to Hamlet Court Road. Provide additional parking by removing yellow lines</p>	<p>This was progressed as part of the extension of the permit parking controls and additional parking has been provided where safe to do so.</p>	<p><b>No further action</b></p>	<p>£0</p>

<p>Scratton Road Provide parking bays and pay and display machines creating an additional 40 bays (estimated)</p>	<p>Parking is available between 6pm and 8am during the evenings on the south side of Scratton Road (property side). In order to provide pay and display bays on the north side, all other parking would need to be prohibited as the road is not wide enough to accommodate two side parking and two way traffic.</p> <p>Designs could be created with areas of parking on the north side but with passing places provided.</p> <p>Residents are likely to object to the proposal to remove parking outside the properties.</p> <p>The area is part of the town centre area, were pay and display bays be introduced, residents of this section of Scratton Road would become entitled to apply for a concessionary season ticket and park for unlimited time in the new parking bays therefore additional income is unlikely to be generated.</p>	<p><b>Recommend no further action at this time</b> as the request is not related to safety or traffic flow.</p>	<p>£12,000 to progress Traffic Regulation Order, remove existing markings and replace with parking bays, provide signage and payment machine.</p>
<p>Clifftown Parade opposite Prittlewell Square – remove yellow lines and replace with parking bays</p>	<p>Likely to only provide 6 bays as there is a need to maintain parking prohibitions around the easternmost junction of Prittlewell Square for access by larger vehicles. Relocation of donated seat will be required.</p>	<p>The existing shared resident and pay and display parking on Clifftown Parade is not fully utilised.</p> <p>As the request is not related to traffic flow or safety, no further action.</p>	<p>£4000 to progress Traffic Regulation Order, remove existing markings and replace with parking bays, provide signage.</p>



<p>Westcliff Parade cliffs pavilion end. Replace unmarked bays with diagonal parking.</p>	<p>Although this will give additional parking (approximately 8 spaces), this area is part of a Permit Parking Area which does not feature marked bays. The recommendation by the Department for Transport for management of parking in these areas is to not provide marked bays unless the controls differ from the main area ie a loading bay or disabled bay is provided with an area.</p> <p>Proposals to amend this to a shared area for resident permit holders and pay and display were considered in 2018 and rejected by this Committee following a large number of objections.</p> <p>Any additional bays would be therefore be for permit holders use only creating an anomaly of marked resident bays within the area.</p> <p>Any change to the current parking layout would require a build out to protect the pedestrian ramps and create visibility for pedestrians,</p>	<p><b>No further action.</b></p>	<p>£6000 to provide build out and road markings</p>
---	---	----------------------------------	---

<p>Clarence Road Car Park /Alexandra Road</p>	<p>Remove Project 49 parking bays from the car park and increase the ambulance bay in Alexandra Street. make the ambulance bay shared pay and display at weekends.</p>	<p>The ambulance bay has been subject to complaints from nearby businesses and was relocated away from the complainants property in 2018. As such, this cannot be extended without reverting to the previous situation.</p> <p>Project 49 have not advised us that they no longer require the parking facility for the vehicles and providing this in an off street car park is beneficial compared to decreasing on street parking availability.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action at this time as the request is not related to safety or traffic flow.</b></p>	<p>£3000 to progress Traffic Regulation Order and amend signage.</p>
---	--	---	--

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)  
to  
**Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet  
Committee**  
on  
**6<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

Agenda  
Item No.

**6**

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,  
Interim Group Manager Highways & Traffic Network

---

## Requests for Traffic and Parking Items

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

---

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

- 1.1 For the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider a number of parking related requests submitted by Councillors. These were submitted in a notice of motion to Council at its meeting on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019 and were forwarded to the Working Party and Cabinet Committee in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8.4.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. **That the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee note and agree the recommendations related to each of the requests.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 A list of requests related to various items have been received from Councillors.
- 3.2 Each of the requests have been assessed and comments provided, however, in accordance with the decision taken by the Portfolio Holder to only progress requests which relate to traffic flows or safety, none of the requests are recommended for progression at this time.
- 3.3 A small number of requests are related to amendments to road layouts and a number also involve major works which are not within the terms of reference for this Committee.

### **4. Other Options**

- 4.1 Should Members be minded to progress any of the requests, the current work programme would need to be re-prioritised.

