

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

**Cabinet Committee**

**Date: Monday, 13th September, 2021**

**Time: 6.30 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, 26th July, 2021 (Pages 1 - 4)**
- 4 Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report (Pages 5 - 84)**
- 5 Update on Outstanding Schemes (Pages 85 - 94)**

**Chair & Members:**

Cllr R Woodley (Chair), Cllr P Collins (Vice-Chair) and Cllr C Nevin

This page is intentionally left blank

# SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Meeting of Cabinet Committee

**Date: Monday, 26th July, 2021**  
**Place: Council Chamber - Civic Suite**

# 3

**Present:** Councillor R Woodley (Chair)  
Councillors P Collins (Vice-Chair) and C Nevin

**In Attendance:** Councillors L Burton, A Jones, K Buck, T Cox, D Garston, A Moring,  
J Moyies and S Wakefield  
A Dalton and T Row

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

### **205 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **206 Declarations of Interest**

The following interests were declared at the meeting:

(i) Councillor Buck – Agenda Item No. 7 (Update on Outstanding Schemes – Scheme No. 335 - Highwood Close) – Non-pecuniary interest lives in the road.

### **207 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 10th June 2021**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2021 be received confirmed as a correct record and signed.

### **208 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 17th June, 2021**

Resolved:-

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday, 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

### **209 Traffic Regulation Order (Waiting Restriction)**

The Cabinet Committee received a report of the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) that sought approval of the commencement of consultation and implementation of a Traffic Regulation Orders to introduce no waiting restrictions in the sections of road set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report.

With reference to the proposals for Item No. 2 Ashburnham Road, Southend on Sea, the Cabinet Committee noted that there may other roads within the Borough where one-way traffic flows had been introduced and additional parking could be

provided safely, by revoking sections of the existing waiting restrictions. The Council's Traffic & Highways Business Change & Development Service Manager undertook to refer this suggestion to the Highways Engineers for investigation.

It was also noted that the details of the proposals for Item No 3. London Road near to Cranleigh Drive, Leigh on Sea as set out in the Appendix to the report were unclear as reference had been made in the officer comments section to the introduction of shared use loading bay and pay and display parking. There were no other pay and display parking in this area of the London Road. Having considered the views of the Traffic Regulations Working Party, it was:-

Resolved:-

1. That the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods & Environment) be authorised to undertake the statutory consultation and prepare the requisite traffic regulation order(s) for the introduction of restrictions in the sections of road detailed Item No 1. Rayleigh Road Service Road, Eastwood (Rochford Corner) and Item No. 2 Ashburnham Road, Southend on Sea, as set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report and, subject to there being no objections following statutory advertisement to arrange for the order to be confirmed and the proposals implemented. Any unresolved objections will be submitted to the Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet Committee for consideration.

2. That the proposals in respect of Item No. 3 London Road near to Cranleigh Drive, Leigh on Sea be deferred pending clarification of the restrictions being recommended and the outcome of consultation with the Councillors representing Belfairs Ward, Blenheim Park Ward and Leigh Ward.

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

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley

**210 Report for Information: Traffic Regulation Order (Electric Vehicle Charging Only)**

This matter was deferred until the next meeting of the Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet Committee.

**211 Update on Outstanding Schemes**

The Cabinet Committee considered the report of the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment) that provided an update on the status of the progression of Traffic Regulation Order requests in respect of various Waiting Restrictions and Schemes across the Borough and by Ward.

The Cabinet Committee was informed that all of the schemes listed as "to be advertised by end July" had now been advertised with the exception of scheme

No. 175 in relation to Eastwood Park. This scheme was pending the outcome of the review on the consultation of payment parking in parks.

The Cabinet Committee noted the comments of the Traffic Regulations Working Party regarding the lack of information on the spreadsheet attached at Appendix 1 to the report and suggested that more information be included in future. The Council's Traffic & Highways Business Change & Development Service Manager gave assurances that this would be addressed.

In response to questions regarding the current situation regarding the possible installation of average speed cameras in Eastern Avenue, Southend on Sea, the Council's Traffic & Highways Business Change & Development Service Manager undertook to circulate the details to the Working Party.

Resolved:-

1. That the update be noted.
2. That Councillors be requested to inform the service area by email to [traffweb@southend.gov.uk](mailto:traffweb@southend.gov.uk) if there are any schemes missing from the list.

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

Cabinet Member: Councillor Woodley

**Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_

This page is intentionally left blank

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party  
and Cabinet Committee**

on

# 4

**13<sup>th</sup> September 2021**

Report prepared by: Alistair Turk,  
Senior Policy Manager

---

**Traffic Regulation Order Statutory Consultation Analysis  
(PTO 1009, PTO1010, PTO1011 and PTO1012)**

**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 details of objections and support for draft traffic regulation orders in respect of proposals detailed in the Appendices and to decide whether to implement the proposals and advertise the Making of Orders.
- 1.2 In line with the Controlled parking zone policy adopted by Cabinet in January 2021; any road opting out of a scheme will not be considered for a review for two years, ensuring resources are fairly used and other schemes are not delayed

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 **The Traffic Regulation Working Party: -**
  - a) **Approve the implementation of the proposed measures in streets and parts of streets where there were no objections (see detailed list of locations in Appendix A) by the advertising and Making of Traffic Orders.**
  - b) **Instruct Officers to further review the proposed measures where there is significant objection or where alternative solutions have been proposed by residents (see detailed list of locations in Appendix A).**
  - c) **Not progress the measures where the majority of responses oppose the proposals in Crosby Road**
  - d) **Not progress the measures where the majority of responses oppose the proposals in Thorpe Bay Gardens**
- 2.2 **Recommend to the Cabinet Committee to agree the course of action set out in paragraph 2.1.**

### **3. Background**

3.1 The Draft Orders that are the subject of this report are: -

- PTO1009 Junction protection measures
- PTO1010 Crosby Road proposed waiting restrictions
- PTO1011 Various historic proposed waiting restrictions
- PTO1012 Thorpe Bay Gardens proposed waiting restrictions

The Draft Orders are detailed in Appendix B.

3.2 Draft Orders were advertised in the local press, notices were displayed at appropriate locations on-street, and letters delivered to local properties in the area with information where details of the proposals could be viewed and the process and timescale for making representations about the proposed restrictions. The deposit documents containing plans, the draft Order and the Statement of Reasons were available to view during normal office hours and the Civic Centre and the information was also available on the Councils website.

3.3 Objections and representations must be made in writing (letter or email) and received by the given date in the notices which is usually 21 days from the date the notices are published. A summary and analysis of the representations received is set out in the Appendix A. Any objections to the proposals are measured against the Statement of Reasons and recommendations to accept or overrule objections are also set out in Appendix A.

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

4.1 The proposed Orders have been proposed in accordance with powers under section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 where it appears to the authority making the order that it is expedient to make it: —

(a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or

(b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road,

(c) or for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or

(d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or

(e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or

(f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or

(g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).



4.2 The draft traffic order was advertised in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and the comments and objections analysed.

4.3 It is recommended to: -

- a) only proceed with measures where there is majority support or no objections as the measures aim to reduce congestion, improve sightlines and safety for all road users.
- b) further review proposals where objections or alternative proposals have been submitted by residents.
- c) not progress measures where the majority object to the proposals.

## **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 the Junction Protections Orders will be met from the capital funding that has been agreed for the project.

5.2.2 Costs for implementation of other schemes will be subject to the approval of a capital budget being made available.

### **5.3 Legal Implications**

5.3.1 The advertising and making of traffic regulation orders has been followed in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

### **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 statutory consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the 1996 Procedure Regulations and including the placement of Notices on-street, letter drops to adjacent properties and deposit documents available on the Council's website.

## 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 B**, 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 traffic regulation orders.

## 6. Background papers

None

## 7. Appendices

Appendix A – Summary of representations received and Officer recommendations.

Appendix B – Summary of scheme proposals.

Appendix C – Details of submissions to Public Consultations (TO FOLLOW)

**PTO1009 Junction protection measures****Summary of representations received and Officer recommendations.**

Seventy-six responses were received to the statutory consultation. Of these, fourteen are either queries or do not comply with the requirements set out in the Traffic Order Procedure Regulations (e.g., they do not state a reason for support or objection) and have been overruled.

Forty-nine objections were received of which eighteen are duplicate comments from households which have been adjusted to count as a single response per household. The majority oppose the proposed waiting restrictions on the basis of loss of parking or propose alternative options. In these circumstances it is proposed that a further review of the proposals is carried out and revised options submitted to a later working party meeting.

Thirteen letters of support were received of which eight were received from one household and have been adjusted to count as a single household representation. The streets where there was support for the proposals are Dawlish Drive, Martyns Grove, Mountdale Gardens, Picketts Avenue, Sairard Gardens, and Shepard Close each had a single letter of support.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that streets where there is support for the proposals or where there are no objections should be implemented. It is recommended that a further review of the proposals is carried out where there are alternative proposals put forward by residents and revised options submitted to a later working party meeting.

**Implement as advertised**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Objections and Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Belfairs Ward</b> The Ryde/Woodside; Woodside/Park View Drive; Orsett Avenue/Park View Drive; The Ryde/Ryde Close; The Ryde/Boyce Hill Close; Thorndon Park Drive/Thorndon Park Close; Eastwood Old Road/Berkshire Close; Eastwood Old Road/Fairway Gardens; Eastwood Old Road/Great Hays; Fairway Gardens/Fairway Gardens Close; The Fairway; Kingswood Chase/Manchester Drive; Flemming Crescent/Woodleigh Avenue; Flemming Crescent/Rayleigh Drive; Irvington Close/Danescroft Drive; Danescroft Drive/Danesleigh Gardens; Danescroft Drive/Danescroft Close; Danescroft Drive/Birch Close; Danescroft Drive/Croft Close; Danescroft Drive/Shannon Close; A127/Abbotts Close; Priorywood Drive; Briarwood Drive/Briarwood Close; Oakwood Avenue/Leighwood Avenue; Eastwood Road North/Leighcroft Gardens; Eastwood Road North/Elmsleigh Drive; Eastwood Road North/Priorywood Drive; Briarwood Drive/Priorywood Mews/Drive including northern spur; Leighcroft Avenue/Danescroft Drive;	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>

<p>Eastwood Road North/Orchard Mead; A127/Priory View Road; A127/Falcon Close; Broadclyst Avenue/Bellhouse Crescent; Bellhouse Crescent/Lodge Farm Close; Fairway Gardens/Gleneagles Road; Moor Park Gardens/Gleneagles Road; Woodcutter Avenue/Bohemia Chase.</p>		
<p><b>Blenheim Park Ward</b>          Thornhill/Hawthorns; Harridge Road/Harridge Close Leigh View Drive/Merryfield Approach; Merryfield Approach southern junction; Mountdale Gardens/Stonehill Road; Stonehill Road/unnamed road north of No 8; Stonehill Road/Stonehill Close; Stonehill Road/Tiptree Close; Stonehill Road/Danbury Close; Sandhurst Crescent/Hurst Way; Hurst Way/Juniper Road; Juniper Road/Salt Reach Close; Juniper Road/Thistley Close; Sandhurst Crescent/Sandhurst Close; Mendip Crescent/Martock Avenue; Middlesex Avenue/Kent Avenue; Norfolk Avenue/Kent Avenue; Suffolk Avenue/Suffolk Close; Middlesex Avenue/Surrey Avenue; Cavendish Gardens/Shanklin Drive; Clatterfield Gardens/Wellstead Gardens; Fillebrook Avenue/Greenbanks; Greenbanks/Lindisfarne Avenue; Kingsway/Southborough Drive; Eastwood Lane South/Holyrood Drive; Holyrood Drive/Martyns Grove;</p>	<p>Junction protection measures as advertised</p> <p>No objections</p>	<p><b>Implement as advertised</b></p>
<p><b>Eastwood Park Ward</b>          Brookfields/Brookfields Close; Brookfields/Southernhay; Pinewood Avenue/Southernhay; Pinewood Avenue/Brookfields; Eastwood Rise/Gravel Road; Springwater Road/Springwater Grove; Springwater Grove/Springwater Close; Gravel Road/Tudor Road; Tudor Road/ Springwater Road; Green Lane/Kendal Way; Kendal Way/Paddock Close; Nobles Green Road/Nobles Green Close; Nobles Green Road/Symons Avenue; Paddocks Close between No 18 and 60; Nobles Green Road/Epping Close; Eastwood Park Drive/The Green; Eastwood Park Drive/</p>	<p>Junction protection measures as advertised</p> <p>No objections</p>	<p><b>Implement as advertised</b></p>

<p>Eastwood Park Close;  Eastwood Park Drive/Alan Grove; Alan Grove/Alan Close;  Fairfield Road/Eastwood Park Drive; Hudson Road/ Rowan Walk; Rowan Walk/Steeplefield; Rowan Walk junction at No 82; Each junction within Steeplefield; The Crest; Gipson Park Close; Green Lane/The Spinneys; Fairfield Road/Fairfield Gardens; Fairfield Gardens/Fairfield Crescent; Heycroft Road/Sunnybank Close; both junction of Pinewood Avenue/Chesterfield Crescent; Hudson Crescent/Mansell Close; A127/Hazelwood Grove; Hazelwood Grove/Priory Wood Crescent; Wren Avenue/Ansley Close; Green Lane/Flemings Farm Road; Turning area in Hylands Grove; Dandies Drive/Dandies Close; Dandies Drive/Hartland Close; Macmurdo Road/Macmurdo Close; Sairard Gardens/Sairard Close; Wren Close northern junction; Green Lane/Riverdale; Parkway Close/Winchester Close.</p>		
<p><b>St Laurence Ward</b>  Blatches Chase/Meakins Close; Meakins Close/Fulford Drive; Whitehouse Road/Blatches Chase; Whitehouse Road/Fulford Drive; Whitehouse Road/Whiteways; Burford Road/Burford Close; Orchard Grove/Orchard Side; Orchard Side; Whitehouse Meadows; Whitehouse Road/Whitehouse Meadows; Whitehouse Meadows Whitehouse Road/Aldrin Way; Aldrin Way/Lovell Rise; Eastwoodbury Lane/Mayflower Close; junction in Mayflower Close; Snakes Lane/access to David Lloyd; Eastwoodbury Lane/Bristol Road; Wells Avenue/Bristol Road; Wells Avenue/Vickers Road; Eastwoodbury Lane/Avro Road; Avro Road/Wilmott Road; Eastwoodbury Lane/Vickers Road; Wells Avenue/Wells Avenue access between No 24-26 and 27-29; Eastwoodbury Lane/Eastwoodbury Crescent; Eastwoodbury Crescent/Eastwoodbury Close; Rochford Road/Nightingale Close; junction in Nightingale</p>	<p>Junction protection measures as advertised</p> <p>No objections</p>	<p><b>Implement as advertised</b></p>

Close; Rochford Road/Eastwoodbury Crescent; Rochford Road and access road to No 168; Alton Gardens/both accesses to Derek Gardens; Alton Gardens/Caroline's Close; Alton Gardens/Audleys Close; Hampton Gardens/Keith Way; junction in Fairlawn Gardens; Oaken Grange Drive and access to and including rear of shops; Beechmont Gardens/Marina Close.		
<b>Leigh Ward</b> Leigh/Ashleigh Drive.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>Milton Ward</b> Retreat Road/Wickford Road; Retreat Road.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>Prittwell Ward</b> Jones Close.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>Shoeburyness Ward</b> Ravendale Way/Shambrook Close; Ravendale Way/Sonning Way; Sonning Way/Chertsey Close; Keighley Mews/Ravendale Way; Churchfields/Datchet Drive; Datchet Drive/Eton Walk; Ravendale Way/Weybridge Walk; Ravendale Way/Mountbatten Drive; Mountbatten Drive; Maitland Place; Mountbatten Drive/Montgomery Court; both ends of Frobisher Way/Colne Drive; Colne Drive/Blackwater Close; Frobisher Way/Midsummer Meadows; Frobisher Way/Collingwood Way; Frobisher Way/Barrington Close; Churchfields/Caversham Avenue; Caversham Avenue; Churchfields/Bay Court; Churchfields/Cookham Court; Frobisher Way/access to Asda; Frobisher Way/The Drakes; Frobisher Way/Maitland; Maitland/Dovecote; Maitland/Puffin Place; Maitland/Toucan Close; Artillery Avenue/Military Close; Sandpiper Close; Anson Chase/Bulwark Road; Bulwark Road; Peel Avenue; Peel Avenue/Newell Avenue; Newell Avenue/Castle Close; Constable Way/Goya Rise; Constable Way/Picasso Way; Constable Way/Hogarth Drive; Hogarth Drive/Whistler Rise; Hogarth Drive/Rubens Close;	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>

