

Public Document Pack
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Traffic Regulations Working Party

Date: Monday, 2nd November, 2020

Time: 6.30 pm

Place: Virtual Meeting via MS Teams

Contact: Tim Row - Principal Democratic Services Officer

Email: committeesection@southend.gov.uk

A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 14th September 2020**
- 4 Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd September, 2020**
- 5 Traffic Regulation Order (Waiting Restriction) in The Maze**
- 6 Traffic Regulation Orders - Objections (Junction Protection)**
- 7 Traffic Regulation Orders (Junction Protection)**
- 8 Traffic Regulation Orders (Waiting Restrictions - Safety Schemes)**
- 9 Traffic Regulation Order (Waiting Restriction) Thames Close**
- 10 Eastern Avenue Safety Scheme**
- 11 Petition - Burges Road Traffic Calming Measures**
- 12 Eastern Esplanade Speed Cameras**

TO: The Chair & Members of Traffic Regulations Working Party:

Councillor R Woodley (Chair),

Councillors K Robinson (Vice-Chair), K Buck, P Collins, D Cowan, T Cox, D Garston,
D Jarvis, A Moring, C Nevin, M Terry and S Wakefield

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Traffic Regulations Working Party

Date: Monday, 14th September, 2020

Place: Virtual Meeting via MS Teams

3

Present: Councillor R Woodley (Chair)
Councillors K Robinson (Vice-Chair), K Buck, A Bright*, P Collins,
D Cowan, T Cox, D Jarvis, A Moring, C Nevin, M Terry and
S Wakefield
(*Substitute in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 31.)

In Attendance: Councillors M Flewitt and D McGlone
L Reed, S Harrington and T Row

Start/End Time: 6.30 pm - 8.00 pm

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Garston (substitute: Councillor Bright).

2 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillor Cowan – Minute No. 4 (Airport Parking Scheme) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has been involved with the issue since for some time and is mentioned in the report;

(b) Councillor Flewitt – Minute No. 4 (Airport Parking Scheme) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has been involved with parking issues since in St Laurence Ward for some time;

(c) Councillor McGlone – Minute No. 4 (Airport Parking Scheme) – Non-pecuniary interest: Has been involved with parking issues since in St Laurence Ward for some time;

(d) Councillor Terry – Minute No. 4 (Airport Parking Scheme) – Non-pecuniary interest: Is a member of the Airport Consultative Committee and has been involved with 2 or 3 companies at the airport; and

(e) Councillor Woodley – Minute No. 4 (Airport Parking Scheme) – Non-pecuniary interest: Daughter is a pilot for EasyJet at the airport.

3 Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 27th July 2020

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 27th July 2020 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

4 Airport Parking Scheme

The Working Party received a report of the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) concerning further requests and alleged issues surrounding the parking areas in the vicinity of the airport. The report also sought the Working Party's views on the preferred way forward,

The Working Party discussed the options in some detail and considered the merits of undertaking consultation on individual roads as set out in Option 3 of the submitted report. It also heard that the concept of a "Southend Pass" and zoning of areas as part of a Boroughwide Parking Strategy were being currently being contemplated. The Working Party therefore felt, on balance, that consultation on any scheme should be delayed until 2021. This would enable the outcome of the discussions on these measures to help inform options this area.

Resolved:-

That Cabinet Committee be recommended that consultation on any scheme for the area around the airport be delayed until 2021 to allow the service to understand the new parking behaviours, including those of the airport, and the outcome of discussions on the potential development of a Southend Pass and the zoning of areas as part of a Boroughwide Parking Strategy.

5 Eastern Avenue Safety Scheme

The Working Party received a report of the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Planning) that presented and update on recent issues that had been experienced in Eastern Avenue and the next steps recommended by the service.

The Working Party noted that a Notion of Motion requesting the installation of average speed cameras in this stretch of road had been considered by the Council at its meeting on 10th September 2020 and referred to Cabinet for consideration.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Traffic Regulations Working Party

Date: Tuesday, 22nd September, 2020

Place: Virtual Meeting via MS Teams

4

Present: Councillor R Woodley (Chair)
Councillors K Robinson (Vice-Chair), K Buck, P Collins, D Cowan,
T Cox, D Garston, D Jarvis, A Moring, C Nevin, M Terry and
S Wakefield

In Attendance: S Harrington and T Row

Start/End Time: 6.30 pm - 8.00 pm

1 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2 Declarations of Interest

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(a) Councillors D Garston and Jarvis - Application Ref No. 20/00181 – Non-pecuniary interest: The applicant's agent is known to them.

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 Application(s)

The Working Party received a report of Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) presenting the exceptional circumstance applications for permanent vehicle crossings (PVX) as set out in Appendix 1 to the report. Applicants or their representatives attended the meeting to present their respective applications.

It was noted that Application Ref No. 20/00018 had been withdrawn by the applicant's agent.

Resolved:-

That Cabinet Committee be recommended that the following PVX exceptional circumstance applications be refused:

Application Reference No. 19/00333
Application Reference No. 20/00137
Application Reference No. 20/00143

Chair: _____

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

5

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee**

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Traffic Regulation Order (Waiting Restriction) in The Maze

**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 agree to the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order in The Maze in accordance with Statutory process following 1 objection has been received.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic Regulations Working Party approve the implementation of the no waiting restriction referred to in Appendix 1 in The Maze and recommend the Cabinet Committee to agree to implement the waiting restriction referred to in Appendix 1 despite the objection received.