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

5.1 The majority of recommendations relate to traffic and parking issues, however, there is an agreement currently in place to not progress any requests unless there is a direct impact to traffic flows or safety issues and in accordance with this agreement, the requests are recommended for consideration at a time when the work programme allows. Any alternative recommendations would result in a reprioritising of the works programme.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

6.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

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

6.2 *Financial Implications*

6.2.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.9 *Value for Money*

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

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 None if the recommendation is agreed.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None if the recommendation is agreed

**7. Background papers**

None

**8. Appendices**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Item	Findings	Estimated Cost / Timescales / Implementation	Type of Works	Parking Management Comments	Recommendations
St Mary's Road & St Benet's Road - Short stay parking spaces - Increase permitted parking time from one hour to two hours. Retain not return within four hours.	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	£2,000 Estimate 2020/21	8 Bays in St Mary's and 8 Bays in St Benet's (3 x Taxi Bays 5 x Parking Bays) Replace signs and re-line. Do a new Order.	No traffic or safety issues identified recommend no further action at this time.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Priory Avenue - near the junction with St Benet's Road, remove stretch of double yellow lines on the west side of Priory Avenue alongside the newsagents, to create two short stay parking spaces (maximum stay 30 minutes)	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	£2,000 Estimate 2020/21	Burn off double yellow lines and mark out parking bays. Put signage post up and sign. Do new Order	No traffic or safety issues identified, recommend no further action at this time.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Highlands Shops - London Road - Leigh-on-Sea area. Erect bollards along the kerbs to stop vehicles mounting and driving along the pavement to park outside the shops and remove pavement crossing south of the Parade	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list		Put in bollards at a width restriction to stop vehicles getting through and on to the footway.	This is unlikely to be practical in this area as too many bollards would be required. A Highways Enforcement Team (when agreed and recruited) would be able to enforce the driving over the footway which would be recommended as the Council have these issues all over the Borough.	<b>The terms of reference for the working party is to authorise the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders and consider resulting objections therefore the request is not within the terms of reference. The Design and Townscape Guide requires all other options to be exhausted before bollards are considered and this area is currently to subject to monitoring activity and potential joint working with the Police to address the issue.</b>
Galton Road, Imperial Avenue, Crowstone Road, Alleyn Place - Consultation on one hour parking restriction for one side of each road only. This is to include new layout of the existing / proposed yellow lines staggered on either side of the roads to also provide traffic calming.	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	£55,000 costs which includes enforcement, cost of Order and then approx. £5,000 for lining	Lines to be painted, posts and signs to be put up. Put a new Order in place.	Addressing parking issues in isolated streets merely displaces parking rather than providing an area wide solution. No traffic or safety issues identified, recommend no further action.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Install double yellow lines at the junction of Eastwood Road North & Chalfont Close	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	£500	Lines to be painted.	This will be picked up as part of the Junction Protection Borough wide scheme to take place in 2020/21	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>

Item	Findings	Estimated Cost / Timescales / Implementation	Type of Works	Parking Management Comments	Recommendations
The length of the carriage way set aside to merge three lanes into one at Kent Elms Corner that the scheme is reviewed with a view to identifying the impact of making the Southend bound, inside lane left hand turn only	Review as part of Kent Elms Improvement Scheme to be undertaken by Major Projects Team	TBC	Unknown	This s a major project outside of the highways remit	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Review the Maya Close / Ness Road junction where there has been one fatality and several accidents	Currently underway. Traffic Regulation Order ready for ad	£20,000		<b>This work is due to start if no objections at consultation</b>	<b>Objections have been received and will be considered within the objections report January 2020</b>
Improve the Ness Road / Campfield Road / Seaview Road / Grove Walk junction to cope with the expected increase in traffic from the construction the of Lidl store with its 140 car parking spaces.	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	TBC	Unknown	As part of the Lidl planning permission the applicant provided a detailed transport assessment which included vehicle tracking for delivery vehicles to the new Lidl store. As the planning considerations included impact on the highway network, officers recommend no further action.	<b>The terms of reference for the working party is to authorise the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders and consider resulting objections therefore the request is not within the terms of reference.</b>
Widen the exit off Ness Road roundabout by the Bridge Garage and increase the space of the pedestrian refuge which carries 40ft lorries all day long and 5 buses in each direction every hour mounting the kerb	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	TBC	Unknown	This request has been discussed on a number of occasions including a site visit with Members and officers where vehicle manoeuvres were monitored and no overrun of the area witnessed. Costs to widen the carriageway will be approximately £45,000 and with no safety or traffic flow issues, this is not justified. Recommend no further action.	<b>The terms of reference for the working party is to authorise the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders and consider resulting objections therefore the request is not within the terms of reference.</b>
Improve the Campfield Road and New Garrison Road junction and the Hinguar School Roundabout to allow for deliveries to the new Lidl store	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	TBC	TBC	As part of the Lidl planning permission the applicant provided a detailed transport assessment which included vehicle tracking for delivery vehicles to the new Lidl store. Any issues should have been raised as part of the planning proposal and cannot be considered by this working party.	<b>The terms of reference for the working party is to authorise the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders and consider resulting objections therefore the request is not within the terms of reference.</b>