<p>both ends of Hogarth Drive/Vermeer Crescent; Constable Way/Rembrandt Close.</p>		
<p><b>Southchurch Ward</b>  Archer Avenue/Canterbury Avenue; Archer Avenue/Appletree Close; Archer Avenue/Archer Close; Archer Avenue/Vallance Close; Newington Avenue/Newington Close; Poynings Avenue/Roedean Gardens; Roedean Gardens/Ashurst Avenue; Glynde Way/Roedean Gardens; Glynde Way/Petworth Gardens; Southchurch Boulevard/Glynde Way; Roedean Gardens/Roedean Close; Newington Avenue/Canterbury Avenue; Newington Avenue access to No 64-82; Canterbury Avenue/Lincoln Chase; Vaughan Avenue/Castleton Road; Sackville Road/Vaughan Avenue; Sackville Road/Pelham Road; Pelham Road/Thurston Avenue; both ends of Shoebury Road/Little Thorpe; Shoebury Road/Branscombe Way; Shoebury Road/Cherrybrook; Cherrybrook/Broadclyst Gardens; Cherrybrook/Plymtree; Cherrybrook/Burlescombe Road; Fortescue Chase/Bovinger Way; Fortescue Chase/Wansfell Gardens; Wakering Road; Fortescue Chase/Willingale Way; Eros Avenue/Zeus Road; Maplin Way North/Plymtree; North Shoebury Road/Armitage Road; Wansfell Gardens/Coptfold Close; Wansfell Gardens/Navestock Gardens; Willingale Way access to No 85; Whittingham Avenue/Philpott Avenue.</p>	<p>Junction protection measures as advertised</p> <p>No objections</p>	<p><b>Implement as advertised</b></p>
<p><b>St Luke's Ward</b>  Journeymans Way/The Candlemakers; Journeymans Way/The Cordwainers; Journeymans Way/The Wheelwrights. Cromwell Road; Weybourne Gardens/Waltham Crescent; Weybourne Gardens/Weybourne Close; Royston Avenue/Lyndale Avenue; Royston Avenue/Walsingham Road; Royston Avenue/St Luke's Road; Walsingham</p>	<p>Junction protection measures as advertised</p> <p>No objections</p>	<p><b>Implement as advertised</b></p>

Road/Selbourne Road; St Luke's Road/Cluny Square.		
<b>Thorpe Ward</b> Woodgrange Drive/Wyatts Drive; Woodgrange Drive/Thurlow Drive; Woodgrange Drive/Rodbridge Drive; both ends of Woodgrange Drive; Chelsworth Crescent; Wyatts Drive/Brettenham Drive; Wyatts Drive/Rodbridge Drive; Wyatts Drive/Thurlow Drive; Buttery's/Woodgrange Drive/Brettenham Drive; Johnstone Road/Marcus Avenue; Johnstone Road/Dungannon Drive.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>Victoria Ward</b> Ruskin Avenue/Sycamore Grove; Ruskin Avenue eastern bend; Tennyson Avenue/Ruskin Avenue; Tennyson Avenue/Ruskin Avenue/Browning Avenue/Sycamore Grove/Byron Avenue; Browning Avenue/Maple Square; Walsingham Avenue/Shelley Square; St Luke's Road/Shelley Square; Sycamore Grove access to No 15/15A; Tennyson Avenue access to No 19.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>West Leigh Ward</b> Ewan Way/Ewan Close; Vardon Drive/Marshall Close; St Davids Drive/Ormonde Gardens; St David's Drive/St David's Terrace; St David's Drive/Aberdeen Gardens; Dundee Avenue/Dundee Close; Lime Avenue/Fairview Gardens; Lime Avenue at north end; Eaton Road/Fairview Gardens; Percy Road/Westcliff Drive; Grange Road; access to Leigh Marshes Car Park; Western Road/Medway Crescent; Walker Drive/Henry Drive; Henry Drive/Tennyson Close; Tennyson Close north end.	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>West Shoebury Ward</b> Aylesbeare/Staplegrave; Aylesbeare/Torrington; Aylesbeare/Rackenford; Aylesbeare and its eastern and western arms; Aylesbeare/Yarnacott; Yarnacott western junction; Kingsteignton/Hawkridge; Kingsteignton/Bickenhall; Kingsteignton/Malmsmead, Buckland; Sedgemoor; Shillingstone; Challacombe; Parsons Lawn/Wambrook; Fitzwarren; Maplin Way	Junction protection measures as advertised  No objections	<b>Implement as advertised</b>



North/Hayes Barton; Maplin Way North/Challacombe; Bishopsteignton/Parsons Lawn; Shoebury Road/St Marys Close; Goldmer Close access to No 31.		
--	--	--

### **Further review**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Objections and Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Belfairs Ward</b> Belfairs Park Drive/Woodside; The Ryde/Belfairs Park Drive; Belfairs Park Drive/Orsett Avenue; Belfairs Park Drive/Belfairs Park Close; Eastwood Road/Belfairs Close; Blenheim Crescent/Ellenbrook Close; Blenheim Crescent/Blenheim Mews.	Alternative proposals made – e.g., proposed waiting restrictions too extensive, only support junction protection	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Blenheim Park Ward</b> Picketts Avenue/Essex Gardens northern end; Picketts Avenue/Essex Gardens southern end; Picketts Avenue/Harridge Road; Picketts Avenue/Leigh View Drive; Picketts Avenue/Picketts Close; Picketts Avenue and northern spur; Clatterfield Gardens/St James Gardens; St James Gardens/St James Close.	Alternative proposals made	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Eastwood Park Ward</b> Hudson Crescent/Lawrence Gardens; Hudson Crescent/Mansell Close	Alternative proposals made e.g. yellow line proposals too extensive	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>St Laurence Ward</b> Neil Armstrong Way/Aldrin Way; Neil Armstrong Way/Young Close; Neil Armstrong Way/Anders Fall; Neil Armstrong Way/Borman Close; Neil Armstrong Way/McDivitt Walk; Neil Armstrong Way/Collins Way; various in Collins Way; Neil Armstrong Way and access to No 69-99; Neil Armstrong Way and access to No 33-61; Neil Armstrong Way/Shepard Close; various in Shepard Close.	Alternative proposals made e.g. yellow line proposals too extensive	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Leigh Ward</b> Elm Road/Torquay Drive; Elm Road/Queens Avenue; Queens Avenue/Dawlish Drive; Leigh Hall Road/Queens Avenue; Redcliff Drive/Queens Road; Queens Road	Alternative proposals made e.g. needs a parking scheme	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Southchurch Ward</b> Waking Road; Apollo Drive/Eros Avenue	Alternative proposals made e.g., needs a parking scheme	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>St Luke's Ward</b> Cokefield Avenue/Peartree Close	Alternative proposals made e.g., only supports junction protection	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>West Leigh Ward</b> Woodlands Park/Cosgrove Avenue including turning area; St David's Drive/Braemar Crescent; Braemar Crescent/Aberdeen Gardens; Braemar Crescent/Hamilton Close; Braemar Crescent/Olive	Alternative proposals made e.g., proposed yellow lines too extensive	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>

Avenue; Darenth Road/Chapmans Walk; Chapmans Walk/Chapmans Close.		
--	--	--

## **PTO1010 Crosby Road proposed waiting restrictions**

### **Summary of representations received and Officer recommendations.**

Ten responses were received during the statutory consultation period. One response makes no objection or support for the scheme. One is confused why the proposals have changed but does not give an opinion on the current proposals.

Of the eight remaining comments, two (25%) are from households in Crosby Road in support of the proposals. There are six (75%) objections to the proposals of which three (38%) are from households of Crosby Road.

### **Recommendations**

There is an overall majority opposing the proposals and from households in Crosby Road. On the basis of no overall support for the scheme it is recommended not to proceed and to write to the objectors informing of the Council's decision to drop the proposals.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Objections and Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Crosby Road</b>	Overall majority opposing the proposals	<b>Not to progress</b>

## PTO1011 Various

### Summary of representations received and Officer recommendations.

Thirty-three responses were received during the statutory consultation period. Two responses do not comply with the requirements set out in the Traffic Order Procedure Regulations (e.g., they do not state a reason for support or objection).

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that where there are alternative proposals put forward by residents a further review of the proposals is carried out and revised options submitted to a later working party meeting. It is recommended that streets where there is support for the proposals or where there are no objections should be implemented by the advertising and Making of Traffic Orders.

Location	Objections and Comments	Recommendation
<b>Blenheim Park Ward</b>		
London Road/ Scarborough Drive	There is one objection from a business objecting to the loss of loading provision as it will impact on their business. This will need further investigation as to proceed could result in a public enquiry.	<b>Not to progress this part at this time</b>  <b>Undertake a revision of the design and re-consult</b>
Scarborough Drive opposite No 10	Alternative proposals made	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
London Road on the north side between Scarborough Drive and Madeira Drive	Alternative proposals made e.g. reconsider loading provision	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
London Road on both sides between the Synagogue on the north and No 817 (Gainsborough Carpets)	Alternative proposals made e.g. reconsider loading provision	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
Scarborough Drive replacing bay opposite the side of Fortune Garden takeaway	Alternative proposals made e.g. reconsider loading provision	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
London Road outside No 1163	Alternative proposals made e.g. reconsider loading provision	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Eastwood Park Ward</b>		
Green Lane both sides on bend outside No 2	Opposition or alternative proposals made	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
Ringwood Drive both sides on bend outside No 26-28	Introduce no waiting at any time  No objections received	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
Sairard Gardens	While there was one response in favour of the proposals there was a technical error with the proposals which has meant it has had to be readvertised as PTO1013. For this reason, the measures will not be progressed at this time	<b>Will be brought again to next committee</b>
<b>Leigh Ward</b>		
Seaview Road	Fifteen responses are from Seaview Road: five from one household and two each from two other households making the same response. These have been counted as a single response for the household. One household supports the measures, one household thinks a one-way system should be considered to retain parking. The majority of comments from	<b>Not to progress</b>

	other households who responded object to the proposals on the basis of the loss of parking.	
Seaview Road on the whole west side except outside 24 Broadway and as junction protection on the east side	Alternative proposals made e.g. residents want to park in front of crossovers	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Milton Ward</b>		
Access road off Alexandra Street behind Nos 59-67	Alternative proposals made e.g. does not want DYL	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Shoeburyness Ward</b>		
Rampart Street on the south side west of John Street	Alternative proposals made e.g. yellow line proposals too extensive	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
<b>Southchurch Ward</b>		
Barnstable Close	Two responses were received. One supports the proposals, and one would prefer different operational hours (11am to noon rather than the proposed 2-3pm proposed).	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>West Leigh Ward</b>		
Thames Close	There are four responses although two are duplicates so have been counted as a single response. One household supports the introduction of at any time restrictions as advertised but the other two do not and want only one-hour controls. On the basis of no overall support, it is recommended not to progress the measures.	<b>Not to progress</b>
Thames Close both sides entire length	Introduce no waiting at any time No objections received	<b>Implement as advertised</b>
<b>West Shoebury Ward</b>		
Bunters Avenue	There are three objections to the proposals due to no off-street parking provision and the loss of on-street parking.	<b>Not to progress</b>
Bunters Avenue turning head	Opposition or alternative proposals made	<b>Undertake a revision of the design and bring back to committee</b>
Maya Close between Ness Road and Jena Close	Introduce no waiting at any time No objections received	<b>Implement as advertised</b>

#### **Other comments**

There are seven other objections from residents to the proposals in general based on the loss of overall parking in the town.

## **PTO1012 Thorpe Bay Gardens proposed waiting restrictions**

### **Summary of representations received and Officer recommendations.**

Sixty responses were received during the statutory consultation period. One response is a query and makes no objection or support for the scheme. This has been overruled. Seventeen responses (both for and against) do not provide an address and cannot be checked if they are duplicates. These have also been overruled. This does not change the percentages for responses for or against.

Of the remaining comments, thirteen (30%) are from households in Thorpe Bay Gardens and all are in support of the proposals on the assumption it will prevent alleged anti-social behaviour in the evenings. It should be noted that civil enforcement officers (CEOs) do not have the power to control or enforce anti-social behaviour which remains the responsibility of the police. If there is anti-social behaviour taking place in the area, CEOs would not put themselves at personal risk to issue a 01-penalty charge notice for parking in a restricted street.

There are twenty-nine (67%) objections to the proposals on the basis that the measures are unnecessary and would result in parking being displaced into adjacent residential streets. Ten of the objectors (35%) also question the basis for the proposals in relation to the safety reasons for proposing a traffic order as set out in the Statement of Reasons. These are based on the reasons given in s.1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The objectors argue that there is not a danger to road safety or a problem with the passage of vehicles if vehicles are parked on the south side of Thorpe Bay Gardens especially at nonpeak hours. There is the potential that the Council could face a legal challenge if it were to proceed with the proposals without being able to justify the highway/traffic safety measures.

### **Recommendation**

There is a 2:1 overall majority opposing the proposals in Thorpe Bay Gardens. On the basis alone it is the Officer view that the scheme should be dropped. The potential for a legal challenge on the rationale and validity of the proposals itself is a further reason not to proceed with the proposals.

<b>Location</b>	<b>Objections and Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Thorpe Bay Gardens</b>	2:1 overall majority opposing the proposals	<b>Not to progress</b>

### DRAFT ORDERS

#### THE SOUTHEND BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING, LOADING, STOPPING AND PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER

The extract from the Notice of Proposal for each scheme is set out below:

#### The draft Order PTO1009 – Junction Protection

The general effect of the proposed Order will be to introduce no waiting at any time junction protection restrictions in the following locations:

##### **Belfairs Ward**

The Ryde/Woodside; Belfairs Park Drive/Woodside; The Ryde/Belfairs Park Drive; Woodside/Park View Drive; Belfairs Park Drive/Orsett Avenue; Orsett Avenue/Park View Drive; The Ryde/Ryde Close; The Ryde/Boyce Hill Close; Belfairs Park Drive/Belfairs Park Close; Thorndon Park Drive/Thorndon Park Close; Eastwood Old Road/Berkshire Close; Eastwood Old Road/Fairway Gardens; Eastwood Old Road/Great Hays; Fairway Gardens/Fairway Gardens Close; The Fairway; Eastwood Road/Belfairs Close; Kingswood Chase/Manchester Drive; Flemming Crescent/Woodleigh Avenue; Flemming Crescent/Rayleigh Drive; Irvington Close/Danescroft Drive; Danescroft Drive/Danesleigh Gardens; Danescroft Drive/Danescroft Close; Danescroft Drive/Birch Close; Danescroft Drive/Croft Close; Danescroft Drive/Shannon Close; A127/Abbotts Close; Priorywood Drive; Briarwood Drive/Briarwood Close; Oakwood Avenue/Leighwood Avenue; Eastwood Road North/Leighcroft Gardens; Eastwood Road North/Elmsleigh Drive; Eastwood Road North/Priorywood Drive; Briarwood Drive/Priorywood Mews/Drive including northern spur; Leighcroft Avenue/Danescroft Drive; Eastwood Road North/Orchard Mead; A127/Priory View Road; A127/Falcon Close; Broadclyst Avenue/Bellhouse Crescent; Bellhouse Crescent/Lodge Farm Close; Blenheim Crescent/Ellenbrook Close; Blenheim Crescent/Blenheim Mews; Fairway Gardens/Gleneagles Road; Moor Park Gardens/Gleneagles Road; Woodcutter Avenue/Bohemia Chase.