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 All requests are assessed and investigated against the policy criterion agreed criteria by the Cabinet Committee in November 2018.
- 3.3 Following approval by The Traffic Regulation Working Party on the 6th November 2014 a no waiting restriction was advertised and an objection was received from a resident regarding land ownership adjacent to no 4 The Maze. The resident contended that this location was not public highway. As a result the waiting restriction was implemented in The Maze but the small section adjacent to No 4 was omitted from the scheme. There followed Court proceedings which resulted in the residents claim of ownership of the small

section of The Maze was dismissed. The councils Legal Department have been consulted and have commented as follows:-

The eastern extent of the highway in the Maze has been based on ownership records at the Land Registry, which include the interpretation of the Court Order dated 8th July 2015. The Court Order has been through legal challenge and is therefore considered accurate and reliable. Any further challenge to the Court Order would need to go through the Courts and should not be considered by the Council unless and until the Court Order is amended.

There does not appear to be a basis for a small part of the adopted highway to be treated differently from the rest of it. Should a decision be made to not extend the lines, such a decision must clearly explain any reasons for treating this piece of the highway differently from the remainder of the Maze. This was also confirmed in counsel's advice.

As a result of the order of the court the waiting restriction was advertised as appears in Appendix 1. 9 letters were received in support of the additional waiting restriction being implemented. 1 objection was received.

- 3.4 The objection from the resident states "Would it be possible for you to send me your reasons for the proposed extension of double-yellow lines adjacent to our driveway at 4 The Maze and in front of 6, The Maze. This land is in private ownership. In his letter of 6th December 2018 Mr Warren stated that the Council has updated its historical records. Please can you send me details of these records.

Please can you take this email as acknowledgement that I should like to speak at the planning meeting when it is arranged.

When I hear back from you and am able to check my records against yours I shall send you all my information. Please advise the name of the person to whom it should be sent."

- 3.5 The objection is based on the waiting restriction being implemented on private land, which is not publicly maintainable highway. The court order dated the 8th July 2015 sets out the extent of the land that is privately owned and we have plotted the extent of highway against this. Our records of the highway in the Maze are therefore accurate at present, but will be reviewed in the event the court order is successfully challenged.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The proposal aims to reduce parking to maximise traffic flow and access to residential properties. by discouraging parking.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

- 5.1.1 Ensure the highway network is effectively managed while maintaining safety and reduction of 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 Where recommended, the source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.

5.3 **Legal Implications**

5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process for Traffic Regulation Orders has been followed.

5.4 **People Implications**

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

5.5 **Property Implications**

5.5.1 None

5.6 **Consultation**

5.6.1 Formal consultation has been undertaken including advertisement of the proposal in the local press and on street as appropriate.

5.7 **Equalities and Diversity Implications**

5.7.1 Any implications have been taken into account in designing the scheme.

5.8 **Risk Assessment**

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such, is likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 **Value for Money**

5.9.1 All works resulting from the scheme design are to be undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process providing value for money.

5.10 **Community Safety Implications**

5.10.1 The proposals in **Appendix 1**, if implemented, is likely to lead to improved community safety.

5.11 **Environmental Impact**

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing this Traffic Regulation Order.

6. Background papers

None

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Notice of Advertisement

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 2020

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Southend-on-Sea Borough Council proposes to make the above Order under Sections 1, 2, 4, and 124 (and part IV of Schedule 9) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended by the Road Traffic Act 1991 and of all other enabling powers and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police in accordance to Part III of Schedule 9 to the act of 1984 as amended by Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 the effect of which will amend the above-mentioned Consolidation Order by the adding of the items listed below and the updating of Map Tile Schedule **J9**

SCHEDULES

To introduce No Waiting at Any Time

File No.	Road	Side of Road	Proposed Description
313	The Maze	Both	from the end of the existing no waiting at any time order in the turning head adjacent to Nos.2,4,6 and 8 The Maze eastwards for approx. 2.3 metres extending round the end section.

Copies of the Draft Order, Plans and Statement of the Council's Reasons for proposing to make the Order may be viewed online at:

<https://www.southend.gov.uk/transport-policies-traffic-regulation-orders/traffic-regulation-orders-consultations/2> or <http://www.southendtraffweb.co.uk/consult/main.html>

Comments on the proposals for or against, together with the reasons for which they are made should be sent in writing or via the southendtraffweb website to reach the **Executive Director (Neighbourhoods & Environment)** and marked for the attention of the **Traffic Management & Road Safety Team at the address below by no later than 15th September 2020.**

All written representations received concerning Traffic Regulation Orders are public documents that may be inspected by any person on demand

A Griffin
Chief Executive & Town Clerk

Civic Centre, Victoria Avenue,
Southend-on-Sea, Essex. SS2 6ER

Date 25th August 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

6

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Traffic Regulation Orders - Objections (Junction Protection)

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 objections and support for Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various proposals for junction protection across the Borough.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Traffic Regulation Working Party consider the comments received to the Orders during the public consultations and recommend to the Cabinet Committee to agree with the officer recommendations and implement the Traffic Orders as drawn**
- 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 proposed restrictions. This process has resulted in the comments detailed in **Appendix 1** of this report. Officers have considered these comments and where possible tried to resolve them. Officer observations are provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

Junction protection aims to reduce congestion, improve sightlines and safety for all road users.

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 and improved sightlines at the various junctions. 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 implementation of these Orders will be met from the capital funding that has been agreed for this project.

5.3 Legal Implications

5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process for Traffic Regulation Orders has been followed.

5.4 People Implications

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

5.5 Property Implications

5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

5.6.1 The formal statutory consultation has been undertaken including advertisement of the proposal in the local press, on street at each location and letter drops to adjacent properties.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

5.7.1 Any implications have been considered in designing these schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

5.9.1 All works resulting from the scheme design are to be undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process ensuring value for money.

5.10 **Community Safety Implications**

5.10.1 The proposals in **Appendix 1**, are likely to lead to improved community safety once implemented.

5.11 **Environmental Impact**

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing this Traffic Regulation Order saved for reduced idling emissions as a result of improved traffic flow .