Item	Findings	Estimated Cost / Timescales / Implementation	Type of Works	Parking Management Comments	Recommendations
Install junction protection on the roundabout on Thorpe Hall Avenue / Woodgrange Drive junction (southbound) just below the railway bridge	Already identified on Works list - To be picked up as part of the Junction Protection borough wide scheme	Incorporated in the Capital Bid	progressing Traffic Regulation Order, Painting lines		<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Introduce 1 hour parking restriction between 09:00 - 10:00 on the new parking bays in Riviera Drive	This request went to committee in September 2018. Due to objections from residents it was agreed not to proceed with the request (Min 249) refers. The Local agreement in place states that the same request will not be considered again under a 2 year period.	N/A	N/A	This request was progressed in 2018 resulting in significant objections, following consideration by this Committee in September 2018, it was agreed to take no further action. As the proposal has been considered within the last 2 years, in accordance with the agreed working practices, the request cannot be reconsidered at this time.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Safety improvements to the Royston Ave / Eastern Avenue junction	This was reported to the Traffic Regulations Working Party & Cabinet Committee on 06/06/19 (Min 57)(iv) where it was resolved that the amendments to the existing restrictions and the relevant Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised.	2020		Works already underway	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Parking restrictions in Mountdale Gardens, Suffolk, Norfolk, Kent and Surry Avenues to deter inconsiderate parking at school drop-off and pick-up times	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	2020/21	Possible Single Yellow Line timed for school pick up or drop off point. If a permit solution is put forward this could displace traffic to Manchester Drive and surrounding roads.	To be reviewed and reported to future Traffic Regulations Working Party for consideration / approval to progress in 2020/21	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Time restriction or other residents backed permit parking scheme in Vickers Road, Avro Road, Wilmott Road and Bristol Road	These have been reported to the service area previously and are included as part of the St Lawrence Area Review	To be undertaken in Spring 2020 Extra Enforcement costs must be considered.	Single Yellow Line with time plate or permit area. Changing and advertising of the Order.	Isolated streets with permit restrictions have been implemented in a small number of streets and resulted in increased parking pressure elsewhere. By restricting a further group of streets without addressing parking issues in the area will place further pressure in unrestricted streets. No Safety or traffic flow issues recommend no further action.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>
Yellow Box Junction at the junction of Dundee Close, Highlands Boulevard	New request to the service. Scheme to be added to future works list	To be reviewed 2020/21	Painting of a Box Junction	Box Junctions should only be used on major routes where a junction has high volumes of traffic on all arms. Neither street is a major route and therefore unsuitable for a box junction.	<b>Refer to Traffic Regulations Working Party for information</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

7

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

Traffic Regulation Working Party  
and Cabinet Committee

on

6<sup>th</sup> January 2020

Report prepared by Sharon Harrington,  
Interim Group Manager Highways & Traffic Network

---

## Petition Report – Mariner House Southend-on-Sea

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley  
Part 1 Public Agenda Item

---

### 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic Regulation Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider a petition from the Residents of Mariner House which was presented by Councillor Mitchell to Council on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2019 which contained 21 validated signatures requesting parking permits due to the issues they have with parking due to permit holder zones in the surrounding area.

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic Regulation Working Party consider the request and

(a) Thank the petitioner for taking the time to compile the petition and;

(b) That the views of the Committee are sought on this request.

### 3. Background

- 3.1 Mariner House is a car free development granted planning consent through the prior approval process (I.e. where we have less control over how the application is considered). The property was converted as permitted development.

- 3.2 *The Planning Officers comments on the submission under section 6.3 of the planning report clearly stated that “The future occupiers will not be eligible for a town centre parking permit. This site is in a sustainable location with regard to the public transport with good links in close proximity”*

3.3 The Council appreciates this is frustrating for those residents of Mariner House, however, the Council is not responsible for providing parking where a development does not feature dedicated parking for residents as part of the planning approval process. Residents appear to have been misled by the developer.

3.4 In addition, no residents of High Street are eligible to purchase the town centre permit as there is no parking directly on their street, this is the case for any street within the zone which does not feature any on–street parking such.