##### **Blenheim Park Ward**

Thornhill/Hawthorns; Picketts Avenue/Essex Gardens northern end; Picketts Avenue/Essex Gardens southern end; Picketts Avenue/Harridge Road; Harridge Road/Harridge Close; Picketts Avenue/Leigh View Drive; Leigh View Drive/Merryfield Approach; Merryfield Approach southern junction; Picketts Avenue/Picketts Close; Picketts Avenue and northern spur; Mountdale Gardens/Stonehill Road; Stonehill Road/unnamed road north of No 8; Stonehill Road/Stonehill Close; Stonehill Road/Tiptree Close; Stonehill; Road/Danbury Close; Sandhurst Crescent/Hurst Way; Hurst Way/Juniper Road; Juniper Road/Salt Reach Close; Juniper Road/Thistley Close; Sandhurst Crescent/Sandhurst Close; Mendip Crescent/Martock Avenue; Middlesex Avenue/Kent Avenue; Norfolk Avenue/Kent Avenue; Suffolk Avenue/Suffolk Close; Middlesex Avenue/Surrey Avenue; Cavendish Gardens/Shanklin Drive; Clatterfield Gardens/Wellstead Gardens; Clatterfield Gardens/St James Gardens; St James Gardens/St James Close; Fillebrook Avenue/Greenbanks; Greenbanks/Lindisfarne Avenue; Kingsway/Southborough Drive; Eastwood Lane South/Shanklin Drive; Eastwood Lane South/Holyrood Drive; Holyrood Drive/Martyns Grove; Shanklin Drive/Martyns Grove;

##### **Eastwood Park Ward**

Brookfields/Brookfields Close; Brookfields/Southernhay; Pinewood Avenue/Southernhay; Pinewood Avenue/Brookfields; Eastwood Rise/Gravel Road; Springwater Road/Springwater Grove; Springwater Grove/Springwater Close; Gravel Road/Tudor Road; Tudor Road/ Springwater Road; Green Lane/Kendal Way; Kendal Way/Paddock Close; Nobles Green Road/Nobles Green Close; Nobles Green Road/Symons Avenue; Paddocks Close between No 18 and 60; Nobles Green Road/Epping Close; Eastwood Park Drive/The Green; Eastwood Park Drive/ Eastwood Park Close; Eastwood Park Drive/Alan Grove; Alan Grove/Alan Close; Fairfield Road/Eastwood Park Drive; Hudson Road/ Rowan Walk; Rowan Walk/Steeplefield; Rowan Walk junction at No 82; Each junction within Steeplefield; Hudson Crescent/Lawrence Gardens; The Crest; Gipson Park Close; Green Lane/The Spinneys; Fairfield Road/Fairfield Gardens; Fairfield Gardens/Fairfield Crescent; Heycroft Road/Sunnybank Close; both junction of Pinewood Avenue/Chesterfield Crescent; Hudson Crescent/Mansell Close; A127/Hazelwood Grove; Hazelwood Grove/Priory Wood Crescent; Wren Avenue/Ansley Close; Green Lane/Flemings Farm Road; Turning area in Hylands Grove; Dandies Drive/Dandies Close; Dandies Drive/Hartland Close; Macmurdo Road/Macmurdo Close; Sairard Gardens/Sairard Close; Wren Close northern junction; Green Lane/Riverdale; Parkway Close/Winchester Close.

##### **St Laurence Ward**

Blatches Chase/Meakins Close; Meakins Close/Fulford Drive; Whitehouse Road/Blatches Chase; Whitehouse Road/Fulford Drive; Whitehouse Road/Whiteways; Burford Road/Burford Close; Orchard Grove/Orchard Side; Orchard Side; Whitehouse Meadows; Whitehouse Road/Whitehouse Meadows; Whitehouse Meadows Whitehouse Road/Aldrin Way; Aldrin Way/Lovell Rise; Neil Armstrong Way/Aldrin Way; Neil Armstrong Way/Young Close; Neil Armstrong Way/Anders Fall; Neil Armstrong Way/Borman Close; Neil Armstrong

Way/McDivitt Walk; Neil Armstrong Way/Collins Way; various in Collins Way; Neil Armstrong Way and access to No 69-99; Neil Armstrong Way and access to No 33-61; Neil Armstrong Way/Shepard Close; various in Shepard Close; Eastwoodbury Lane/Mayflower Close; junction in Mayflower Close; Snakes Lane/access to David Lloyd; Eastwoodbury Lane/Bristol Road; Wells Avenue/Bristol Road; Wells Avenue/Vickers Road; Eastwoodbury Lane/Avro Road; Avro Road/Wilmott Road; Eastwoodbury Lane/Vickers Road; Wells Avenue/Wells Avenue access between No 24-26 and 27-29; Eastwoodbury Lane/Eastwoodbury Crescent; Eastwoodbury Crescent/Eastwoodbury Close; Rochford Road/Nightingale Close; junction in Nightingale Close; Rochford Road/Eastwoodbury Crescent; Rochford Road and access road to No 168; Alton Gardens/both accesses to Derek Gardens; Alton Gardens/Caroline's Close; Alton Gardens/Audleys Close; Hampton Gardens/Keith Way; junction in Fairlawn Gardens; Larke Rise; Oaken Grange Drive and access to and including rear of shops; Beechmont Gardens/Marina Close.

### **Leigh Ward**

Elm Road/Torquay Drive; Elm Road/Queens Avenue; Queens Avenue/Dawlish Drive; Leigh Hall Road/Queens Avenue; Redcliff Drive/Queens Road; Queens Road, Leigh/Ashleigh Drive.

### **West Leigh Ward**

Woodlands Park/Cosgrove Avenue including turning area; Ewan Way/Ewan Close; Vardon Drive/Marshall Close; St Davids Drive/Ormonde Gardens; St David's Drive/St David's Terrace; St David's Drive/Aberdeen Gardens; St David's Drive/Braemar Crescent; Braemar Crescent/Aberdeen Gardens; Braemar Crescent/Hamilton Close; Braemar Crescent/Olive Avenue; Dundee Avenue/Dundee Close; Lime Avenue/Fairview Gardens; Lime Avenue at north end; Eaton Road/Fairview Gardens; Percy Road/Westcliff Drive; Darenth Road/Chapmans Walk; Chapmans Walk/Chapmans Close; Grange Road; access to Leigh Marshes Car Park; Western Road/Medway Crescent; Walker Drive/Henry Drive; Henry Drive/Tennyson Close; Tennyson Close north end.

### **Milton Ward**

Retreat Road/Wickford Road; Retreat Road.

### **Prittlewell Ward**

Jones Close.

### **St Luke's North Ward**

Journeymans Way/The Candlemakers; Journeymans Way/The Cordwainers; Journeymans Way/The Wheelwrights.

### **St Luke's South Ward**

Cromwell Road; Weybourne Gardens/Waltham Crescent; Weybourne Gardens/Weybourne Close; Royston Avenue/Lyndale Avenue; Royston Avenue/Walsingham Road; Royston Avenue/St Luke's Road; Walsingham Road/Selbourne Road; St Luke's Road/Cluny Square; Cokefield Avenue/Peartree Close.

### **Victoria Ward**

Ruskin Avenue/Sycamore Grove; Ruskin Avenue eastern bend; Tennyson Avenue/Ruskin Avenue; Tennyson Avenue/Ruskin Avenue/Browning Avenue/Sycamore Grove/Byron Avenue; Browning Avenue/Maple Square; Walsingham Avenue/Shelley Square; St Luke's Road/Shelley Square; Sycamore Grove access to No 15/15A; Tennyson Avenue access to No 19.

### **Shoeburyness Ward**

Ravendale Way/Shambrook Close; Ravendale Way/Sonning Way; Sonning Way/Chertsey Close; Keighley Mews/Ravendale Way; Churchfields/Datchet Drive; Datchet Drive/Eton Walk; Ravendale Way/Weybridge Walk; Ravendale Way/Mountbatten Drive; Mountbatten Drive; Maitland Place; Mountbatten Drive/Montgomery Court; both ends of Frobisher Way/Colne Drive; Colne Drive/Blackwater Close; Frobisher Way/Midsummer Meadows; Frobisher Way/Collingwood Way; Frobisher Way/Barrington Close; Churchfields/Caversham Avenue; Caversham Avenue; Churchfields/Bay Court; Churchfields/Cookham Court; Frobisher Way/access to Asda; Frobisher Way/The Drakes; Frobisher Way/Maitland; Maitland/Dovecote; Maitland/Puffin Place; Maitland/Toucan Close; Artillery Avenue/Military Close; Sandpiper Close; Anson Chase/Bulwark Road; Bulwark Road; Peel Avenue; Peel Avenue/Newell Avenue; Newell Avenue/Castle Close; Constable Way/Goya Rise; Constable Way/Picasso Way; Constable Way/Hogarth Drive; Hogarth Drive/Whistler Rise; Hogarth Drive/Rubens Close; both ends of Hogarth Drive/Vermeer Crescent; Constable Way/Rembrandt Close.

### **West Shoebury Ward**

Aylesbeare/Staplegrave; Aylesbeare/Torrington; Aylesbeare/Rackenford; Aylesbeare and its eastern and western arms; Aylesbeare/Yarnacott; Yarnacott western junction; Kingsteignton/Hawkrigde; Kingsteignton/Bickenhall; Kingsteignton/Malmsmead, Buckland; Sedgemoor; Shillingstone; Challacombe; Parsons Lawn/Wambrook; Fitzwarren; Maplin Way North/Hayes Barton; Maplin Way North/Challacombe; Bishopsteignton/Parsons Lawn; Shoebury Road/St Marys Close; Goldmer Close access to No 31.



### **Southchurch Ward**

Archer Avenue/Canterbury Avenue; Archer Avenue/Appletree Close; Archer Avenue/Archer Close; Archer Avenue/Vallance Close; Newington Avenue/Newington Close; Poynings Avenue/Roedean Gardens; Roedean Gardens/Ashurst Avenue; Glynde Way/Ashurst Avenue; Glynde Way/Roedean Gardens; Glynde Way/Petworth Gardens; Southchurch Boulevard/Glynde Way; Roedean Gardens/Roedean Close; Newington Avenue/Canterbury Avenue; Newington Avenue access to No 64-82; Canterbury Avenue/Lincoln Chase; Vaughan Avenue/Castleton Road; Sackville Road/Vaughan Avenue; Sackville Road/Pelham Road; Pelham Road/Thurston Avenue; both ends of Shoebury Road/Little Thorpe; Shoebury Road/Branscombe Way; Shoebury Road/Cherrybrook; Cherrybrook/Broadclyst Gardens; Cherrybrook/Plymtree; Cherrybrook/Burlescombe Road; Fortescue Chase/Bovinger Way; Fortescue Chase/Wansfell Gardens; Waking Road; Fortescue Chase/Willingale Way; Apollo Drive/Eros Avenue; Eros Avenue/Zeus Road; Maplin Way North/Plymtree; North Shoebury Road/Armitage Road; Wansfell Gardens/Coptfold Close; Wansfell Gardens/Navestock Gardens; Willingale Way access to No 85; Whittingham Avenue/Philpott Avenue.

### **Thorpe Ward**

Woodgrange Drive/Wyatts Drive; Woodgrange Drive/Thurlow Drive; Woodgrange Drive/Rodbridge Drive; both ends of Woodgrange Drive; Chelsworth Crescent; Wyatts Drive/Brettenham Drive; Wyatts Drive/Rodbridge Drive; Wyatts Drive/Thurlow Drive; Butters/Woodgrange Drive/Brettenham Drive; Johnstone Road/Marcus Avenue; Johnstone Road/Dungannon Drive.

## **The draft Order PTO1010 - Crosby Road proposed waiting restrictions**

The general effect of the proposed Order will be to introduce no waiting 1.00pm to 3.00pm Monday to Friday in Crosby Road in the section of roads described in the Schedule below and updating Map Tiles **T13 and T14**.

### **SCHEDULE**

**To introduce No Waiting 1.00pm to 3.00pm Monday to Friday on the following lengths of Road**

<b>File Ref</b>	<b>Road</b>	<b>Side of Road</b>	<b>Proposed Description</b>
<b>120</b>	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>Between Nos. 31 to 37</b>
	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Outside Nos. 26 to 34</b>
	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>From approx. 46m west of its junction with Crowstone Road westwards for 93m</b>
	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>From approx. 10m west of its junction with Crowstone Road westwards for 41m</b>
	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>From approx. 46m east of its junction with Chalkwell Avenue eastwards for 42m</b>
	<b>Crosby Road</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Between Nos. 38 and 46 Crosby Road</b>

## **The draft Order PTO1011 - Various historic proposed waiting restrictions**

The general effect of the proposed Order will be to: -

### **a) introduce no waiting at any time on:**

- i) Bunters Avenue turning head
- ii) Green Lane both sides on bend outside No 2
- iii) London Road outside No 1163
- iv) Maya Close between Ness Road and Jena Close
- v) Ringwood Drive both sides on bend outside No 26-28
- vi) Sairard Gardens both sides on the bend outside No 23
- vii) Scarborough Drive replacing bay opposite the side of Fortune Garden takeaway
- viii) Seaview Road on the whole west side except outside 24 Broadway and as junction protection on the east side
- ix) Access road off Alexandra Street behind Nos 59-67
- x) Thames Close both side for entire length 23

**b) introduce no waiting Mon-Fri, 2pm-3pm**

- i) Barnstable Close both sides

**c) Limited Waiting Mon- Sat 9am-6pm max stay 4hrs no return within 4 hours**

- i) London Road on both sides between the Synagogue on the north and No 817 (Gainsborough Carpets)

**d) Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm max stay 20 mins no return within 4 hours**

- i) London Road on the north side between Scarborough Drive and Madeira Drive
- ii) Scarborough Drive opposite No 10

**e) Payment parking 8am 6pm**

- i) Rampart Street on the south side west of John Street

**The draft Order PTO1012 - Thorpe Bay Gardens proposed waiting restrictions**

The general effect of the Order will be to revoke the current seasonal restrictions and introduce no waiting 8.00am to 10.00pm Monday – Sunday in Thorpe Bay Gardens from its junction with St Augustine's Avenue to its eastern extremity.