6. **Background papers**

None

7. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – List of road junctions advertised, summary of comments received and officer observations.

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

Item	1
Location	Various Junctions
What is this request for	To deter parking on the corner of the roads by the introduction of junction protection
Proposal	To introduce No Waiting & No Loading at Anytime
Consultation dates	17 th August to 7 th September 2020
Stakeholder feedback	None
Consultation feedback	See below

Road	Proposed Description	Comments Received	Officer Comments/Recommendation
Thorpe Hall Avenue	From its junction with the roundabout at Acacia Drive northwards for approx.. 30m	1 Letter of Support Received but would like restrictions extended to entrance to car park of flats	The proposed restriction is an extension of existing junction protection and the length as advertised is considered adequate. Proceed to implementation.
Constable Way	From its junction with Raphael Drive north-westwards for a distance of 15m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Turner Close south-eastwards for a distance of 20m		
Elm Road	From its junction with Wakering Avenue eastwards for a distance of 20m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
Eastern Avenue Service Road (Royston Avenue)	From its junction with Eastern Avenue north-westwards for approx.12m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Eastern Avenue south-eastwards for approx.12m		
	From its junction with Royston Avenue south-eastwards for approx.40m		
Cromwell Road/ The Access Road to The Brambles	From its junction with the access road to The Brambles eastwards for approx.12m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with the access road to The Brambles westwards for approx.12m		
	From its junction with Cromwell Road northwards for a distance of 8m		
Hermitage Road	From its junction with Cossington Road eastwards for a distance of 10m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
Grosvenor Road/ Whitefriars Crescent	From its junction with Whitefriars Crescent southwards for approx.16m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Whitefriars Crescent northwards for a distance of 13m		
	From its junction with Grosvenor Road westwards for a distance of 13m		
Cavendish Gardens/ Holyrood Drive	From its junction with Holyrood Drive westwards for a distance of 12m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Holyrood Drive eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Cavendish Gardens southwards for a distance of 8.5m		

Eastwood Road North/ Highbank Close	From its junction with Highbank Close south-westwards for a distance of 16m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Highbank Close north-eastwards for a distance of 15m		
	From its junction with Eastwood Road North south-eastwards for a distance of 10m		
Green Lane/ Parkway Close	From its junction with Parkway Close westwards for a distance of 12m	4 letters of support and 1 general letter of support on this and other roads and 1 letter of objection received. Main comments in support were	These 3 junctions are all in close proximity of each other and are in the vicinity of the local school. Site observations have shown that parents either park in the roads or close to the junctions at drop off and pick up times as there is an entrance to the school from 2 of these closes and 1 from Green Lane itself. Outside of these times all junctions are heavily parked. Green Lane is a busy road at all times of the day with traffic and buses using it to connect to Rayleigh Road. Part of the road is on a bend, there is a mixture of double yellow lines, the school keep clear and bus stops which result in traffic parking close to the junctions making visibility at times dangerous when entering and exiting. All 3 roads are closes with off street parking (driveways) for the residents. The introduction of junction protection at the entrances to all three roads would help improve visibility and safety for all road users.
	From its junction with Parkway Close eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 10m		
Green Lane/ Roach Vale	From its junction with Roach Vale north-westwards for a distance of 13m	Fully Support; will help with entering and exiting roads; will deter parking by parents at drop off and pick up times for nearby school.	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Roach Vale south-eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Green Lane north-eastwards for a distance of 10m		
Green Lane/ Byfield	From its junction with Byfield north-westwards for a distance of 10m	Main comments for objections in relation to Roach Vale include the amount of yellow lines throughout the district is reducing capacity to cope with the parking; loss of parking; residents from Green Lane use the road for parking reducing space for residents of Roach Vale; restrictions along Green Lane will only cause traffic to speed; restrictions are not required and adds additional costs	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Byfield south-eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 12m		
Green Lane/ Wren Avenue	From its junction with Wren Avenue eastwards for a distance of 13m	4 letters of support main comments include the introduction of further measures to reduce speed of traffic; lines need to be further along Green Lane to deter parking for the school; would also like restrictions or traffic calming to deter speeding around bend further east in Green Lane	Site observations at the junction show that the provision of junction protection would help improve visibility; other comments made need to be investigated further as separate measures and have been added to future works programme for investigation and possible introduction of traffic calming measures. Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Wren Avenue westwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 10m		