3.5 However; there are options that could be considered as outlined below:

**Option 1:**

Residents can purchase an annual Season Ticket which allows them to park without additional payment in one of the car parks owned and maintained by the Council and these are currently priced at £600.00 for the year however, there is a waiting list for these permits. Residents can apply to be added to the waiting list and as and when space becomes available, they will be contacted.

**Option 2:**

There are privately owned car parks located near to Mariner House and at The Royals and also South East Essex College.

**Option 3:**

Under committee approval parking permits could be issued to residents of Mariner House to purchase; however this will put additional pressure on the kerb space in the vicinity that already has parking pressures. Members are also advised that this option would enable any property within the High Street to apply for permits and could result in other streets/properties which are currently excluded from purchasing permits being included as eligible to purchase permits.

3.5 Following consultation on these options, the Ward Councillors are in the opinion that Option 3 would be the best option. However, the Committees views on the preferred option are sought.

**4. Reasons for Recommendations**

4.1 To ensure any action is appropriate to the issue and results in a beneficial impact without negatively impacting on parking.

**5. Corporate Implications**

**5.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map.**

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 will be met through any requests received for parking permits.

### **5.3 Legal Implications**

5.3.1 None **5.4 People Implications**

5.4.1 Staff time will be required to organise any agreed recommendation and will be undertaken by existing staff resources.

### **5.5 Property Implications**

5.5.1 None

### **5.6 Consultation**

5.6.1 If the Committee agree to proceed with Option 3 the normal statutory consultation will be carried out

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

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

### **5.8 Risk Assessment**

5.8.1 The requests have been assessed against current parking policies.

### **5.9 Value for Money**

5.9.1 Any works associated with the agreed recommendations 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 requests were assessed against current parking policies.

### **5.11 Environmental Impact**

5.11.1 None, however, should Option 3 be agreed and Members decide to proceed with the residents of Mariner House request, there will be an impact on the number of parking spaces available and could lead to other requests and there will be increased congestion and pollution. Members are also advised that this option would enable any property within the High Street to apply for permits and could result in streets/properties which are currently excluded from purchasing permits being included as eligible properties.

## **6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

None

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

8

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet  
Committee**

on

**6<sup>th</sup> January 2020**

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,  
Interim Group Manager Highways & Traffic Network

---

## Update of Traffic Flows, Oakwood Avenue

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

---

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

- 1.1 For the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to consider the latest data for traffic flows and speeds in Oakwood Avenue further to the decision by this Committee.

### **2. Recommendation**

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

- a) **Note the information contained in this report which demonstrates reduced vehicle movements and speeds in Oakwood Avenue.**
- b) **Take no further action in regard to speed reduction or closure of Oakwood Avenue.**

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 A petition requesting speed reducing measures from residents of Oakwood Avenue was considered by this committee on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2018. A further petition requesting the closure of Oakwood Avenue at the junction of the A127 was received in December 2018 and referred to this Committee for information only on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.
- 3.2 Oakwood Avenue was subject to increased traffic due to the major works at Kent Elms junction potentially resulting in increased traffic using Oakwood Avenue to access the A127 and as such, Members of the Committee decided to defer any considerations until the works had been completed.
- 3.3 Traffic monitoring comparisons for 4<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> October 2019 and August 2018 are outlined in the table below:

Dates	Vehicle Movements	Movements northbound	Movements Southbound	Average vehicle movements per day	Average Speeds
October 2019	30,460	24,031	6,429	2538	21mph  3.9% of vehicles exceeding 30mph
August 2018	36,481	29,688	6,513	3040	24mph  12% of vehicles exceeding 30mph

Overall there has been a reduction in levels of traffic along with a significant reduction in the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limit as shown below:

Vehicle movements: a reduction of 6,021 from 2018 to 2019 vehicles during the monitoring period equating to a reduction in daily vehicle movements of 502 vehicles per day.

Vehicles speeds: a reduction in average speeds from 2018 to 2019 of 3mph and an overall reduction of vehicles travelling in excess of the speed limit by 8.1%.