**TT1009 Junction Protections**

**All Comments**

<p>19<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: There are already double yellow lines in the area indicated on the map - what difference will be achieved with the proposed change? Many thanks</p>
<p>17<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: SHEPARD CLOSE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The Statement of Reasons for TT1009 states that the draft order is intended to improve safety, improve visibility, and improve access by relocating parking away from junctions. Comments purely in relation to the proposals for Shepard Close. Comments in relation to the Shepard Close/Neil Armstrong Way junction are separate. I have spoken to [redacted] all of whom confirmed [redacted], have not requested this or aware of any other [redacted]who have mentioned needing such measures. Firstly I believe these plans have been suggested without a site visit which would have provided insight into the corners, road/pavement layout and a realistic view of the expected usage, secondly we are unaware of any complaints being made in relation to safety, visibility or restricted access. Google street view for the close is significantly out of date but also do not show that there is an issue with these corners, however, it does show the layout. The turnings are not roads, they are the estate traditional red pavement followed by characteristic pebbles and then into a black speckle type asphalt. The proposals are not possible as you would be unable to cross the pavement with the yellow lines and aesthetically ruin this character. The close is small with limited on and off-street parking, however, these corners are not used for parking by any residents. I asked[redacted]to undertake a site visit and [redacted]confirmed that the planned proposal was unnecessary and a potential error due to the comments above. The plans do not fit with your proposed justifications and they also suggest they would be 10 meters deep, they would hinder parking that does not cause any obstruction and create further issues at other points within the close due to the limited parking. The only vehicles that struggle to navigate these corners are large trucks including rubbish collection. However, the close has not been designed to allow for this sort of access and you would have to prohibit parking on the opposite sides of the road as well and then you will be removing perfectly reasonable parking spaces to suit the weekly rubbish collection and odd delivery which neighbours can accommodate. Most of the rubbish collection trucks just sit outside these turnings and walk the rubbish to the truck which is a much safer option given that the houses on these entrances have front doors on the road. Comment in relation to Shepard Close/Neil Armstrong Way, I can confirm that I and [redacted] have spoken to fully support this proposal and agree that it meets all the justifications. It is dangerous to pull out of Shepard Close into Neil Armstrong Way with no parking restrictions. I therefore reject the proposal of various yellow lines within</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	Shepard Close and recommend it is altered to reflect just yellow lines on the entrance to Shepard Close where it meets Neil Armstrong Way.
17 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>I am writing to oppose the prevention of parking down the A127/Falcon Close. There are no other areas for us[redacted]to park. The other roads near by are used up by their residence to park and taking it away from us all will mean we all have to park miles away from our houses. This is not realistic nor safe being near a busy road. Especially with children walking and running around. You will have people walking for miles and it isn't right or safe.</p> <p>We are all fully against this.</p> <p>Many thanks for taking the time to read. I hope you do not take away our right to park [redacted] We have no other space to park.</p> <p>And you have a duty not to put children at risk which they will be if they have to walk for miles near a busy road like the A127.</p>
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	<p><b>Subject:</b> Larke Rise</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>I am contacting you in relation to the proposed yellow lines to be place on larke rise and bell walk.</p> <p>I would like to express that I am unhappy about this as this would cause a great and unnecessary inconvenience for me and the residents.</p> <p>There has never been a requirement and do not understand the purpose or the reasonings behind this.</p> <p>This will cause great problems going forward as there will be no allocated parking for visitors or workmen.</p> <p>Could you please forward this complaint to the necessary department.</p> <p>Thank you for your assistance in this matter</p> <p>Regards [redacted]</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>I have not heard back yet so wanted to lodge my comments prior to the 6th August.</p> <p>I wish to oppose the length of yellow lines proposed outside my property. The reasons for this is that it would devalue my property.</p> <p>I am happy for the proposed length marked out in the Henry Drive section but not the full length marked out in the Walker Drive section outside [Redacted]. Having lived here[redacted] I have not heard of any accidents at this junction. Walker Drive is a bit of a cut through road and I have spoken to neighbours who would be happy for it to be made a 20 MPH road as an option.</p> <p>Last year there was a problem [redacted] with parking, [redacted]</p> <p>I did speak with some of them and requested the vehicles to be moved when close to the corner.</p> <p>[redacted]we do not get that problem any more.</p> <p>I await your reply</p> <p>Kind regards [redacted]</p>
15 <sup>th</sup> July 2019	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html;</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I live[redacted]regarding order TT1009. I have followed the email addresses on the sign but cannot seem to get much information about the proposal or find the place where I can send in my comments. Can you advise please.</p> <p>Kind regards [redacted]</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to appeal the decision of proposing a safety junction in St Lawrence Gardens in Eastwood, Leigh-On-Sea. I believe that these parking restrictions will cause inconvenience as it is already difficult to park near [redacted] Introducing these restrictions will leave residents with no other option than to take the spaces [redacted] which will not only effect myself, but many of the other neighbours [redacted]. I hope that this will be strongly considered in your decision. Many thanks Kind regards [redacted]</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I [redacted] Leigh on sea object to the plans for double yellow lines on the junction of st Lawrence gardens and Hudson Cresent as this will be detrimental to the residents of this road in regards to parking as we would lose the parking spaces that are desperately needed in this road due to the amount of houses and flats in these roads. [redacted]</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: ST LAWRENCE GARDENS [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I hereby forward my objection to the above part of the scheme. As a resident in the immediate area I feel this will have an adverse and damaging affect on local parking which is already limited. This proposal requires more consideration with more viable solutions being sought. Perhaps more dialogue with residents in the affected areas would be a more productive way forward to seek a solution better suited to everyone.</p>
<p>1<sup>st</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CAVENDISH GARDENS [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: We object to this as we have lived [redacted] and there have been no problems with this junction. It is wide junction and traffic flow has always been good so there is no need for the restrictions. The proposal will mean the restrictions go over [redacted] which means we will not be able to park [redacted] and this will add to the parking problems on Shanklin Drive . The parking problems on Shanklin Drive have been exacerbated by the Council agreeing to two houses being built on what was one plot and these houses[redacted] If the Council wants this can we suggest that the restrictions end before [redacted] Thank you.</p>
<p>2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: ESSEX GARDENS [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I have lived a[redacted] and there have never been any issues with traffic or accidents in this location. I have checked the councils accident records, likewise I have check Crash Map and there has not been a single issue, accident, slight or otherwise at the junction or Picketts Avenue and Essex Gardens. At school times (Blenheim school) parents do park in Essex</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>gardens and on Picketts Avenue but never dangerously - not that I have seen. Parents drop off for 10 minutes in the morning and afternoon (commonplace everywhere I would suggest) but following that the area is very quiet and only used by residents, its is also not a cut through to anywhere. Clearly if there is inconsiderate/dangerous parking, yellow lines would be an appropriate deterrent, especially where accidents are happening. In this case neither are, and safety cannot therefore be the reason in this location. Does the council hold specific complaints or issues reported in this location (Picketts Avenue/Essex Gardens (east)) which resulted in this proposal? If so I would appreciate if I could be made aware under my general right of access to information held by the Council under the freedom of information act. Also do you have specific dimensions on the extent of the yellow lines (start/finish around the corner) as this online portal doesn't provide detail. I summary object for the above reasons and see no highway safety reason why this should be implemented in this location.</p>
3 <sup>rd</sup> August 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: EATON ROAD [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: [redacted] which you are proposing to paint yellow lines, parking on this island is dangerous, if this is the extent of the parking restrictions in Eaton Road we have no objections. IF however the lines are extended in any way in front of the surrounding properties it would cause great distress to all concerned parking is at a premium already with two blocks of flats adding to the houses using Eaton road to park and the loss of any more would cause great difficulty.</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: ASHLEIGH DRIVE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Whilst I understand there can be issues with parking on corners, this is an extremely congested area for residents. It is a conservation area and so drive ways are understandably not permitted but there doesn't seem to be any proposal for where residents who live on the road can park. Please advise? Can a scheme be put in place to limit shoppers and businesses who use the Broadway from parking here so there is space for residents?</p>
17 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I am happy with the proposal that no parking on the side of no 34 and 32 Chapmans walk for safety reasons but I don't agree with the yellow lines on the opposite side of the round section. I am again happy with the yellow lines alone the straight road section but the round area opposite[redacted] seems strange. When you come out of Chapman's Close and cars are parked on the round section there it can be dangerous but on the opposite side there is no road coming out so the cars parked there are not a hazard and do not obstruct your view when turning into Chapman's Walk. But I would like to add that although you have put yellow lines on Chapman's walk and round to Darenth Road already. You need to put yellow lines across the</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>top section of Darenth road as well when you are coming out of Chapman's Walk. It can be very difficult and dangerous turning round here and is more hazardous than the comment above.</p>
17 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: DARENTH ROAD [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: I would like to comment that yellow lines should be added opposite Chapman's walk junction as well as from Chapman's Walk round into Darenth Road. Cars always park opposite the junction and can be quite difficult to turn there. also if someone is coming out of Chapman's walk while you are coming along Darenth road to turn into Chapman's Walk you have to back up down the road because there is no room there. Which again I think is quite dangerous.</p>
17 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: These proposed double yellow lines would be very detrimental to all living on Chapmans Walk and the surrounding roads. Current there is up to 6/7 cars parked in this area and use this space regularly every day. As well the the necessity of these spaces for local residents, the introduction of double yellow lines would require many residents of Chapmans Walk and Chapmans Close to convert their front gardens to provide off road parking at their own cost. This would have devastating impact on both the presence of green space in Leigh-on-Sea and micro ecosystem and habitats that these green lawn front gardens would otherwise provide. Furthermore itâ€™s an unnecessary cost of taxes payers money the could go to better use be that into schools, NHS or providing increased green spaces instead of potentially removing them. In terms of access, the risk of bin men, emergency vehicles or other large trucks etc. not being able to get past this junction is little to none as this has never been an issue in the past and vehicles are able to easily pass this area with no problem. Overall it is the belief of not only[redacted] of Chapmans Walk and Chapmans Close that this proposed introduction of double yellow lines with no stopping at anytime would do more harm than good and should not go ahead.</p>
17 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: These proposed double yellow lines would be very detrimental to residents of Chapmans Walk and Close and the surrounding roads. Current there are up to [redacted] parked in this area and use this space regularly every day. Parking is already tight on Chapmans Walk and this will force residents on the street to compete for existing spaces on the street and inevitably result in many residents being forced to convert their front gardens to provide off road parking at their own cost. This would have negative impact on both the presence of green space in Leigh-on-Sea and micro ecosystem and habitats that these green lawn front gardens would otherwise provide. In terms of access, the risk of bin men, emergency vehicles or other large trucks etc. not being able to get past this junction, I have never witnessed any issue and vehicles are able to easily pass this area with no problem. Overall it is the</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>belief of not only [redacted]Chapmans Walk and Chapmans Close that this proposed introduction of double yellow lines with no stopping at anytime would do more harm than good and should not go ahead. As[redacted] I strongly object to this proposal at this location.</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: BLENHEIM CRESCENT [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: 1. Parking is already limited, putting in these restrictions will only make it worse. This is a side road, in poor condition and other than the residents and council vehicles, it should not be used. 2. If you leave a gap on the north side of the road between blenheim mews and Ellenbrook, someone will park there and make the road unpassable. 3. This road needs resurfacing and sleeping policemen added as people use it as a dangerouse cut through - I have contacted you about this before but no one has bothered answering</p>
18 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I was extremely disappointed to read the planning notice pinned to the lamp posts near our house this weekend and am particularly frustrated that no direct notification has been sent to myself, nor the other residents that will be directly affected by this significantly detrimental proposal. No reason is given for the introduction of the proposed double yellow lines but the suggestion muted is that it may have something to do with access for refuse collection, as our street does not suffer from commuter parking. We would like to question who is dictating this sudden change? How is it that some roads have been picked, but others with crowded parking at junctions have been ignored? It is important to note that we have lived at this address[redacted]and access has not changed in all that time. If access for refuse collection is the reason for the sudden change I would suggest that the proposal smacks of being 'a 'sledgehammer to crack a nut', bearing in mind that such collections only take place within a very short time period on just one day each week - [redacted] If a restriction is necessary it would surely make more sense for it to be for limited hours or even for a particular day each week, rather than the proposed plan for 24 hours a day, seven days per week as why would there would be a need for restrictions to be in place on non-collection days, in the evenings or at weekends? Painting yellow lines may be cost effective and a 'quick fix' but it will cause significant parking issues for all residents on the street. &amp; #10;This unnecessary change will mean that [redacted] will have to park our cars further up an already crowded road and/or create more environmental damage (at significant cost to ourselves) through paving over what are very small front gardens (due to the circular nature of the road). The impact will be felt on the whole road. Added to this is the potential damage to the valuation of said properties which will no longer have adjacent parking. I would be very grateful to discuss this proposal at this location to further explain the difficulties that this will cause. Kind regards [redacted]</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: MOUNTDALE GARDENS [redacted]</p>



Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Comment type: Agree Comment: but why no parking on junction with Pickett ave and Mountdale this corner is a blind corner from mountdale and would be a great improvement to the area</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 [redacted] Comment type: Agree Comment: but the lines do not go into Essex gardens enough to stop being able to pull into the roadif cars are parked passthe new yellow lines</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: QUEENS AVENUE [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: Whilst I wholeheartedly agree these junctions need double yellows as the current parking is awful and leave these junctions dangerous, where are the cars that currently park along queens ave going to park? The roads are already busy and at capacity - have you considered shortening the double yellows on the east side of Leigh hall rd at the london road junction as they are unnecessarily long and removing/reducing the restrictions for the single yellow on the west side? And some sort of a permit scheme allowing residents to park in the under-utilised parking bays along the London Road for more than two hours? Just to add[redacted]the parking issue doesnâ€™t really affect me directly, though itâ€™ll no dou bt worsen the problem of people parking [redacted]</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: [redacted], I know how much of an issue parking is in this road and in Chapmans Close. Adding double yellow lines to the "circle" at the junction of Chapmans Walk and Chapmans Close would only increase the number of cars parked along Chapmans Walk and/or other nearby roads, making it more difficult to navigate the street when leaving and coming home. What is the rationale for adding double yellow lines here after all this time? We can only guess that it is to help bin lorries coming and going, but as one of my neighbours commented, they have been here for 20 years and never noticed any issues with refuse / recycling collections. I've certainly never had any issues dr iving along Chapmans Walk and can only see the implementation of this "no waiting" rule having negative rather than positive outcomes.</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I understand that the rationale for the change is to improve safety and visibility, but the latter certainly doesn't seem to apply to the "circle" at Chapmas Close / Walk because the road layout offers great visibility even when cars are parked near the junction - it is not the same as a regular T-junction. Restricting parking there would only lead to more congestion along the rest of Chapmans Walk which would negatively impact [redacted] Many thanks</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>21<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: QUEENS AVENUE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: If there is no waiting at any time in Queens Road, it means that people that own houses and flats there will park in Elm Road heading towards Torquay Drive. Therefore parking [redacted] will be come even more difficult. By restricting parking it just moves the problem in the surrounding streets. Why is that section going to be restricted?</p>
<p>21<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: ELM ROAD [redact] Comment type: Object Comment: If there is no waiting at any time in this section of Elm Road and Torquay Drive plus the proposed restriction in Queens Road, it means that people that own houses and flats there will park in other sections of Elm Road, Torquay Drive and Dawlish Drive. Therefore parking [redacted] will be even more difficult. By restricting parking in these sections just moves the problem to the surrounding streets. Why is that section going to be restricted? Yet the bend at Victoria Drive where dust carts seem to have really issues remains the same?</p>
<p>21<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: QUEENS AVENUE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: As the council should be well aware this area of Leigh has a very challenging parking problem. It is extremely difficult for people to find places to park in the evenings and at weekends, leaving many people having to park a long way from their homes. A main factor is the decisions by previous local governments to allow houses to be converted into flats with no provisions from parking. I estimate that at least 22 parking places will be lost by this plan in Queen's Avenue, where there are junctions with Elm Road, Dawlish Drive and Leighhall Road. Where are these 22 vehicles going to park? This will eventually lead to more parking problems in another part of Leigh. How many accidents have been caused by parking in these areas planned for yellow lines? Very few I suspect. If anything I would suggest that traffic goes slower and is more cautious.</p>
<p>22nd July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: There is no need to add yellow painted markings onto the road at either corner with St James Gardens. Adding paint to the road would be visually unnecessary and another maintenance implication to the Council. Instead focus on resurfacing the carriageway as a whole rather than pot-hole spot filling.</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I object to the proposal as I cannot see what you will gain by doing</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>this other than create even more problems parking than [redacted] have already in this street.</p>
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CLATTERFIELD GARDENS [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Same comment as for St James Close / St James Gardens. No need. Visually unnecessary and would be another highways maintenance implication to the Council. Focus on full carriageway width resurfacing to avoid all the pot-holes and past spot infilling, which don't last.</p>
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: As a [redacted]I see little reason for these proposals and object for the following reasons:-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>â€¢ This is a quiet residential neighbourhood that is not in close proximity to main roads, stations, schools or shopping areas (other than small local shops) and where it is, there are already yellow lines, which is perfectly understandable. The placing of these new lines and signage is out of keeping and disproportionate to the area.</li> <li>â€¢ The Highway Code already states (Rule 243):-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>â€˜Do not stop or park within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junctionâ€™</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>This is not enforced, so I doubt that the yellow lines would be enforced, therefore it makes no difference.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>â€¢ I would like to know what the cost of these works will be, as I believe it to be a complete waste of public funds which could be better spent on putting some tarmac on the bare concrete roads or maintaining the trees so that the roots stop damaging roads, pavements and [redacted] garden walls and paving [redacted] This would certainly benefit local residents and make a lot of Council tax payers very happy.</li> <li>â€¢ There is no current issue with corner parking due to most residents being considerate of others so who does this benefit?</li> <li>â€¢ As [redacted] I believe that this will have a detrimental effect on the value of [redacted] I would be grateful for a response to these comments so that I know they have been considered.</li> </ul> </p> </p>
26 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I am a [redacted] however the majority of the residents in this road own more than one car per house and only have the ability to park the one car on their drive. Therefore the vast majority of permanently parked cars in the road belong to the residents. There is very little parking in the road due to the narrowness of the road so the only viable space to park is in the circle where the ridiculous restriction is proposed for. Also it begs the question as to where visitors will park. I understand it may be necessary to introduce this for the dust carts but the rubbish collectors can easily walk the rubbish from the houses to the circle, there are very few houses in the close so it would take a very minimal amount of time. If any restriction must be applied then a timed no parking one similar to Theobalds Rd etc (2-3pm) would make much more sense so our residents can continue to rightfully park outside their houses at ease</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>23<sup>rd</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: PEARTREE CLOSE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The proposal documents do not state the distances from the junction that the restrictions would extend therefore it is not possible to comment accurately as the detail is not publicly accessible. Without this information it would be theoretically possible to enforce no parking for the entire length of Peartree Close via this order - which is surely not the intent. As such I formally object to the proposal until such time as the detail required to make an informed public consultation is made available. At the date this information is made available the public consultation should be restarted. Then, assuming the distance is reasonable for the stated purpose of the order, I would intend to withdraw my objection.</p>
<p>26<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The parking situation in the road is bad enough most days, the circle enables additional parking for residents and visitors.</p>
<p>26<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: QUEENS AVENUE [redacted] Comment type: Agree Comment: We live at [redacted] - we have needed this for a long time. We are cursed by commercial traffic. Fully supported.</p>
<p>28<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: KEIGHLEY MEWS [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: This is totally unnecessary. I have lived [redacted] and have never experienced any problem here. All properties have generous drives and any on road parking is short lived and not obstructive to views or movement. This is over regulation and I think the council should spend their time and money on real problems.</p>
<p>30<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: BRAEMAR CRESCENT [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: Please resurface the road first - otherwise you will be painting the grass which has grown in the broken surface and flattened kerbs through deficient road maintenance over at least 2 decades. I also suggest this to be a total waste of council tax-payers money while enforcement is totally deficient. A classic example was the inability to complete the yellow lining on the SE corner of Walker Drive with London Road after resurfacing because cars were parked in the way!</p>
<p>31<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: STAPLEGROVE [redacted] Comment type: Agree</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Comment: We wholeheartedly support the Council's proposal to install double yellow lines at junction of Aylesbeare &amp; Staplegrove. We live at [redacted] but it must be done. The point at which Staplegrove accesses Aylesbeare is very close to a sharp bend and quite often with people parking very close to the junction, the view of any driver leaving Staplegrove is severely restricted which could lead to a bad accident if double yellow lines are not installed particularly as some cars come round Aylesbeare very quickly. I would respectfully suggest double yellows should be placed on both sides of Staplegrove up to the driveways of [redacted] and for a full 10 yards in to Aylesbeare on both sides of the junction with more double yellows in Aylesbeare on the bend on the opposite side of the junction. If you are interested I can send you some photographs of some irresponsible parking on the bend whilst there are no double yellow markings in place.</p>
<p>31<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: SAIRARD CLOSE [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: I refer to the proposal for no waiting/stopping outside no 23 sairard gardens on both sides of road and note we have not had any notices put up in Sairard gardens. However another linked proposal in Green Lane which also details the Sairard gardens both sides outside no 23 has notices on lamp posts with a closing date of 30/7. Most of us [redacted] have been waiting for notices in order to vote in favour only to find we still have no notice at all and appear to have just missed a deadline to make our views known. We are in favour of the proposal and would have stated so if we had seen any notification, having been waiting for it. I was out for an evening walk and just happened to see the notices at the other location w hich also details Sairard gardens by chance.</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1009 Street name: CHAPMANS WALK [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Good evening, [redacted]during which time we (or guests/visitors have regularly used the spaces [redacted]. Our neighbours have been here [redacted] We have never once seen the our vehicles cause an obstruction to any traffic in the road, be in refuse trucks, ambulances and large delivery lorries. The refuse trucks never have a problem turning to reverse into Chapmans close, in fact they quite often do that whilst[redacted]which clearly shows it isnâ€™t a difficult manoeuvre form them. We are a street not affected by commuter parking and should you go ahead and place double yellows around the circle it will mean that the cars parked in each corner will move further down the road causing congestion which could potentially impact emergency vehicles having clear access to the road. I would kindly urge you to reconsider this proposal - there are far worse roads in leigh that do need double yellows. Chapmans Walk is not a cut through, itâ€™s a quiet street in West Leigh that will suffer should the lines be installed. Many thanks.</p>
<p>4<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>To whom it may concern, I was given this email address by one of your planning team call handlers - I do hope this is correct. The instructions on the notice on our street sign simply said 'comments on the proposals... should be sent through the <a href="http://southendtraffweb.co.uk">HYPERLINK "http://southendtraffweb.co.uk" southendtraffweb.co.uk</a> website...' which then has no further clues on how to submit feedback. I think this will have put off</p>