<p>Green Lane/Nobles Green Road</p>	<p>From its junction with Nobles Green Road westwards for a distance of 15m</p> <p>From its junction with Nobles Green Road eastwards for a distance of 12m</p> <p>From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 40m</p> <p>From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 20m</p>	<p>4 letters of support received; 1 general letter of support on other roads and 1 letter of objection received. Main comments in support were the fact that there are problems with residents parking and the bus and cars having problem turning into Green Lane; the owner of corner property; would like speed reduction measures in the road and road resurfaced; fully supportive of the proposals.</p> <p>Comments against the proposal from the occupier of the corner property are the restrictions are too long; buses only have problems when cars park at the junction and loss of on street parking space. Restrictions are unnecessary.</p>	<p>The junction of Nobles Green Road and Green Lane is a busy junction. Nobles Green Road runs between Rayleigh Road and Green Lane in a north/south direction, the road is a hill with the crest at the junction with Green Lane. Buses use the road to travel southbound into Rayleigh Road. The request for the yellow lines has been requested by the bus company as the buses have problems turning into the Nobles Green Road. Buses travel down this road every 15 mins. The road is busy at all times of the day as traffic use it to gain access to Rayleigh Road. It is also used as rat run to avoid traffic delays further along Rayleigh Road. Site visits confirm that traffic parking at the junction are causing problems for both buses and cars turning into Nobles Green Road. At times vehicles encounter difficulties turning into Green Lane due to the narrowing of the road caused by the parked vehicles. The corner property has off street parking.</p> <p>Proceed to implementation.</p>
<p>Green Lane/ Dandies Drive</p>	<p>From its junction with Dandies Drive eastwards for a distance of 12m</p> <p>From its junction with Dandies Drive westwards for a distance of 12m</p> <p>From its junction with Green Lane southwards for a distance of 12m</p>	<p>2 letters of support and 1 general letter of support on this location and other roads; main comments are: will help with buses turning into Green Lane; will help to improve visibility and safety; would like restrictions on North side of Green Lane to help keep junction clear for turning; would like restrictions to go up to the bus stop.</p>	<p>The junction of Dandies Drive and Green Lane is a busy junction. Dandies Drive runs between Rayleigh Road and Green Lane in a north/south direction, the road is a hill with the crest at the junction with Green Lane. Buses use the road to travel northbound into Green Lane. Site observations have shown that the provision of the lines will help with visibility especially for north bound vehicles at the junction as it will give a clearer view for turning traffic. The request for restrictions on the northside will be investigated for possible implementation in the future.</p> <p>Proceed to implementation.</p>
<p>Hudson Road / Hudson Crescent/ Lambeth Road</p>	<p>From its junction with Lambeth Road westwards for a distance of 12.5m</p> <p>From its junction with Lambeth Road eastwards for a distance of 12m</p> <p>From its junction with Hudson Road northwards for a distance of 12m</p>	<p>1 letter of support main comment in favour of proposals and are needed</p>	<p>Site observations at the junction show that the provision of junction protection would help with visibility.</p> <p>Proceed to implementation.</p>

Hudson Road / Hudson Road / Pinewood Avenue	From its junction with Pinewood Avenue eastwards for a distance of 13m	1 letter of support main comment in favour of proposals and are needed; 1 letter of objection received main comments will impact on parking in other local roads if proposals go ahead. Would like the reduction to length of the yellow lines.	Site observations at the junction show that the provision of this junction protection would help with visibility. Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Pinewood Avenue westwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Hudson Road southwards for a distance of 10m		
Eastwood Rise/ Springwater Road	From its junction with Springwater Road south-westwards for a distance of 15m	16 letters of support main comments include fully support; dangerous junction for crossing due to parked cars; visibility when turning is bad; lines needed badly; whole heartedly support; long overdue.	An over whelming support from the residents. Site observations at the junction show that the provision of junction protection would help with visibility as cars park right up to the junction. This is a busy junction with cars using it as a rat run to avoid traffic on Rayleigh Road and as a rat run through to Green Lane. Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Springwater Road north-eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Springwater Road north-eastwards for a distance of 15m		
	From its junction with Springwater Road south-westwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Eastwood Rise south-eastwards for a distance of 12m		
From its junction with Eastward Rise north-westwards for a distance of 12m			
Oaken Grange Drive/ Alton Gardens/ Hampton Gardens	From its junction with Alton Gardens westwards for a distance of 12m	1 letter of objection received; main points raised include will move traffic further south along Hampton Gardens towards the bend in the road, The road is used as a rat run to avoid congestion around Cuckoo Corner Roundabout and the Bell traffic Lights; the flow of traffic needs to be improved; resident in Hampton Gardens has planted box hedging causing sight problems near the bend.	The comments received do not have a direct impact on the proposals as they are not adjacent to the junction. Site observations show that this is a busy junction, and the introduction of junction protection will help with the visibility for traffic turning in and out of Alton Gardens/Hampton Gardens at the junction of Oaken Grange Drive. Traffic flow is likely to improve after the Bell junction works have been completed. Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Alton Gardens eastwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Oaken Grange Drive northwards for a distance of 12m		
	From its junction with Oaken Grange Drive southwards for a distance of 12m		
Canewdon Road/ Retreat Road	From its junction with Retreat Road westwards for a distance of 12m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Retreat Road eastwards for a distance of 15m		
	From its junction with Canewdon Road southwards for a distance of 10m		
Eastwood Road North/ Chalfont Close	From its junction with Chalfont Close south-westwards for a distance of 16m	No Comments Received	Proceed to implementation.
	From its junction with Chalfont Close north-eastwards for a distance of 17.5m		
	From its junction with Eastwood Road North northwards for a distance of 10m		

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to
**Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee**
on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Agenda
Item No.

7

Traffic Regulation Orders (Junction Protection)

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley
Part 1 Public Agenda Item

For Information Only

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee of the commencement of consultation and implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders in respect of various Junction Protection schemes across the Borough.
- 1.2 The Junction Protection Scheme is a 2 year capital funded scheme. This report is the second of a number of reports that will be presented in 2020/21 and 2021/22.

2. Recommendation

For information only

3. Background

- 3.1 The junction locations referred to in the attached appendix 1 were the subject of requests received from Councillors and members of the public. All of the proposed locations have been surveyed by officers and meet the current criteria for the implementation of the no waiting at any time restriction to provide the appropriate junction protection at these sites. All other junctions without protection will be the subject of a Borough wide survey for implementation of no waiting at any time restrictions later in 2020.

4. Reasons for Implementation of Junction Protection

- 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, general traffic flow and improved sightlines at junctions. 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 implementation of the Order in **Appendix 1**, if approved, will be met from the capital funding that has been agreed for this project.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The statutory consultative process for Traffic Regulation Orders will be followed. Any objections received will be responded to by the service area.

5.4 People Implications

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

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.6.1 Any implications have be taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such, is 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 is likely to 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 Order.

6. Background Papers

6.1 None

7. Appendices

7.1 **Appendix 1** – The draft Traffic Regulation Order advertisement.