- 3.4 As detailed, vehicle movements have decreased along with average speeds and the numbers of vehicles travelling in excess of the speed limit.
- 3.5 Further analysis of collisions show that no collisions resulting in personal injury have been recorded since December 2017, the two collisions recorded in 2017 were unrelated to speed and involved a vehicle swerving to avoid an animal and a driver failing to correctly judge the path of a pedestrian crossing the road.
- 3.6 In relation to speed reduction measures, vehicle speed has reduced. . With only 3.9% of vehicles exceeding the speed limit, Oakwood Avenue does not feature within the top 50 streets ranked by the percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit, the list is located at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 3.7 There have been no collisions reported resulting in personal injury which have been attributed to speed and as such, there is little justification in reducing speeds in this street as either an isolated project or as a priority against other streets where large numbers of vehicles are exceeding the speed limit
- 3.7 In relation to the closure of Oakwood Avenue at the junction of the A127, vehicle movements have reduced by approximately 500 vehicles per day following completion of the works at Kent Elms junction.



3.8 It is therefore recommended that no further action be taken on relation to the petitions.

#### **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 an alternative course of action.

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

5.1 The traffic flows and speeds have been monitored with the results showing a reduction in both speeds and traffic volumes and with no speed related collisions recorded, intervention is not justified.

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

6.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

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

6.2 *Financial Implications*

6.2.1 No financial implications if the recommendation is agreed.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

6.3.1 No legal implications if the recommendation is agreed.

6.4 *People Implications*

6.4.1 No people implications if the recommendation is agreed.

6.5 *Property Implications*

6.5.1 None

6.6 *Consultation*

6.6.1 No consultation is required if the recommendation is agreed.

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 any 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**

Report considered by the Cabinet Committee 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

## 8. **Appendices**

**Appendix 1** list of streets where vehicles are exceeding the speed limit.

	<b>Road</b>	<b>% of Vehicles Exceeding Speed Limit</b>	<b>End of monitoring period</b>
1	White House Road	84.60%	03-Dec-18
2	Elm Road, Shoebury	80.00%	19-Dec-18
3	Eastwoodbury Lane	70.30%	24-Sep-18
4	St Georges Park Avenue (20)	63.10%	26-Jul-18
5	St Laurence Way	57.00%	18-Jun-18
6	Green Lane	56.30%	24-Sep-18
7	Station Road, Leigh	56.00%	11-Sep-18
8	Eastern Esplanade/Thorpe Esp	55.40%	12-Jan-18
9	Western Approaches	52.20%	24-Sep-18
10	Crosby Road	50.30%	29-Aug-18
11	Western Road	46.80%	11-Sep-18
12	Marine Parade, Leigh	35.60%	08-Feb-18
13	Gravel Road	35.00%	27-Apr-18
14	Tankerville Drive	33.20%	08-Aug-18
15	The Fairway	28.40%	04-Apr-18
16	Wakering Road, Shoebury	27.80%	19-Dec-18
17	Central Avenue	26.20%	18-May-18
18	Southchurch Road	25.50%	19-Dec-18
19	Fairfax Drive	25.30%	20-Nov-18
20	Hornby Avenue	24.80%	26-Jan-18
21	Elmsleigh Drive	24.80%	23-Oct-18
22	Priory Crescent	24.10%	12-Jan-18
23	Central Avenue	24.00%	12-Dec-18
24	Mountdale Gardens	23.50%	20-Nov-18
25	Fairfax Drive	23.50%	20-Nov-18
26	Kings Road	22.80%	26-Jan-18
27	The Fairway	21.80%	08-Feb-18
28	Western Approaches	21.50%	24-Sep-18
29	Kings Road	21.30%	26-Jan-18
30	Royston Avenue	21.20%	04-Apr-18
31	Eastwood Road North	17.60%	10-Oct-18
32	Marlborough Road	17.00%	18-Jun-18
33	Nelson Road, Leigh	16.20%	27-Feb-18
34	Leighwood Avenue	15.70%	27-Apr-18
35	Rutland Avenue	15.20%	17-Apr-18
36	Poynters Lane (40)	14.90%	12-Jan-18

37	North Avenue	14.10%	12-Dec-18
38	Oakwood Avenue	12.70%	08-Aug-18
39	Station Road, Westcliff	11.70%	29-Aug-18
40	Scratton Road	11.60%	26-Jan-18
41	Maldon Road	11.40%	03-Jul-18
42	Eastwood Rise	11.10%	27-Apr-18
43	Mannering Gardens	10.50%	29-Aug-18
44	Marine Parade, Leigh	10.30%	08-Feb-18
45	Hamstel Road	9.90%	18-May-18
46	Elmsleigh Drive	9.90%	23-Oct-18
47	Leigh Hall Road	8.90%	27-Feb-18
48	Argyll Road	8.00%	26-Jul-18
49	Poynings Avenue	7.60%	18-May-18
50	Elmsleigh Drive	7.10%	23-Oct-18