	<p>less determined people from submitting their comments - surely a flawed consultation process for this proposal. I[redacted]. In all that time I have never had a problem with people parking on the corner of the road. Three questions: 1. Has there been a full review of the need for this scheme? 2. Where is the evidence to support the need? 3. Has there been any cost benefit analysis done to support the expense of this scheme? Without these questions being answered, why would any council tax payers' money be spent on this scheme? Surely there are more deserving residents' needs, particularly in a financial crisis? What is the total cost of painting road markings and associated signage when added to ongoing maintenance costs? Not to mention the cost of additional traffic warden resourcing to police the parking restrictions. All this to solve a problem that doesn't exist [redacted], and I suspect others. When I look at a similar scheme that has already been implemented [redacted], the condition of the road-marking is dreadful, to the point where it is questionable that any parking infringement would be legally enforceable. If there have been numerous complaints by residents from each of the roads concerned in this scheme, backed up with satisfactory answers to the questions I have posed, then I am sure the facts will speak for themselves. If however, there is a lack of evidence to support this scheme, it should be withdrawn immediately, and a long hard look taken at how evidential based action takes place in efficient and effective organisations. Yours sincerely [redacted]</p>
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p><b>Subject:</b> Proposed Yellow Lines at St Lawrence and Hudson Good morning. I would like to comment by saying I am against the proposed yellow lines. I understand they may be for a safety element for an emergency service vehicle, but to put all 4 corners out of use will have a huge impact on parking. Cars will shift down the affected roads, causing more congestion further along. There is already an increasing number of cars per household. [redacted]a T road at the bottom so vehicles travelling down this road are not through traffic. I also will be personally affected as the plan shows [redacted] The yellow lines may also have an impact on the [redacted], as especially if I do move where will the removal vehicles park? I guess all extra money to apply for a permit to allow them to override the rulings for so many hours on a particular day I also feel the sign on the lamp post has not been seen by residents and maybe more signs or letters through the door would of been fair, even if only to those houses directly affected, so they could at least make others aware. I would like to be kept up to date on the decisions and also when would I be notified if it goes ahead. I thank you in advance. [redacted]</p>
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding the proposal to put in yellow lines on the Junction of Lambeth Road and St Lawrence Gardens Eastwood I am for yellow lines being installed at this Junction.This has been a very big issue for many years and is a situation that is only getting worse, as [redacted] I find it very difficult driving out of [redacted] due to cars dangerously parked at and on the Junction many of these have recently been Vans. On one occasion due to poor visibility [redacted]. And on</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>many occasions when driving into St Lawrence from the lambeth road Junction I have had to reverse back into the road due to cars coming out of St Lawrence this has caused many a near miss as cars/Vans park so close to the junction. This is also a very unsafe Junction for pedestrians to cross due to poor visibility and[redacted] Yellow lines would make this Junction so much safer for all road users and pedestrians. I understand that it may cause people to lose parking spaces but many now have driveways and lambeth road always has plenty of space. In my opinion yellow lines should be installed along one side all the way down St Lawrence as many houses now have driveways, and those who haven't seem to feel it's ok to park on curbs and block people's access from their properties.</p>
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposals to put double yellow lines on St Lawrence Garden's between the junction of Hudson Crescent This would penalise residents There will be fewer parking spaces available for residents and visitors There will be an increase in the number of vehicles speeding past the junction as with the cars parked there it makes them slow down I can foresee no significant benefit from the proposed change as we are not on a main or through road and only a side road / dead-end it's mostly residents that use this road Most cars are only parked in the area in the evening when Residents are home from work so it doesn't cause a problem in the day especially Tuesdays with the binmen I have [redacted] in recent years it has become increasingly difficult to park for some at times [redacted] we have put off street parking in place to ease the problem Restricting the parking on St Lawrence Gardens as proposed will make the situation much worse, and will also put more pressure on the parking situation in the surrounding area. [redacted]I have not seen any significant difficulties arising with the flow of traffic in St Lawrence Gardens other than it makes drivers slow down at the junction and look rather than just pull out [redacted] Having vehicles parked out side their own homes appears to have provided some degree of traffic calming, which has helped to reduce the speed of vehicles, This serves to make the road safer and quieter, which can only be a good thing. Restricting parking as proposed will not only reduce parking options for residents, it will effectively widen the road leading to an increase in speed, making the road noisier, and less safe for residents, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; We [redacted] Object to the proposed double yellow lines for the junction of St Lawrence Gardens and Hudson Crescent especially on the odd numbers side of St Lawrence gardens as we feel that this would take up crucial parking for 2 cars in a road that already has nowhere near enough parking for its residents and would only add to the current issues in the road over lack of parking spaces available, especially with many of the[redacted] We urge you to reconsider or drop the proposal for the lines on this junction as it will only create more problems than it will solve. [redacted]</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Good evening, Re: Planned Parking Restrictions in Leigh - Ref: TT1009 We wish to express our concerns in relation to your proposal to impose parking restrictions on the corner of Olive Avenue and Braemar Crescent. According to your notice (TT1009) SBC plan to place double yellow lines [redacted] which will effectively deprive us of our freedom to [redacted] We [redacted] therefore require availability of a parking space [redacted] The graphic attached illustrates the specific issue. [image redacted] Please accept this email as our challenge to these restrictions, and request that reconsider. Parking in Leigh is already at a premium and this plan would cause a significant issue. Please find correspondence address below, or call us on [redacted] We look forward to hearing from you, Thank you [redacted]</p>
<p>11<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Order 2021 TT1009 Dear Sirs I have just seen the notice on the lamp post in Ashurst Avenue and would like to comment that I have not seen any of these restrictions being introduced in Ashurst Avenue on the very sharp bend outside Nos. 22 and 24, on your plans. We consistently have vehicles parked on this corner which then means you have to approach on the opposite side of the road to go around them. This is an accident waiting to happen. [redacted] showing vehicles parked in what I consider to be a dangerous position. I have attached 3 photos which were taken today but is just one of many days when we have vehicles parked like this. [redacted]</p>
<p>27 July 2021</p>	<p>Proposed Double Yellow Lines Corner Green Lane and Kendal Way In connection with the above proposed restrictions, we would ask that the following observations be taken into consideration. The front door [redacted], the garage with parking is at the end of the rear garden in Kendal Way. Now [redacted] these normally have no choice but to park near the corner, due to cars being parked on the opposite side of Kendal Way, usually by people who do not live adjacent - and often for days on end. [redacted] and before the Pandemic often had to park close to the corner in order to unload heavy shopping [redacted] We fully appreciate the safety implications of parking restrictions, on what is now undoubtedly a very busy corner, though sadly, double yellow lines are unlikely to reduce the speed of vehicles entering Kendal Way ! Yours faithfully [redacted]</p>
<p>29<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Attention of the Business Change and Development Team- Southchurch Ward Parking Good afternoon, Please forward this on to the above department. I have used both of the websites stated on the road sign but neither give an option to contact the Department formally. As a [redacted] I would like to express my opinion on the proposed junction protection for Apollo Drive/ Eros Avenue. Having [redacted], I have realised that there isn't enough parking for the amount of residents across the entire estate. Although this is not at the fault of others, I do think this should be</p>



	<p>looked into more and providing more parking options rather than endeavouring to limit them further. Although one junction on the estate does seem to cause a lot of issues the mentioned one does not. Cars, lorries and emergency services can still access the road with ease (all have driven down the road in the last[redacted] and this would not cause an issue for anyone trying to enter the estate. However, if there are soon to be lines across the estate I am worried that the junctions will become less busy but at the detriment to the rest of the estate- thus causing more problems and posing more danger than the junctions to begin with. It will also mean that roads that are seemingly free of cars will now be full of them and be even more congested then they are currently. It also seems unfair that a number of houses could park outside their houses (albeit dangerously- Apollo Road) [redacted] The houses along Apollo road do not have parking bays which means that they park along the road. This is much more dangerous as the large number of work vans that park along the road result in a long stretch of the road becoming a blind spot and therefore could easily cause an accident. I think this problem is a much bigger issue then the parking at junctions. I would like their parking addressed first before the junctions as those cars will cause an accident and actually prevent other cars from driving down there properly rather than the one car that is parked at our junction. You can barely see around these vehicles and the space in which to pass them is increasingly difficult to get around-especially when there is another car trying to enter the estate from the opposite direction. If the proposed parking restrictions are put in place the roads will be more congested, there will be less parking available which means that more people will park on pavements/park dangerously or park along Liftstan's Way- causing this to become busier too. I think that the options for parking, especially larger commercial vehicles, needs to be addressed first before looking at junctions when they don't pose the same amount of danger as the vehicles who block out large parts of the road.</p> <p>Kind regards, [redacted]</p>
<p>27<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Dear Business and Development Team</p> <p>I am[redacted] and think the proposed changes listed in the Consultation document TT1009 are excellent and long overdue. There are numerous occasions when cars are parked on the corners of junctions making it dangerous to manoeuvre. I am fully in support of the proposed changes but would suggest they go further and also include parking opposite junctions. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states you must not park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. This is often broken, making it dangerous to turn left or right into or out of various roads.</p> <p>I appreciate that parking is at a premium and not everyone has off street parking [redacted] but I feel that the issue of safety for all drivers needs to be raised and to move away from some of the selfish practices on display along some of my neighbourhood roads.</p> <p>Can I also take the opportunity to highlight that I have[redacted] and little gets done? I do understand that if a car is taxed and has a valid MOT there is little that can be done but makes parking even more difficult when people who don't live along the road car their vehicles for weeks and months on end.</p> <p>Kind regards [redacted]</p>
<p>23<sup>rd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear [Redacted]</p> <p>Across Leigh and West Leigh we would like to let you know that there has been some kickback against certain junction protection proposals on the basis</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>of existing high levels of parking pressures on roads identified in the latest advertised TRO: Woodlands Park – the lines going around the traffic island where the substation is have not been well received. This is due to parking pressures related to access to Belfairs Woods Eaton Road Westcliff Drive – here [redacted]and has a group of supporters who are saying no further loss of roadspace will be tolerated. Chapman’s Walk and Close – slightly undefined, but objections here too. I would strongly urge the Highways Officers responsible to listen, respond to and adapt to the concerns raised to [redacted] over these issues, and if necessary amend their proposals so that the public end up being appreciative of the good work you are doing, in relation to protecting people from unsafe junctions. All the very best to those working on this, [redacted]</p>
1 <sup>st</sup> August 2021	<p>Dear [redacted], A number of residents from Chapman’s Walk were extremely disappointed to read the planning notice pinned to the lamp posts near to their houses last weekend and were particularly frustrated that no direct notification has been sent to them, nor the other residents that will be directly affected by this proposal. They were self-isolating and only alerted by a neighbour. They would like to know why no reason is given for the introduction of the proposed double yellow lines outside their house in the centre of our street, but the suggestion muted is that it may have something to do with access for refuse collection, as their street does not suffer from commuter parking. They would like to know how some roads have been picked, but others with crowded parking at junctions have been ignored? While they can see that cars parked along the side of Chapmans Close make the road narrow for the refuse trucks, their highly skilled drivers manage to navigate this every week. Painting yellow lines may be cost effective and a 'quick fix' but it will cause significant parking issues for all residents on the street with up to 7 parking spaces unnecessarily lost in a quiet residential road. If a restriction really is necessary, what is the purpose of having it on our side of the street? And even on the other side of the road, why is it a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week proposal? This unnecessary change will mean that affected residents will have to park our cars further up an already crowded road. Could someone help me with this issue? Thanks, [redacted]</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>I am a [redacted] &amp; it has come to my attention that you are proposing to put double yellow lines at the junction of St Lawrence Gardens &amp; Hudson Crescent, after viewing the plans I would like to object this proposal, I am not against the corners of the roads having double yellow lines but I am against how far the double yellow lines will extend up &amp; down St Lawrence Gardens which is not necessary, [redacted]already have parking problems this will only make matters worse with the prospect of losing more parking spaces, I hope you will reconsider.</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>To whom it may concern I am a[redacted]and it has been drawn to my attention that there is a proposal for double yellow lines on the corner junctions of St Lawrence gardens and Hudson crescent This would increase the already very challenging parking in [redacted]! I am [redacted]being able to park near my house is important and</p>

	<p>with the adding of yellow lines will impede on many parking spaces causing congestion within the road. I am writing this as a formal objection to this proposal and would like it to be taken into consideration when deciding on the final decision please Many thanks [redacted]</p>
--	---

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

Re Statement of Reasons for TT1009 Woodlands Park/Curzon Avenue

22

22 JUL 2021

RECEIVED

19<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Dear Sir / Madam

I refer to the notice (ref TT1009) of your authority's intention to amend The Southend Borough Council (Waiting, Loading, Stopping and Parking Places) Order

The statement of reasons given in this notice is inadequate principally because it fails to set out any evidence of safety issues or inadequate visibility which would justify the proposed amendment to the order. Secondly there is no reasoned justification given for the assertion that moving parking away from the junction at Woodlands Park and Curzon Avenue would improve access. For these reasons alone the statement of reasons would be insufficient in law to justify the proposed changes. As such any decision taken by the local authority on this basis would be unlawful.

Yours faithfully,



Send to:

Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment)

FAO Business Change and Development Team

Civic Centre

Victoria Avenue

Southend SS2 6ER

RECEIVED

[REDACTED]  
Planning Officer  
Southend on Sea Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Victoria Avenue  
Southend on Sea  
Essex SS2 6ER

20 July 2021

Dear Sirs,

**Re : Notice pinned to Pole  
in respect of Parking Restrictions  
Yellow Lines  
Under Road Traffic Act 1984**

Firstly I would like to introduce myself as I [REDACTED] along  
with my [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] to the address at the head of this letter, due in part to  
the fact that we felt it a nice area, where properties are kept in good order,  
the property itself, and the fact that, most importantly, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] had parking, which in today's society is most important due to the  
number of vehicles now on the road.

Reading through your notice at first glance, two things, immediately come  
to mind. One, and this is a very important factor you state that your  
future venture, as I wish to name it is under Road Traffic Act 1984. It is  
very easy to quote 'this Act and any other, whereby lay person would  
immediately think, what chance do we have to state that we greatly  
oppose such a restriction. (1) on the part of myself and my wife that,  
parking was an issue, we took seriously enough to decide whether to  
[REDACTED]. We have only been in residence  
[REDACTED] and this is a huge blow as one can imagine reduces the  
price of our property immediately if these plans go ahead. It could be  
stated, why had our [REDACTED] that would  
have been earmarked within the conveyancing remit when purchasing a  
property. This immediately evokes the fact that these plans although have  
only been forthcoming, and brought to light recently, even though they

may have been under wrap some time prior, as a Lawyer will, and would have checked all or any future road changes, parking restrictions, landslide etc etc, so I ask the Council why at such a late date have so many roads now come under the yellow line restriction, and as such what does one do for future parking.