Appendix 1

To introduce No Waiting at Any Time

File No.	Road	Side of Road	Proposed Description
159	Glynde Way	North	From its junction with Wick Chase eastwards for 12m
	Glynde Way	South	From its junction with Wick Chase eastwards for 12m
312	Dandies Drive	West	From its junction with Rayleigh Road northwards for a distance of approx. 29m.
		East	From its junction with Rayleigh Road northwards for a distance of approx. 36m
309	High Street Shoebury	East	Outside Nos 72-74 High Street Shoebury
313	Woodside	South-East	From its junction with Hickling Close north-eastwards for a distance of 19m
	Hickling Close	Both	From its junction with Woodside south-eastwards for a distance of 10m
	Woodside	Northwest	From its junction with Wroxham Close north-eastwards for a distance of 12m
			From its junction with Wroxham Close south-westwards for a distance of 12m
	Wroxham Close	Both	From its junction with Woodside north-westwards for a distance of 10m
Woodside	South-East	From its junction with Hickling Close south-westward for a distance of 11m	
315	Eastwood Road	East	From its junction with Belfairs Drive southwards for 22m
			From its junction with Belfairs Drive northwards for 20m

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

8

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee**

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Traffic Regulation Orders (Waiting Restrictions – Safety Schemes)

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

1. Purpose of Report

For the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to agree to the commencement of consultation and implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order in Thames Close in accordance with Statutory processes.

2. Recommendation

2.1. That the Traffic Regulations Working Party approve the commencement of the consultation and implementation of the no waiting restrictions referred to in Appendix 1 and recommend the Cabinet Committee to :

(a) Agree to the commencement of the statutory consultation process to implement the waiting restriction referred to in Appendix 1, and subject to any objections received, they are dealt with by the service area and not referred back to this committee

(b) take no further action.

3. Background

3.1 The locations referred to in the attached appendix 1 were the subject of requests received from Councillors and members of the public. All the proposed locations have been surveyed by officers and meet the current criteria for the implementation of the no waiting at any time restriction at the various locations.

3.2 All requests are assessed and investigated against the policy criterion agreed criteria by the Cabinet Committee in November 2018.

4. Reasons for Implementation of Safety Waiting Restrictions

- 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, general traffic flow and improved sightlines at the various locations. 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 implementation of the Order in **Appendix 1**, if approved, will be met from capital funding that has been agreed for the provision of Waiting Restrictions.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 The statutory consultative process for Traffic Regulation Orders will be followed. Any objections received will be responded to by the service area.

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 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.6.1 Any implications have been taken into account in designing the schemes.

5.8 Risk Assessment

- 5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such, is 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 are likely to 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 Order save for the possible reduction in idling emissions resulting from improved traffic flow.

6. Background Papers

6.1 None

7. Appendices

7.1 **Appendix 1** – The draft Traffic Regulation Order advertisement.

Appendix 1

To introduce No Waiting at Any Time on the following lengths of Road

File No.	Road	Side of Road	Proposed Description
161	Gunners Road	West	From a point opposite the northern boundary of No. 27 Gunners Road south-westwards for 66m
158	Ambleside Drive	South	From a point opposite the west flank wall of the Adult Community College eastwards for approx. 14m
		North	From a point 10m west of the west kerblines of Victoria Road westwards for 13m
171	Clifton Drive	Both	From its junction with Seaforth Road westwards for approx. 12m
			From its junction with Manor Road eastwards for approx. 12m
216	Earls Hall Avenue	South	From a point opposite the boundary between Nos 46 and 48 Earls Hall Avenue eastwards to a point opposite the boundary between Nos 29 and 27 Earls Hall Avenue

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

9

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

**Traffic Regulation Order (Waiting Restriction)
Thames Close**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley
Part 1 Public Agenda Item
For information only**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee regarding the implementation of the extension of the junction protection and the informal consultation with residents regarding potential additional restrictions in Thames Close.

2. Recommendation

For information Only

3. Background

- 3.1 The extension to junction protection of 10 metres has now been implemented. This has been well received by the residents in Thames Close. Feedback has included a request for further restrictions to be implemented in the Close to address commuter parking and ensure access for emergency vehicles. However there is at this stage no consensus on whether this should be no waiting at any time or a time limited restriction. An informal consultation with all residents in the Thames Close will now take place to obtain their views on the following:-
- To introduce a no waiting at any time restriction throughout the Close.
 - To introduce a time limited no waiting restriction throughout the Close.
 - To take no further action.

The outcome of the consultation will be included in a further report for consideration by Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 To obtain a consensus of residents for future restrictions in Thames Close and further consideration by Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

5.1.1 Ensure the highway network is effectively managed while maintaining safety and reduction of 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 Where recommended, the source of funding will be from allocated budgets, where funding is provided from alternative budgets, this is highlighted as appropriate.

5.3 Legal Implications

5.3.1 The formal statutory consultative process for Traffic Regulation Orders will be followed.

5.4 People Implications

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

5.5 Property Implications

5.5.1 None

5.6 Consultation

5.6.1 Formal consultation will be undertaken once a proposal is approved including advertisement of the proposal in the local press and on street as appropriate.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

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

5.8 Risk Assessment

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such, is likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

5.9.1 All works resulting from the scheme design are to be undertaken by term contractors appointed through a competitive tendering process to provide value for money.

5.10 Community Safety Implications

5.10.1 The proposals in **Appendix 1**, if implemented, is likely to lead to improved community safety.

5.11 Environmental Impact

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing this Traffic Regulation Order.

5. Background papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

10

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

Traffic Regulation Working Party
and Cabinet Committee

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Eastern Avenue Safety Scheme

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley
Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To inform the Traffic Regulation Working Party and the Cabinet Committee of the findings of an independent Road Safety Review (RSR) on the westbound carriageway of Eastern Avenue between Weybourne Gardens and Sutton Road.

1.2 To respond to the Notice of Motion received by Council at its meeting on 10th September 2020 (Minute 320 refers). A copy of the Notice of Motion is set out in Appendix 1.

2. Recommendation

2.1 **That the Traffic Regulation Working Party consider the options outlined below and in accordance with the detail provided, that Option A or Option C are agreed as actions as these options reflect the outcome of the Road Safety Review.**

3. Background

In September 2017 a report was considered by the Cabinet Committee following requests for safety cameras to be positioned in Eastern Avenue. Officers liaised with the Safer Essex Roads Partnership (SERP) regarding the site at the time.

Following investigation, Members of the Committee were advised that the proposed location did not meet the criteria set out by the SERP, and therefore the request for the deployment of a fixed safety camera at this location was not recommended. This recommendation was agreed by the Committee and no further action was taken.

In August 2020, following a further collision, requests were received from Ward Members and residents to reduce the speed of this road and install safety cameras.

A notice of motion has been received to install speed cameras along Eastern Avenue. This has been proposed by Cllr Nelson and Cllr Buck and seconded by 17 other Cllrs

- 3.2 The notice of motion alleges that urgent action needs to be taken as residents walls have been knocked down, cars written off and constant excessive speeding witnessed along this stretch of dual carriageway.

As a result of the request, further investigation has been undertaken by officers and independent road safety professionals along with consulting SERP as to the safety camera criteria.

SERP are in the process of agreeing a new policy to be used Essex wide for the installation of safety cameras. The revised policy features a relaxation of some requirements and SERP have assessed the site against these proposed criteria. We have asked when this will be ready but have not received a response to date.

SERP examined the westbound carriageway between Fossetts Way and Sutton Road on 24th August 2020. They advised based on the three year period for collision data, the site does not meet either the existing or proposed criteria.

An independent Road Safety Review (RSR) was undertaken between 24th August and 13th October 2020 for the westbound carriageway of the A1159 Eastern Avenue from Weybourne Gardens to Sutton Road.

Vehicle speed data was collected on Friday 4th, Saturday 5th, Sunday 6th and Monday 7th September 2020 prior to the utility works implemented traffic management measures and Vehicle speeds were collected on Eastern Avenue (near no. 88) approximately 285m east of Sutton Road roundabout. The results by lane and lanes combined are shown in Table 1-1 below for this period. . Comparing the speed measurements from 2016 to the 2020 readings shows a small decrease in vehicle speeds.

TABLE 1 - Vehicle speeds comparing 2016 and 2020 readings.

The vehicle speeds were collected on Eastern Avenue (near no. 88) approximately 285m east of Sutton Road roundabout. The results by lane and lanes combined are shown in Table 1 below for the period 4th – 7th September 2020.

TABLE 1 - Vehicle speeds comparing 2016 and 2020 readings.

Month/Year	Average Speed	85 th Percentile Speed	Average Vehicle Flow	Percentage of Vehicles Exceeding Speed Limit
June 2016	31.3 mph	37.4 mph	14054	5.6%
September 2020	29.5 mph	36.0 mph	18303	6.3%

Collisions resulting in personal injury were reviewed for the 10-year period 1st July 2010 to 30th June 2020 for the westbound carriageway of the A1159 Eastern Avenue from Weybourne Gardens (inclusive) to the give-way lines at Sutton Road Roundabout. A long-term period was chosen to counter the effects of changes in reporting procedures. Collisions are recorded as Slight, Serious or Fatal depending on the personal injuries sustained as a result of the collision.

The collisions occurred at three main locations:

- A1159 Eastern Avenue from Sutton Road Roundabout eastwards to the bends;
- A1159 Eastern Avenue from Bournemouth Park Road to Cromwell Road and;
- A1159 Eastern Avenue/Bournemouth Park Road.

During the 10-year study period, a total of 14 personal injury collisions were recorded on the A1159 westbound carriageway from Weybourne Gardens to Sutton Road. Of the 14 collisions, six were classified as serious and eight as slight; no fatal collisions were recorded.

TABLE 2 - Collisions by Year on Eastern Avenue Westbound Carriageway

2010 (part)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020 (part)	Total
0	1	0	3	3	0	5	1	0	1	0	14

Notes:

Data for 2010 covers the period July – December 2010 and

Data for 2020 covers the period January – June 2020.

Summary of Collisions.

Eastern Avenue from Sutton Road to the bends (4 collisions)

- Eastern Avenue 30 yards east of Sutton Road. A car was queuing in heavy traffic in the offside lane and was hit by the car behind. The collision occurred on 02/07/2014 at 08:35 on a dry road surface and was recorded as a slight injury collision.
- Eastern Avenue 50 metres from Sutton Road. Two cars were apparently ‘racing’ along Eastern Avenue when one car hit a motorcyclist. (The contributory factor ‘aggressive driving’ was attributed to both car drivers by the reporting officer and appears to confirm the racing scenario.) The collision occurred at 06/08/2014 at 19:50 on a dry road surface and was recorded as serious.
- Eastern Avenue 90 metres from Sutton Road. A car lost control for unknown reasons. The car hit a telegraph pole and two parked cars. The collision occurred on 13/01/2016 at 21:50 on a wet road surface and was recorded as slight.
- Eastern Avenue westbound approach to Sutton Road Roundabout, a car pulled on to the roundabout and then stopped suddenly because of an approaching bus. The car behind did not stop and hit the car on the roundabout. The collision occurred on 17/04/2017 at 14:56 on a dry road surface and was recorded as slight.