Secondly, is the fact that the Act itself is relevant to the City of London and comes under the Metropolitan District and states that it was to consolidate the Road Traffic Regulation 1967 and certain related enactments of the Law Commission and the Scottish Law Commission as 26 June 1984, at no time does this give priority to the fact that so many residential streets in the now City of Southend should be reduced in its parking. To this end it would seem that all and any residence, both new and those that have resided within this borough for many many years have been given no cause as to what they will and should do as far as parking is concerned.

It would seem, that the negativity has been given no thought or just cause as to the residence with not only one but two vehicles and some with more, as to where their vehicles can be placed specifically overnight and to the safety of this kind of Act.

It has obviously been on the mind of the Council for some time, for the plans to have been placed on "a Pole". What of those that are disabled. What of those that come home late at night due to their employment. I greatly and most wholeheartedly desist to this whole concoction, that as far as I am concerned, will cause traffic chaos, danger for people working late who may need to park far from their actual property and then to walk home in the dark.

We understand that yellow lines need to be put in certain areas (busy roads) but this part of Neil Armstrong Way is fairly quiet, also it would be nice to find out exactly where the lines would stop !! My wife's car is left in the street [REDACTED] which is approximately [REDACTED]. If the planner [REDACTED] could contact us directly and maybe visit the site to show where they will end.

I look forward to hearing from you as, of course this matter is of the utmost importance to both [REDACTED]

I remain your faithfully  
[REDACTED]

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

Re Statement of Reasons for TT1009 Woodlands Park/Curzon Avenue

22 JUL 2021

19<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Dear Sir / Madam

I refer to the notice (ref TT1009) of your authority's intention to amend The Southend Borough Council (Waiting, Loading, Stopping and Parking Places) Order

The statement of reasons given in this notice is inadequate principally because it fails to set out any evidence of safety issues or inadequate visibility which would justify the proposed amendment to the order. Secondly there is no reasoned justification given for the assertion that moving parking away from the junction at Woodlands Park and Curzon Avenue would improve access. For these reasons alone the statement of reasons would be insufficient in law to justify the proposed changes. As such any decision taken by the local authority on this basis would be unlawful

Yours faithfully



22 JUL 2021

RECEIVED

Send to:

Executive Director (Neighbourhoods and Environment)

FAO Business Change and Development Team

Civic Centre

Victoria Avenue

Southend SS2 6ER

**TT1010 Crosby Road**

All comments

<u>Date</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>28<sup>th</sup> May 2021</u>	<p><b>RE: Crosby Road Permanent Traffic Regulation Order – Ref: TH/3010/bf</b></p> <p>I write to express my support for the proposed traffic regulation order on Crosby Road. I believe that the proposed order is necessary to reduce how long cars can park on the road during the week and calm the flow of traffic that can turn Crosby Road into a rat-run.</p> <p>Yours faithfully [redacted]</p>
<u>3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021</u>	<p>Hi</p> <p>I am [redacted] and I would be grateful if you could consider amending the time for the proposed parking restrictions in Crosby Road.</p> <p>Before lockdown in March 2020 I believe the no parking time was between 12-1 and would be grateful if the new proposal was changed to this time. We have [redacted] on a Wed afternoon and most [redacted] drive there.</p> <p>Many thanks [redacted]</p>
<u>17<sup>th</sup> June 2021</u>	<p>I wish to object to parking restrictions being imposed in Crosby Road, Westcliff on Sea from 1.00 PM to 3.00 PM. Parking anywhere in the vicinity is a problem and to restrict parking in Crosby Road will only make parking in the adjacent roads more difficult. Just because you make restrictions in one road does not make the problem disappear! [redacted] which means parking [redacted] will become difficult. I park in Crosby Road for a couple of hours, but if restrictions are in place, I will not be able to find a parking place easily. The residents of Crosby Road seem to think they can tell others not to park outside their house, as has been the case on a couple of occasions.</p> <p>I object strongly to any restrictions [redacted]</p>
<u>17<sup>th</sup> June 2021</u>	<p>To the Executive Director (Neighbourhoods &amp; Environment) For the attention of the Business Change and Development team</p> <p>Re: Crosby Road Permanent Order 2021 Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>I wish to object to Crosby Road Permanent Order 2021, [redacted]</p> <p>Briefly, these are my objections: Drivers race through Crosby Road. Parked cars serve to limit the maximum speed that people can achieve.</p>



	<p>How are the places chosen to place yellow lines? Because they were over my drive and outside my house and I don't want them.</p> <p>I have [redacted] I dislike the idea that those helpful people could receive a parking ticket.</p> <p>I have visitors who come to stay to help me, often for more than one day at a time. They too risk a parking ticket.</p> <p>People who want to go to the beach or are commuting to London are victimised. There is no parking at Chalkwell Station.</p> <p>In what way are the changes proposed going to improve the lives of residents except at a cost to residents.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [redacted]</p>
<p><u>18<sup>th</sup> June 2021</u></p>	<p><b>CROSBY ROAD PERMANENT ORDER 2021 / THE SOUTHEND BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING, LOADING, STOPPING AND PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION) (AMENDMENT No. *) ORDER 202*</b></p> <p>Sir/Madam</p> <p>1. I am a resident of [redacted] and wish to register my objection to the above Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on the following grounds:</p> <p><b>Ground 1 – Failure to follow the 1996 regulations correctly.</b></p> <p>2. The Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 sets out the procedures for traffic regulations orders. Regulation 7(4) states, "<i>Deposited documents shall be made so available at the times and at the places specified in the notice of proposals throughout the period beginning with the date on which the notice of proposals is first published....</i>"</p> <p>3. The Crosby Road Permanent Order 2021, notice of proposals published 28<sup>th</sup> May 2021 states, "<i>Copies of the draft Order, plans and the statement of reasons for proposing to make the Order, may be viewed online at: <a href="https://www.southend.gov.uk/transport-policies-traffic-regulation-orders/traffic-regulation-orders-consultations/2">HYPERLINK "https://www.southend.gov.uk/transport-policies-traffic-regulation-orders/traffic-regulation-orders-consultations/2"</a> <a href="https://www.southend.gov.uk/transport-policies-traffic-regulation-orders/traffic-regulation-orders-consultations/2">https://www.southend.gov.uk/transport-policies-traffic-regulation-orders/traffic-regulation-orders-consultations/2</a>....</i>"</p> <p>The screenshot attached to this e-mail is a web capture of the above website on the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2021, the day after notice of proposals was published. It shows that the order and the deposited documents were not available to view, at the place, or from the published date, stated in the notice. These documents were not available to view for consultees until after the Bank Holiday weekend, on the 1<sup>st</sup> June at the earliest. If the deposited documents were not available to view at the stated website on the 28<sup>th</sup> May then the correct procedures have not been followed.</p> <p><b>Ground 2- Officers have not been authorised to advertise this Permanent TRO- only an experimental order/ Why would the Committee agree to advertise the same scheme they rejected 12 months previously?</b></p> <p>4. Officers have not been authorised by the Traffic Regulation Working Party Committee to advertise this permanent TRO. On the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020, at its Meeting, the Committee</p>

	<p>authorised an experimental order for Crosby Road having rejected a proposed permanent Order-the same order advertised now. At no stage since that date has the committee authorised a further permanent order. In fact, it is very unlikely the Committee would authorise the advertisement of exactly the same Permanent Order it had previously rejected.</p> <p>5. The Statement of Reasons for this Order states, "The Council's Traffic Regulation Working Party and Cabinet Committee at its meeting on the 22 February 2021 authorised the advertising of traffic orders for the introduction of waiting restrictions on Crosby Road in late May 2021." This statement is not supported by the facts. Item 8 from that meeting, "Updates on Outstanding schemes per Ward", was "for information only". The draft minutes of that meeting are clear, "That the update be noted". Nothing was 'authorised'. In any case, the Crosby Road update stated, "The service will therefore be re-advertising the agreed scheme in May 2021". The agreed scheme was an experimental order- not a permanent scheme that the Committee had previously rejected. To me, it is clear that Officers had no authorisation from the Committee to advertise this permanent order.</p> <p><b>Ground 3- Confusion as to the name of the proposed order.</b></p> <p>6. The consultation letter (26th May 2021) sent to my address states that, "<i>The order which relates to this proposal is the "Crosby Road permanent order 2021"</i>". However, the 'Notice' and 'draft order' in the deposited documents, state the name of the order as, "<b>THE SOUTHEND BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING, LOADING, STOPPING AND PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION) (AMENDMENT No. *) ORDER 202*</b>" Which is it? It can't be both? If the order is entering the consolidation shouldn't those asterisks be replaced with numbers to follow the sequence? Perhaps the individual drafting the order failed to update the template. Or maybe, perhaps, it was intentional. I can find no evidence of a previous order being named in such a way.</p> <p><b>Ground 4- This order will negatively impact road safety in Crosby Road. Order needs to be accompanied by additional traffic calming measures.</b></p> <p>7. This order has been proposed, in part, to improve road safety (See Statement of Reasons) even though there have been no recent reported collisions in Crosby Road. I believe the proposed TRO will have the opposite effect and make Crosby Road more dangerous. The road is something of a 'rat-run' with speeding cars and an increasing number of vehicles. Vehicles parked on both sides of the road provide some traffic calming by forcing single-file traffic. Opening up one side of the carriageway (albeit staggered) will raise traffic speeds and, I suspect, increase the volume of traffic. Increased traffic speeds will be dangerous to the pedestrians and cyclists who use the road, children accessing the tennis clubs, and for residents exiting their driveways. The council should be discouraging traffic from using residential streets not facilitating its progress and raising its speed. The Council is proposing to remove a no cost traffic calming measure with no replacement. Any TRO in the road should be</p>
--	--

	<p>accompanied by an adequate package of traffic calming measures (the staggered areas of parking restriction zones will not be sufficient). The introduction of a 20mph limit would be appropriate.</p> <p><b>Ground 5 - It is nonsensical to actively try to increase the traffic flow on a residential street when traffic flow isn't an issue or required.</b></p> <p>8. This order is proposed, in part, to “facilitate the passage on the road of traffic” i.e. to increase traffic flow. Crosby Road is a residential street. It is not a primary road, a feeder road or on a bus route. Gaps in parking due to resident’s driveways provide ample passing opportunities for rat-running vehicles. As far as I am aware the emergency services or refuse collection have reported no difficulties in accessing the road. For the safety reasons outlined above it is absurd for the Council to increase the volume and speed of vehicles on a residential street.</p> <p><b>Ground 6 – A TRO cannot be made for the purpose of facilitating access to driveways.</b></p> <p>9. This order is proposed, in part, “to facilitate access to driveways”. Section 1 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sets out the 7 statutory purposes for making a TRO. Without further explanation from the Council, it is unclear to me which of the 7 purposes listed would allow the council to make an order on the grounds of facilitating access to driveways.</p> <p><b>Ground 7- Absurd to claim that the proposed TRO will improve the residential nature of the road- the opposite is true.</b></p> <p>10. This order is proposed, in part for, “preserving or improving the residential nature of Crosby Road by restricting non-residential parking”. Is it really the Council’s contention that cars parked on the street make a road less residential? In any case, under this order, parking by non-residents would still be permitted, and the desired effect, even if it existed, would not occur. I would contend that the increased traffic flow and speeding due to the order would have an actual negative impact on the residential nature of Crosby Road.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, [redacted]</p>
<p><u>16<sup>th</sup> June 2021</u></p>	<p>Sir/Madam, I object to the Crosby Road Permanent Order 2021. As a [redacted] I understand that one of the reasons cited is blockage of resident's driveways but, [redacted] I have never seen a driveway blocked. Further, every property has at least 2 parking spaces on their own land. Classic NIMBYism. Regards, [redacted]</p>
<p>2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sir I write in support of the proposed order as now Covid restriction are relaxing parking in Crosby Road is again a nightmare. To be honest I think more stringent parking restrictions would be better ( no parking at all on side of the</p>

	<p>street – for example), however any restriction is better than none.</p> <p>On Friday afternoon 28/5, at 4pm it took me a considerable time to [redacted] numerous cars parked both sides of the road, traffic backing up from the traffic lights &amp; cars/ vans weaving in &amp; out of all parked vehicles at times at reckless speeds.</p> <p>Whilst on the general topic if someone put a camera at the lights at Chalkwell Ave &amp; Crosby Road they would earn a small fortune with the vast number of vehicles going through red lights in all directions, with all the current road works in the area the drivers are getting more impatient &amp; the problem is worsening. I saw one car on Thursday overtake 2 cars stopped at the lights to turn right into the Ridgeway whilst the lights had clearly gone red! It was a miracle he didn't hit anyone.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully [redacted]</p>
<p>18<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p>	<p>F.A.O. Business Change and Development Team</p> <p>Dear Executive Director (Neighbourhoods &amp; Environment) I write to raise our concerns about the proposed Traffic Order to Crosby Road for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am confused why the 'no waiting' has been changed to 2 hours? Surely, the main purpose is to stop the commuters from parking on Crosby Road and a 1 hour restriction would achieve this.</li> <li>2. It would appear there is a section where cars can park on both sides of the street outside no.26. I thought the purpose of this restriction was to stop this.</li> <li>3. Whilst writing, I would like to check why the first part of Crosby Road has a different time restriction shown on the Crosby Road Order 2021 plan?</li> </ol> <p>Kind regards [redacted]</p>

### TT1011 Various Historic

#### All Comments

<p>20<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>RE: TT1011 Seaview Road</p> <p>The proposed changes included in this draft Order are intended to improve safety and visibility with double yellow lines and single yellow lines. This Order also proposes improving parking provision with new limited and payment parking.</p> <p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The removal of parking in Seaview Road from the West side (10 public places + the dropped curb owners) including the existing double yellow on the East side will seriously impact on the quality of life for the inhabitants of</li> </ol>
--------------------------------------	---

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Seaview Road. There has been no proposed parking in compensation of the loss of parking spaces. 2. If it is the intention of swapping the sides where the double yellows are painted from the East side to the West I would still object. Having the double yellow [redacted] means that I am able to unload &amp; load my car. This order has not proposed improving parking provision. Yours faithfully [redacted]</p>
30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p><b>BUNTERS AVENUE</b> Comment type: Object Comment: As resident of [redacted], this simply can NOT go ahead! To start with, you have hidden the notice half way down Bunters Avenue so you know full well no one else will see this notice! There are 6 houses that need parking on the opposite side of the road (24 down into the corner) and of course [redacted]. It is not just ourselves that use that corner for parking. We are fighting with local residents already for parking in this area. This forces us onto the grass on the corner. If you put these lines in as proposed, then it looks as though you will have 7 plus houses fighting for what looks like, only 2 spaces!! The bin lorries have managed so far getting up and down the road! All this will end up doing is forcing people to block driveways, causing neighbourly arguments, or parking on the grass down the side of our property then you will be handing out fines for doing so. Please, please re consider. I look forward to your response. Many thanks.[redacted]</p>
23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2021	<p>Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD Regarding Scheme: TT1011 [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I object</p>
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	<p>Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I object due to the lack of value of changing the current system I believe it will make it more difficult to park</p>
30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I don't understand the purpose of this change and cannot see any advantages other than adding a couple of extra parking spaces to the east side, which will be filled with residents who work at home and don't move their cars, [redacted] Parking is a big issue for residents and visitors to this area but this feels a waste of time and money for no real advantage.[redacted] I am more concerned with the speed some cars travel up and down the road so making one way would be more beneficial. Or considering resident parking permits. [redacted] it is a hassle having to drive around looking for a parking space, especially at the weekend. [redacted] I would be concerned [redacted]</p>
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The proposed intentions are not clear, but I cannot see how</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	changing the double yellow lines will make it safer. Making the road one way could improve safety.
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Parking is hard enough as it is
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I strongly object to this proposal.[redacted] and the road works fine as it is. I [redacted] If there are double yellow lines in front of it I will no longer be able to park there. This will add another car trying to find a space.[redacted] I also feel it will devalue[redacted] property by getting rid of a valuable parking space
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Being unsure of the motives for these changes as there hasnâ€™t been any consultation with the residents I believe that by retaining the current parking arrangements and making the road one way will improve both the flow and safety requirements.
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Having looked at the documents again, It appears the entire road will be no parking!! Please advise the rationale behind this!! Who is responsible for suggesting such a ridiculous scheme and why Seaview Road?
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The proposal for Seaview Road under order TT1011 appears to show that it will lose all of its parking provisions on both the East and West side of the street. This means the loss of more than 20 existing car parking spaces which are predominantly used by residents. The cars that use these spaces will need to park somewhere and that will place additional burden on other nearby streets. It is not clear what benefits this proposal brings, if it is to prevent shoppers from the Broadway parking on the road then a far preferable option would be to have a residents parking scheme with permits.
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: The proposed changes included in the draft Order are intended to improve safety and visibility with double yellow lines and single yellow lines. The Order also proposes improving parking provision with new limited and