Eastern Avenue between Bournemouth Park Road and Cromwell Road (2 collisions)

- Eastern Avenue/Cromwell Road. A pedal cycle was travelling east on the Eastern Avenue footway and crossing the Cromwell Road junction. A westbound car on Eastern Avenue was about to turn left into Cromwell Road and the driver braked because of the pedal cycle and was hit by the car behind. The collision occurred on 10/11/2013 at 17:54 and was recorded as slight.
- The location is given as Eastern Avenue only and plotted approximately 40m west of Bournemouth Park Road. The collision involved a nose-to-tail collision between three vehicles in the nearside lane. The collision occurred on 05/06/2016 at 15:16 on a dry road surface and was recorded as slight.

Eastern Avenue/Bournemouth Park Road (8 collisions)

- A car pulled out of Bournemouth Park Road into the nearside lane and a motorcycle approaching on Eastern Avenue moved into the offside lane. The car then moved to the offside lane and collided with the motorcycle. The collision occurred on 16/06/2011 at 16:50 on a dry road surface and was recorded as slight.
- A car turned right from Eastern Avenue towards Bournemouth Park Road and hit a westbound motorcycle. The collision occurred on 29/08/2013 at 15:50 on a dry road surface and was recorded as slight.
- A car turned left out of Bournemouth Park Road and collided with a westbound pedal cyclist on Eastern Avenue. The collision occurred on 31/08/2013 at 13:45 on a dry road surface and was recorded as slight.
- A car turned right from Eastern Avenue towards Bournemouth Park Road and hit a westbound motorcycle. The collision occurred on 03/07/2014 at 13:05 on a dry road surface and was recorded as serious.
- A car and a pedal cycle were traveling westbound on Eastern Avenue approaching a coned-off section towards the Bournemouth Park Road junction. The car collided with the pedal cycle and failed to stop. The collision occurred on 22/02/2016 at 16:35 on a dry road surface and was recorded as serious.
- A car turned right from Eastern Avenue towards Bournemouth Park Road and hit a westbound motorcycle. The collision occurred on 27/05/2016 at 09:46 on a dry road surface and was recorded as serious.
- A car turned right from Eastern Avenue towards Bournemouth Park Road and hit a westbound motorcycle. The collision occurred on 22/06/2016 at 18:20 on a dry road surface and was recorded as serious.
- A car failed to give-way and turned left out of Bournemouth Park Road and was hit by a westbound car on Eastern Avenue. The collision occurred on 26/09/2019 at 06:30 on a wet road surface and was recorded as serious.

As part of the review, four main options were asked to be considered as well as any other appropriate measures which could reduce the occurrence of future collisions.

Option A: Do nothing

Based on the data for collisions resulting personal injury for the latest three-year period ending 30th June 2020, only one personal injury collision was recorded, which is lower than the minimum intervention level applied throughout the borough of four personal injury collisions within a three year period.

This option reflects current practice on intervention levels.

Option B: Reduction in speed limit

An assessment of whether the current speed limit is appropriate to the nature and construction of the road has been undertaken

Given the recorded speeds from both surveys demonstrate that over 93% of vehicles are travelling under the current speed limit a lower speed limit is unlikely to be justified and to gain support from Essex Police.

Based on this information, this option is not recommended by the service.

Option C: Additional signs, hazard warning posts and road markings

- Install SLOW markings on the approach to the bend near Cromwell Road.
- Install a bend warning sign on both sides on the approach to the bend outside number 90 Eastern Avenue.
- Install hazard marker posts to the bend west of Cromwell Road
- Increase the width of the warning lines from Cromwell Road to the Puffin Crossing.

These measures would help to highlight the bend and to reflect the road layout ahead. A 'double-bend ahead' sign (to diag. 513) might be more appropriate and a 'reduce speed now' warning plate could be added.

These measures are warning drivers of a bend and could be considered.

Option D: Vehicle-Activated Sign

Vehicle Activated Signs have been shown to be effective in rural areas but the effect in urban areas is less well documented and local experience indicates there is little long term impact and therefore this is not an option recommended by the service

Option E: Fixed Safety Camera/Average Speed Camera System

As set out in the background information at Point 3 to this report, the location does not meet the current and proposed criteria set by SERP and therefore this Option is not considered viable and not recommended by the service.

Economic Assessment

The estimated costs of Option C is detailed below. Option A has no cost.

- Option C (Bend warning and ‘SLOW’ markings and hazard marker posts) - £7,000

The first-year economic rate of return (FYERR) was calculated for the recommended option using the scheme costs about the average cost of an accident in 2019 in a built-up area of £86,497.21, taken from Table RAS60002 on the gov.uk website. Of the accidents recorded on this section, the two recorded on the bends are the ones mostly likely to be affected.

The rates of return are given below in Table 3 below based on scheme costs, accident costs and potential accident savings.

Table 3 – Estimated First-Year Economic Rate of Return

Option	Accident Savings Potential	Accident Savings/Year	First-Year Economic Rate of Return
C	30%	0.06	£741.00

Option C gives the best rate of return based on the low scheme costs.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The recommended options reflect the outcome of the Road Safety Review and while considering Members and residents’ concerns.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map.

- 5.1.1 Ensuring traffic is managed safely 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 implementing a scheme like this for an average camera system it would be £280k for 8 cameras which a capital would need bid to be agreed.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 None.

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 No public consultation is required for the implementation of the proposals.

5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

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

5.8 Risk Assessment

5.8.1 The proposals are designed to improve highway safety and as such, are likely to have a positive impact.

5.9 Value for Money

5.9.1 Works associated with the proposals 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 could lead to improved highway safety.

5.11 Environmental Impact

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of introducing the proposals.

6. Background Papers

6.1 Deployment of Fixed Safety Cameras considered by the Cabinet Committee on 14th September 2017

7. Appendices

7.1 **Appendix 1** – Notice of motion

NOTICE OF MOTION**Speed Camera on Eastern Avenue**

Along the stretch of dual carriageway on Eastern Avenue there has been a history of accidents along this stretch of road. We have seen residents walls knocked down, cars written off and constant excessive speeding.

Urgent action needs to be taken to try and control the excessive speeds on this stretch of dual carriageway and protect those residents whose lives are being put at risk by this antisocial and dangerous behaviour. Acknowledging that a static speed camera would not be affective along the whole stretch of road, we seek a solution that would be affective and works for all the affected residents.

This Council therefore resolves that it should:

1. Install average speed cameras along the stretch of dual carriageway along Eastern Avenue between Hamstel Road and Sutton Road immediately.

Proposed By: Cllr Nelson Cllr Buck

Seconded By:

Cllr Cox
Cllr Boyd
Cllr Burzotta
Cllr Davidson
Cllr Dear
Cllr Evans
Cllr Flewitt
Cllr Folkard
Cllr Garne
Cllr Garston
Cllr Habermel
Cllr Jarvis
Cllr Bright
Cllr McGlone
Cllr Moring
Cllr Salter
Cllr Walker

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

11

Report of Executive Director
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee**

on

2nd November 2020

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic Management & Highways Network

Petition - Burges Road (Traffic Calming Request)

**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 agree to further monitoring of Burges Road following receipt of the petition for traffic calming measures to be introduced as submitted in the petition that appears in appendix 1 below.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. **That the Traffic Regulations Working Party approve further monitoring of traffic speeds and accidents in Burges Road and the submission of a further report, with recommendations to be submitted in 6 months. and recommend the Cabinet Committee to :**

- a) **Agree to further speed monitoring and the submission of an updating report in 6 months.**
b) **Take no further action.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The petition that appears in appendix 1 refers to residents' observations of vehicles driving at excessive speeds and a history of numerous accidents in Burges Road and the surrounding junctions. The petition proposes the following measures to be introduced:-
- An illuminated automatic speed warning sign
 - Implementation of a 20mph speed limit
 - The change of the priority for the north and south junctions
 - The implementation of cul-de-sacs in parts of Burges Road
 - Projections of the footway
 - The introduction of speed humps

- 3.2 The Council has carried out speed monitoring in Burges Road on 2 separate occasions. The results were as follows:-
November 2014 – 26.20% of vehicles exceeded the speed limit.
January 2020 – 27.90% of vehicles exceeded the speed limit.
This ranked Burges Road as 152 in the list of roads that have been monitored for traffic speeds.
- 3.3 The accident/collision data in the last 3 years shows there have been 4 accidents. This does not meet the Council's intervention criteria.
- 3.4 Taking into consideration all of the evidence on file, the safety criteria that is needed to be met, the other roads which have a higher percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit and with a greater accident history, it would be an inappropriate use of the council's resources and funds to currently intervene with the matters raised in the petition.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 The introduction of traffic calming measures does not meet the Council's intervention criteria.

5. Corporate Implications

5.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

- 5.1.1 There are no implications if no action is taken as other roads need to be addressed where there are safety concerns and which meet the Council's intervention criteria.

5.2 Financial Implications

- 5.2.1 There are no financial implications for this recommendation.

5.3 Legal Implications

- 5.3.1 No legal implications have been identified for not progressing with traffic calming measures

5.4 People Implications

- 5.4.1 There are no staff implications as a result of this recommendation.

5.5 Property Implications

- 5.5.1 None

5.6 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 5.6.1 There are no implications as a result of this recommendation.

5.7 Risk Assessment

5.7.1 The risk of not intervening is minimal given the results of speed monitoring and the accident history in Burges Road.

5.8 Value for Money

5.8.1 There are financial implications relating to value for money.

5.9 Community Safety Implications

5.9.1 The recommendation has no community safety implications taking into account the results of speed monitoring and the accident history in Burges Road.

5.11 Environmental Impact

5.11.1 There is no significant environmental impact as a result of not introducing traffic calming measures.

5. Background papers

None

6. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Petition

Canvass of the whole of Burges Road Undertaken By Malcolm Webster(No 148) & Ian Stobart (144)

1. Initial problem- Continuing and increasing traffic recklessly speeding at up to 60mph and using Burges road as a cut through. Over a long period there have been numerous accidents at all junctions & it is clear that this will get worse and lives will be lost.
2. Object- To evaluate the level of evidential support from Burges Road residents & to urgently instigate the best traffic calming methods.
3. Method- To approach all possible residents & acquire signatures from all available households to show the level of urgent support. To then present copy of this support to BERA and to our current local councilor, Mr. Ron Woodley to endorse his efforts to instigate local traffic calming of 20mph. Furthermore, to present copies of the Burges Road residents' signatories both to the Southend Council and to the local police authority to urgently motivate them into action to resolve this serious situation
4. Results of the Survey- Massive overall support from every household that we were able get an answer to the door. From a total of 123 Burges Road households we achieved a total of 107 positive signatures, none negative and only met 3 who were nervous to sign anything.
5. Overview of Resident's Opinion Gathered- We totally appreciate that we & the residents are not qualified to deliberate over this but present it to the authorities as a point of interest. There were inevitable suggestion & are listed in some order of seeming popularity
An automatic illuminated sign telling the motorist when the limit is being broken similar to that in Church Rd Shoebury. This appears to be the least interruptive to the traffic streaming. An improvement to this might be where the actual excess speed is displayed until the legal limit achieved.
Traffic calming of 20mph
Priority of North-South junctions being changed.
Some part or parts of Burges Rd to be cul-de-sac,
Chicane one lane projections of footway
Speed humps (a number of residents did comment that they were not in favour of this option.

We have undertaken this canvass only in the best interests of the community and trust this will be of benefit to the authorities to take much overdue action to resolve this desperately dangerous situation Malcolm Webster & Ian Stobart

This page is intentionally left blank