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>payment parking. Unless I am reading the proposal wrong, this scheme is going to considerably reduce the parking provision in Seaview Road, thus relocating the cars that are regularly parked in Seaview Road to park elsewhere in nearby roads such as Victoria and Avenue, which are already continuously busy – how is this improving the parking provision ? Improving safety and visibility is all well and good, but how are you measuring this ? Are there any documents in the Order citing how unsafe and visually poor the current parking is ? Have there been any accidents documented ? Where is the logic in reducing parking spaces for residents and visitors to Leigh high street ? Why is this scheme only proposed for Seaview road ? If the Borough of Southend on Sea have money to spend there are far more worthy traffic issues that need attending to, for instance numerous pot holes in the road that when winter comes will only get worse, subsidence to the road/pavement along Cliff Parade (which has been cordoned off for months with no visible action), some speed restricting road bumps/traffic islands or signage/cameras along Cliff Parade which has become a race track !..</p>
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SCARBOROUGH DRIVE Name: Mrs [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Scarborough Drive - Proposed No Parking - Abandonment of 20 minute loading area [redacted] We have been struggling to continue to operate throughout the past 18 months, and have done so without personnel loss to date. However, this proposed no parking zone, [redacted] There seems to be no benefit, no domestic properties are adjacent to [redacted] The current 20 minute loading zone aids local businesses and is not abused.</p>
20 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I live at [redacted] currently the double yellow lines are [redacted] of the road. The reason I [redacted] my house was so I could [redacted] I seriously object to you moving the lines [redacted] for this reason. There is no advantage whatsoever to moving the lines over, it just means the people who will be losing parking spaces on the east side will just be moving their cars over the west side and leaving them there and not moving them.</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Permit parking or a one way road would be far more preferable than taking away spaces. It’s a dangerous road with many people Often speeding up and down it. Changing the parking would result in excess cars From households needing to be parked. It benefits no one.</p>
19 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: This scheme will take several parking spaces away thus adding an addition 10 cars (approx) that will need to be parked elsewhere. There is absolutely no benefit at all in changing the the double yellow lines to the west side of the road and would do nothing – push the problem around – rather</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>than solve it. As a [redacted] the general feeling is that we have no problem with the lines as they are. Some of those [redacted] may feel differently but when it comes to the addition 10 cars being parked, constantly and not often moved, [redacted] Please consider residents parking or perhaps a one way road first before making a situation far, far worse.</p>
14 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: RAMPART STREET [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I would like to object to the proposed paid for parking restrictions on rampart street .. there has always been a small section of road with no yellow lines that made for easier parking for people visiting the nearby housing as well as using the beach .. I see no reason to change this .. since the new road surfacing the old yellow lines that were in place from rampart terrace to a short distance on rampart street have not yet been repainted which has caused some problems for the buses so I would suggest these are put back in to place and leave the original part of the street with no restrictions . Many thanks [redacted]</p>
28 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: BARNSTAPLE CLOSE [redacted] Comment type: General Comment: Would prefer the restriction to be 11:00-12:00 rather than 14:00-15:00.</p>
27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Agree Comment: There will be more opportunities for parking on the east side due to less crossovers so this would be an improvement and is supported</p>
27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Agree Comment: I agree as this will provide more on street parking and this is fairer for all.</p>
26 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: BARNSTAPLE CLOSE [redacted] Comment type: Agree Comment: Close becomes clogged with commuters leaving their vehicles for the day. Also residents of Barnstaple Road use the Close for parking as there are no restrictions. If an emergency vehicle was required it would be very difficult for it to get into the Close. On bin collection day, the lorry has to mount the opposite kerb which is causing damage.</p>
23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2021	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: No double yellows</p>



Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Would be a massive inconvenience
23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: To the double yellow lines as itâ€™s a residential road with no parking
30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: BUNTERS AVENUE [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: At this moment we don't have enough parking space to park our car if this happens we need to park our cars on top of the roof of our house.i think the decision makers at council they don't care about the residents the are after the money only.there are couple garden[redacted] they can transfers it to parking bays for those houses at the bottom of the road.
26 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Scheme TT1011 Thames Close Leigh-on-Sea Dear Team I would like to object to the above scheme which I understand will have full double yellow lines for the whole of Thames Close The reason for the objection is 1 There needs to be parking for visitors. 2 There needs to be parking for traders 3 A better solution would be a 1 hour restriction per day to avoid long term visitors and commuters 4 A limited restriction would also be similar to surrounding roads Many thanks Happy to explain further [redacted]
11 <sup>th</sup> July	Dear Sir or Madam, With reference to the Road Traffic Regulation Notice TT1011 Proposed Order to introduce no waiting at any time on (x) Thames Close both side for entire length. This is not what the residents originally requested or want. This Order would prevent all services or maintenance vehicles from parking anywhere at any time within the Close. What was requested by the 7 residents of Thames Close, (b) Introduce no waiting Mon-Frid, 2pm-3pm, this helps prevent commuters parking all day in the Close whilst travelling to London from Leigh Station. This then allows parking for the residents visiting relatives and friends during the day in the limited area of the Close. Please consider this request on conclusion of your Proposed Order TT1011 Yours faithfully, [redacted]
12 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Morning, hope you are well

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>This email is in response to the proposals for double yellows throughout Thames Close [redacted]. I would like to offer my <b>FULL SUPPORT</b> for the proposals, the reasons being as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -This will relieve the daily congestion in the close.</li> <li>• -It will provide the access for emergency vehicles to all properties.</li> <li>• -Relieve pressure form the footpaths that are deteriorating rapidly owing to the continuous parked cars mounting them.</li> <li>• -Provide a safe footpath for pedestrians to walk along the footpath, at present it is not safe to walk on.</li> <li>• -Double yellows will provide safe passing access for those whom are disabled.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you, I trust my response will be listened too, with the appreciation of the detrimental impact the present parking situation is having upon the close and my welfare. My very best, [redacted]</p>
<p>17<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Good Morning, I would like to let you know of my SUPPORT of the proposal to put double yellow lines in Thames Close, Leigh-On-Sea, [redacted] The parking of vehicles in the close creates a major safety issue in the fact pedestrians, especially the less able, find it difficult to walk on the footpath, emergency vehicles will struggle to access the close in an emergency and also, large vehicles and rubbish trucks constantly ruin the footpaths opposite a parked vehicle as they mount them to gain access. Kindest regards, [redacted]</p>
<p>22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Having [redacted]i have witnessed first hand how difficult parking in Leigh is. Firstly I'm unsure what the reasoning behind the extra double yellow lines would be, there is not one other road in the Broadway area which has yellow lines on both sides of the road. I believe that having yellow lines on both sides would make the road more dangerous as cars will use the road as a rat run knowing that there may not be cars parked and will cause dangerous driving. I believe that making the road a one way road would be much much safer than removing all parking on the road.</p>
<p>17<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html; Regarding Scheme: TT1011 Street name: SEAVIEW ROAD [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: I do not agree with this movement as if you move the parking it will damage prices of the houses that have two parking spaces and there is more room on the current side for parking the cars on the other side will be sticking out resulting in more damaged car</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

Executive Director

Southend Business Change and Development Team

SOUTHERN ON SEA  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

13 JUL 2021

RECEIVED

11<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Dear Sir or Madam,

With reference to the Road Traffic Regulation Notice TT1011 Proposed Order to introduce no waiting at any time on (x) Thames Close both side for entire length

This is not what the residents originally requested or want This Order would prevent all services or maintenance vehicles from parking anywhere at any time within the Close

What was requested by the [redacted], (b) Introduce no waiting Mon-Frid, 2pm-3pm, this helps prevent commuters parking all day in the Close whilst travelling to London from Leigh Station This then allows parking for the residents visiting relatives and friends during the day in the limited area of the Close.

Please consider this request on conclusion of your Proposed Order TT1011

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

**TT1012 Thorpe Bay Gardens**

Date	Comments
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	To whom it may concern  We are a resident in Thorpe bay Gardens, number [redacted], and fully support the application to change parking restrictions as per the ref number above.  There are many reasons to be in favour as :

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>It will reduce and deter young drivers from gathering in groups. These gatherings often tend to play loud music, litter, take drugs and cause noise pollution and disrespect to the area.</p> <p>The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</p> <p>As a resident we pay a premium to live and enjoy the area. It is heartbreaking to see the area abused by non residents and visitors that use it as an extended car park and also carry out anti social behaviour.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>8<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Reasons why we support this change: -</p> <p>It will reduce and deter the young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like ) The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead as they need to be grouped together</p> <p>[Redacted], [Redacted], Shoeburyness</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>I am wholeheartedly SUPPORTING the parking proposals in Thorpe Bay Gardens. They are desperately needed as a deterrent to cease the pattern of anti-social and illegal behaviour which has become the normal along this residential road. Police attendences and security services has been need over the past 2 years to deal to manage the ASB, drug use, driving at speed along the grass verge, large gatherings and fighting (one incident redulting in a serious head injury). It really is a very serious situation that the proposals will be able to address.</p> <p>Those living along THB are best placed to give an honest argument as have for been living through the disturbances night after night.</p> <p>The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don't have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</p> <p>Thank you. [Redacted]</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am writing this letter in support of the proposed parking changes requested by residents of Thorpe Bay Gardens of which I am a [Redacted]. For [Redacted] we have been trying to sort this nuisance out. There is no alternative but to enforce what [redacted] is proposing. Until this road becomes a no parking zone I don't see this nuisance stopping. [redacted] are fearful of walking down the road alone in the evenings. I don't walk on this road in the dark when I can clearly see intoxicated youths loitering about their parked cars. In the mornings when I go for my morning walk I can see beer cans and small capsules littered on the roads.</p> <p>This state of affairs has to stop and the first step in this direction will be to make this a No Parking zone as suggested by all of us who live on this road. I hope you will take note of my letter and do what is required to make us safe.</p> <p>Regards Yours sincerely [Redacted]</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I would like to support the parking restrictions for Thorpe bay gardens.</p> <p>There is ample paid car parking spaces available, so no need for it at all.</p> <p>Also the issues around anti social behaviour is terrible. I am sure you remember the issues last summer with a car trying to run someone down.</p> <p>The speed bumps have been very successful in stopping the drag racing which use to take place.</p> <p>Let's hope these parking restrictions stops drug dealer, drivers out of their heads on hippy crack &amp; people dropping their take away wrappers out of the car windows of which they council has to pay for people to clear up.</p> <p>My [redacted] also supports this &amp; we are residents of [Redacted]</p> <p>Thanks, [Redacted]</p>
31 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>We strongly support the new measures to address the problems in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>Our reasons include the following:</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>1. It will reduce and deter the mostly young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like )</p> <p>2. The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the people causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</p> <p>3. Objections to this proposal can only be based on ignorance of the facts. The facts are, there is Antisocial behaviour, drug use and intimidation of residents on a regular basis along this stretch of ThorpeBayGardens. This has all been documented and reported to Police and local authorities in the preceeding years.</p> <p>Best regards [Redacted] [Redacted]</p>
<p>1<sup>st</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>reference TT1012 Reasons why we support this change: -</p> <p>1. It will reduce and deter the young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like )</p> <p>2. The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead as they need to be grouped together</p> <p>[Redacted] [Redacted]</p>
<p>31<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Please accept this email providing the following reasons why I support the change in your notice TT1012.</p> <p>1. It will reduce and deter the young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like )</p>

	<p>2. The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</p> <p>3. For anyone who doesn’t live in TBG, any objections to this proposal can only be made in ignorance of the real reasons why they are sorely needed</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>[Redacted] [Redacted]</p>
<p>8<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>I thank you for your letter dated 29th July.</p> <p>As a resident of [redacted] Thorpe Bay gardens for over [redacted] years, I am very pleased to fully support the Council regarding the proposed alterations to the parking restrictions in TBG.</p> <p>Unfortunately over the years TBG seems to have become a magnet for Undesirables. They turn up, mainly by car, in the evenings for what seems deliberately anti social behaviour. They openly take drugs and are heavy drinkers. They race their cars at speeds which are a danger to their occupants and residents. They leave litter that would bring shame to a third world country. They play sports, cricket and football, in the road, with their boundaries often being the front gardens of our houses. They seem oblivious of flower beds and our cars.</p> <p>The proposal alterations are in my opinion good for the town and us. As it would break the habit and the convenience of this group as they will not be able to find such a suitable area to meet.</p> <p>I am sad that I've had to send an email to you but unless you have suffered the experiences that the residents have , the rapid deterioration in social behaviour over the years, you would not believe</p> <p>Thank you for your cooperation and understanding of our problem.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>31<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Dear Business and Development Team</p> <p>I agree with the above proposal for the following reasons</p> <p>1 It will deter ASB, which is unfortunately a common occurrence, especially in the evening</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>2 It is TBG which attracts ASB. I consider it most unlikely, on balance, that there would be displacement of vehicles or people into nearby roads</p> <p>3 Moblie homes and caravans often come to the area</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>31<sup>st</sup> July 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I write this email as representative of some [redacted] along this particular section of road</p> <p>We, as residents who live here 24/7, are the most severely and directly impacted by the nuisance of anti-social behaviour and all that it brings, along our road. On nearly al occasions, when such behaviour occurs, it is from people who have arrived in their cars and parked alongside the public green space, using it as a substitute seafront</p> <p>To summarise, these are the reasons why we write in support of the proposals, which should go some way to reducing the impact of this ASB :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will reduce and deter the young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like )</li> <li>2. The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</li> <li>3. For anyone who doesn’t live in TBG, any objections to this proposal can only be made in ignorance of the real reasons why they are sorely needed</li> </ol> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I write with reference to the above proposal to affirm my support for the changes outlined therein. My preference would be for double yellow line restrictions throughout the year but in lieu of that I am supportive of the proposal as set out.</p>



Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>I would make the following points;</p> <p>1. Over recent years the gathering and behaviour of a substantial number of young adults with cars during summer evenings has been both very alarming and frightening to residents of Thorpe Bay Gardens and surrounding areas. From highly intrusive loud music, open drug dealing, drunkenness and very aggressive behaviour to gang fights, knives and dangerous driving the environment has become totally unacceptable. The behaviour improves and dissipates when enforcement and security is present but returns immediately security goes away. The only way that residents were able to protect themselves last year was to hire private security to achieve the safety and quality of environment which should be the responsibility of the Council to deliver, 2. The new proposals -if properly and regularly enforced -should drive such behaviours onto the sea front parking bays and away from the immediate residential areas. Whilst that still leaves the behavioural issues to be addressed it is at least removed from direct confrontation with large numbers of residents both in Thorpe Bay Gardens and surrounding roads.</p> <p>3. Removing the seasonal limitations will in winter free the road to a better flow of traffic and increased visibility of pedestrians and children coming off the green space and send parking to where it should be in the bays on the sea front. Often on bright winter days TBG is parked nose to tail with all the frustrations that brings and the seafront bays are empty; the revised proposals should solve that problem, 4. The revised proposals will only be successful if they are regularly and rigorously enforced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, [Redacted]</p>
<p>2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>As a [redacted] resident I am writing to support the changes proposed to parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>During the warmer weather the road becomes a focal point for young people meeting up in groups and we have witnessed much anti-social behaviour (loud music, littering, urinating, drug selling, drug taking,...). The presence of groups of young people attracts drug dealers, which in turn leads to further antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>I feel the new restrictions (if enforced) will deter drivers and their passengers from parking on the road and dramatically reduce the amount of anti-social behaviour in the area. Enforcement could be achieved and illegal parking and anti-social behaviour reduced by a regular visit of a 'camera car' as used elsewhere in Southend.</p> <p>Any one genuinely visiting the area to enjoy the views and the beach has adequate areas to park in the adjacent council-run car parks that are away from the residential area so I do not believe these new restrictions will lead to displacement of the problem to nearby streets.</p> <p>Regards, [Redacted]</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>8<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>For the attention of the Technical Support Officer, Business Change and Development Team:</p> <p>I wish to support the proposal TT1012 to revoke the existing seasonal restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens and replace them with waiting restrictions operating between 8am and 10pm Monday to Sunday.</p> <p>Considerable disturbance has been experienced as a result of mainly young drivers and their passengers gathering in groups in the evening, after the expiry of the current parking restrictions, then committing various types of antisocial behaviour including, but not limited to, drug selling and consumption, noisy and rowdy behaviour, playing loud music, playing football in the road, consuming alcohol to excess and creating large amounts of litter, all to the considerable detriment of the nearby residents and causing additional expense to Southend Council and Veolia through the need for additional street and environmental cleaning. Furthermore, as the cleaning crews will confirm, the area has been blighted by large quantities of gas canisters, balloons and other drug-taking paraphernalia to the detriment of one of Southend's most popular public open spaces.</p> <p>The proposed changes will have no effect on surrounding roads. Thorpe Bay Gardens is being used as an alternative to the seafront parking bays to avoid notice by the Police and to avoid parking charges. Those who are committing the existing nuisance will have no interest in parking further from the seafront in the adjoining streets.</p> <p>The residents of Thorpe Bay Gardens have been subjected to aggressive and unpleasant nuisance – sometimes seen on national TV and in the national press. Such nuisance may not be appreciated by those who might object to this proposal, nevertheless, the proposal is a sound one and will almost certainly solve the problems which have been such a problem.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>10<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of the 29th last regarding change to waiting restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>As [redacted] residents we wholeheartedly welcome the proposed changes. We have for a [redacted] suffered anti social behavior ( over loud music, football in the road, blocking of the road to other road users etc) from occupants of cars parked along the gardens.</p> <p>There are plenty of parking spaces available along the seafront for those that wish to park in the area without using T/BAY gardens or any other local roads.</p> <p>With kind regards,</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>With regards to Thorpe bay Gardens as a resident for the past [redacted] years and a Thorpe bay [redacted] for [redacted], the last few years we have seen a difference in the road. Speeding. Cars at night parked that eat takeaway food throwing their rubbish in the road which I clean up in front of my house. Using my garden to throw rubbish in. People in cars inhaling gas. Youths on seats in gardens with loud music leaving rubbish and breaking glass. Men using the hedge as a urinal opposite our house in full view. These few antisocial people just spoil it for all Thorpe bay residents not just us. This is why we would like measures to stop these things happening.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>1<sup>st</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>This letter is to confirm my support for the proposed parking restriction in Thorpe Bay Gardens. There are a number of reasons why this restriction should be authorised. Drivers are using this road instead of parking on the nearby seafront. There is constant antisocial behaviour after 6.00pm including very loud music, littering and drug taking; the evidence of this last is seen the following morning in the litter left. I look after a young child and he is frequently awakened by the noise of this behaviour. I believe that this problem would not transfer to adjacent roads but these drivers would in the evening park on the seafront where other young drivers congregate. This is in a non residential part of the seafront.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>1<sup>st</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>We are in favour of the proposed measures because:</p> <p>It will reduce and deter the young drivers who, in winter as in summer, park in TBG at (or often before) 6pm, and then go on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like.)</p> <p>The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displace vehicles into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti-social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</p> <p>For anyone who doesn’t live in TBG, any objections to this proposal can only be made in ignorance of the real reasons why they are sorely needed.</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Yours faithfully, [Redacted]</p>
<p>5<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Please accept this email providing the following reasons why I support the change in your notice TT1012.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will reduce and deter the young drivers and their passengers from gathering in groups, in TBG, quite often going on to commit some form of ASB (noisy music, playing football in road, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, littering and the like )</li> <li>2. The additional hours of this restriction, over and above the seasonal restrictions already in place, would not cause and displacement into other nearby roads. The overwhelming majority of the people who park in TBG in these “extra” times, particularly in the evenings, are the same ones who are causing the anti social behaviour – and they are using TBG like an extra part of the seafront – except they don’t have to pay for parking. Inevitably, therefore, if they are moved on from TBG, they would not go into any other adjacent residential roads, they would use the seafront instead.</li> <li>3. For anyone who doesn’t live in TBG, any objections to this proposal can only be made in ignorance of the real reasons why they are sorely needed</li> </ol> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>24<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>With regards to the proposal to restrict parking in Thorpe Bay Gardens I would like my objection to be noted.</p> <p>Why should this road be treated in a special way when most other residents in Southend have no prospect whatever of receiving such favoured treatment ? I live in [Redacted] and already throughout the summer months traffic is constant in our road[redacted] and parking outside our properties a nightmare. We have difficulty getting in and out of our houses and often find cars parked over our driveways. Why, when we pay the same Council Tax, do we not receive the same privilege as Thorpe Bay Gardens?</p> <p>Your proposal smacks of favouritism for some unknown reason and it is not good enough! It is an insult to us and other Southend residents and we have experienced far greater problems!</p> <p>Your reasons for the proposal can be applied to any road in the borough and there are no grounds to single out this road as a special case.</p> <p>There is no pressure on parking in the winter and no issue with driveways. I propose that this measure be cancelled immediately and you arrange a meeting with us and in the other areas of St Augustine’s, St James and Marcus Avenues as well as Dungannon Drive to explain your proposal and listen to our concerns.</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Yours Sincerely [Redacted]</p>
8 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Dear Sir, I notice with dismay that there are intended parking restrictions to be installed in Thorpe Bay Gardens, Thorpe Bay.</p> <p>The present allowance for parking between certain times seems perfectly adequate for a no through road and acceptable to visiting members of the public and residents.</p> <p>The proposed permanent no parking in this road will only force drivers to park in nearby roads near the seafront ,including Burges Road which is a main thorough fare road ,an alternative route from the seafront to and from Southend and has been subject to many traffic accidents over the last few years , due to speeding and drivers failing to stop at the junctions intersecting Burges Road and I am concerned that adding further parking in this road will only add to the possibility of increased incidents on this busy road.</p> <p>As a resident I fully accept the increase in seasonal parking in this area ,as visitors to the seafront are welcome and contribute to local businesses .</p> <p>I would ask you to urgently reconsider this proposed change of parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens for the benefit of visitors and local residents, who will suffer from these unnecessary changes to local parking</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, [Redacted]</p>
12 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>It is my understanding that the Council has posted a notice of intent to revoke existing seasonal restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens; and introduce daily no waiting restrictions, between the hours of 8am and 10pm.</p> <p>I should like to voice my objections to the proposals, and to the reasons given, as the stated reasons ie...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road and preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising;</li> <li>(b) facilitating the passage on the road of traffic;</li> <li>(c) facilitate access to driveways; and,</li> <li>(c) preserving or improving the residential nature of Thorpe Hall Gardens by restricting non-residential parking.</li> </ul> <p>Such stated reasons can be applied to every road in the town...and...if implemented every road should be subject to the same restrictions.</p> <p>In a popular seaside town such as Southend-on-Sea, that sees many day-trippers, it is not unreasonable to see seasonal parking restrictions. However it is also not unreasonable to expect local residents to be able to park, and enjoy the green and the beach, at other less busy times...when there is no pressure with parking and no issue with access to driveways.</p> <p>Furthermore it is not unreasonable to mention that there are many residential roads within the borough; far busier than Thorpe Bay Gardens and with more immediate issues, whose residents would rightly question the proposals.</p> <p>Finally the Council will be aware of incidents of anti-social behaviour in Thorpe Bay Gardens involving vehicles. These proposals would give the road the potential to becoming a straight and unhindered cruise strip; thus creating problems, not solving problems that do not essentially exist.</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I understand the council are proposing to extend the seasonal parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens to No Waiting between 8am and 10pm 365 days a year. In my capacity as [Redacted] [Redacted] ([Redacted]) I would strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>I fully support the current seasonal restrictions on Thorpe Bay Gardens, but such an extension would push the traffic to park in Marcus Avenue, Burges Road, Dungannon Drive, St. James Avenue and St. Augustines Avenue. The stated reasons could be applied to any road in the borough, there are certainly no grounds to single out this road as a special case.</p> <p>I would respectfully urge you not to change the existing restrictions.</p> <p>Thank you, [Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>As a resident of [Redacted] I strongly object to this proposal for Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>Summer restrictions make sense, but to extend these to an annual restriction unfairly biases these residents at the expense of roads like Burges. This follows on from speed bumps being installed along the Gardens while traffic often hurtles down Burges road.</p> <p>This proposal appears to be blatantly unfair and I therefore ask that you do not proceed with it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, [Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Sir,</p> <p>We hear you are imposing restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens, all year round. We accept the seasonal parking, but in winter it not reasonable to stop Southend residents parking in this quiet street, pressure will built up on roads like Burges road which does get a lot of traffic all times.</p> <p>Please reconsider your decision</p> <p>With regards</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
25 <sup>h</sup> August 2021	<p>I wish to register objection to the proposed extension of parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens and I do so by reference to the stated reasons for the proposal as follows:</p> <p>a. and b. These reasons are of universal application. Logically, if these reasons are sufficient to support the proposal no vehicles should be permitted to park on any road!</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>c. I have lived in [Redacted] for [Redacted] . I have not noticed any problem with parking in the winter months, nor any problem with access to driveways.</p> <p>d. This is clearly discriminatory and unfairly prejudicial to residents in other roads. We must share our facilities and roads where they are maintained at public expense.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>There have been always been restrictions in Thorpe bay Gardens, now further restrictions and even more being proposed.</p> <p>What entitles these residents to live in a comparatively quiet, very low traffic road to now have all parking banned ?</p> <p>They had speed humps installed in a matter of weeks of an incident, ridiculous on a road such as this, but of course its Thorpe bay gardens !!</p> <p>We live in [redacted] and apart from continual parking on both side of the road it is notorious for speeding, some cars go past my house at 60mph, if ever speed humps were needed its in this road, regular speed checks, with the heavy parking and speeding accidents are inevitable,</p> <p>We object most strongly to your proposals to 'preserve or improve the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens ' what about the residential nature of Burges Road, we are only a matter of yards away yet are being treated as second class residents. Why cant there be shared restrictions between the roads in the area ? Why should all the resources be used on one part of a road, what did the speed humps cost ? money was very quickly found for that. Preferential treatment of the highest level, outrageous.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I write to object to the proposed parking restrictions on Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>Thorpe Bay Gardens is one of the widest roads in the area and can quite easily take parking from residents or visitors, allowing people to park and walk their dogs and enjoy the green themselves.</p> <p>Because of the width and size of the road this puts no pressure on access to driveways. These gardens are for everyone to enjoy not just the few.</p> <p>The arrangement as it stands has been working for many years and has been very successfully, therefore I believe these proposals to be unjustified.</p> <p>If these proposals were to go ahead this would cause more congestion on smaller roads south of Burges Road compared to the expanse of Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
12 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>We live at [Redacted] and strongly object to the proposal to extend parking restrictions to 12 months as we do not consider this necessary for the winter months. In addition this will also increase parking in Marcus Ave as drivers seek the nearest spots with unrestricted parking. We already experience</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>problems of day trippers blocking our drive occasionally and this proposal if going ahead will make matters worse. Eventually it will be necessary to impose traffic restrictions in Marcus Ave. I trust this proposal will be reconsidered [Redacted]</p>
<p>12<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Southend Council,</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the seasonal parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens as per the above reference number for the following reasons:</p> <p>The reasons stated for applying these amendments to this road do not meet any of the councils polices or minimum criteria for highways amendments or intervention.</p> <p>The reasons stated apply to all roads within the borough, not just Thorpe Bay Gardens, therefore this proposal and its reasonings is a moot point and not a justification in itself.</p> <p>If the council is to proceed with these changes, it will set a precedence, which could be justifiably applied to all other roads in the Borough of Southend.</p> <p>There has been no documented or corroborated evidence to show that an issue exists that requires any form of amendment or intervention.</p> <p>There should be clear and unequivocal justifications and information providing unambiguous reasons for this highways intervention. None has been presented to the public consultation or publicly broadcast council meetings.</p> <p>The intervention has been driven purely on political grounds by the ward councillors and is not one that is of a priority nature that warrants either officer and/or elected members time.</p> <p>The intervention has detracted valuable officer time away from higher priority highways issues, that are being neglected in favour of this request.</p> <p>If approved, it may cause traffic displacement and parking stress in surrounding roads, which has not been evaluated, factored in to, or considered in this proposal. No evidence or information has been presented detailing this important information.</p> <p>The changes seek to change restrictions during the 'out of season' period. This is an irrational proposal that seeks to affect changes that are not needed, justified or warranted.</p> <p>Parking stress is not an issue in Thorpe Bay Gardens and there is no evidence of such to support such a claim.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the global pandemic, decisions such as this should not be taken until it can be established that any potential issues being experienced would be considered as near normal as possible and not temporary due to a short term change in behavioural patterns.</p> <p>There should be a greater understanding of the wider implications for other surrounding roads who may be impacted by this decision. We would apply the same logical thinking to a residents parking scheme and the same should apply to this, as the potential impacts are identical.</p> <p>There has been no impact assessment conducted to understand and evaluate what consequential issues this action may cause to those who will be affected by these changes. A full and detailed impact assessment, including the number of potentially displaced vehicles, should be conducted and presented to the council committees before reaching a decision on this matter.</p> <p>It would be irresponsible to make the proposed changes taking the aforementioned in to account and whilst the current</p>



Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>circumstances prevail and this proposal should be deferred for at least 12 months and reviewed after this time.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
25 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>I certainly object to unlimited parking in any of the roads off Thorpe Bay Gardens. I live in [Redacted] I am of the opinion that certain people in TBG think they can snap their fingers and the powers that be will obey. It's enough now that in the summer the parked traffic gets further up the road. No one really wants cars parked everywhere but why should certain roads be exempt. Thank u. [Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>As a long time resident of [redacted] I feel the request quite unreasonable having Had speed bumps put in the nice seats taken away do the own the place what About the rest of us we to pay rates too[Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>I object to the above proposal. The current restrictions are perfectly adequate. Any further restrictions will see further traffic disruption into Burges Road and a number of roads leading off it from St Augustine's Avenue to the East. It appears that Thorpe Bay Gardens has been singled out as a special case. As a local resident I have seen no evidence regarding issues with access to private driveways.</p> <p>So far as the notion that it will improve the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens is concerned, I feel that all this will do is drive traffic into other roads surrounding Thorpe Bay Gardens which are already taking more than their fair share of the traffic burden.</p> <p>Quite frankly, if the council provided visitors from outside of the locality with adequate public parking along the seafront at a reasonable cost, the current situation would not arise and most of us in Thorpe Bay would be freed from the onerous burden already forced upon us by the council.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
24 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>We would like to object to the proposal to introduce No Waiting restrictions across parts of Thorpe Bay Gardens throughout the year.</p> <p>In our view, there is no need for this outside the Summer season and the current restrictions are sufficient. Outside the summer season there is no pressure on the existing provision, and no problems on accessing driveways by the residents. Residential properties are only on the north side of the road, leaving plenty of options for parking on both sides, and the road is quiet in the winter months.</p> <p>The result of implementing such a scheme will lead to greatly increased traffic in the surrounding roads, in particular Burges Road, which is already a busy thoroughfare. Burges Road is a driving test route, and as such is used by many driving schools. The speed of cars along Burges Road is already well in excess of the speed limit, and there have been several accidents at junction points.</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>Prohibiting traffic from parking in Thorpe Bay Gardens will increase the parking in Burges Road, leading to more accidents and congestion. Why should Thorpe Bay Gardens have this privilege in preference to other roads in Thorpe Bay? Seasonal restrictions are expected and acceptable, but there is no reason why these restrictions should be increased throughout the year, when there are few cars parked there in the winter months and the road is quiet.</p> <p>As residents of [Redacted], we would like to point out that this road is used as a race track, particularly in the evenings and night times, with cars regularly driving at ridiculous speeds, and yet there is no traffic calming in place, unlike Thorpe Bay Gardens, which now has a series of speed bumps.</p> <p>We are emailing to object to these proposals.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>25<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>We wish to object to the plan to change the parking restrictions on Thorpe Bay Gardens to all year round restrictions. There is no need for the restrictions in the winter months, the road is wide enough to accommodate traffic even with the parking allowed. The consequence of this change will be to push the parked vehicles up the roads nearest to Burges Road and they are much more likely to cause traffic problems than on Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [Redacted]</p>
<p>25<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>REF TT102</p> <p>We are writing to object to the proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The stated reasons can be applied to any road in the borough, there are no grounds to single out this road as a special case.</p> <p>We accept that the seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable, but in the Winter it is not reasonable to stop Southend residents parking in this quiet street to walk on the green.</p> <p>There is no pressure on parking in the winter and therefore no issue with access to driveways.</p> <p>As for improving the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens, this is an insult to other Southend residents who have no prospect of obtaining restrictions to parking in their own roads, most of which have far greater parking stress and traffic.</p> <p>Yours faithfully [Redacted]</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

<p>26<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>As a resident in [Redacted] I am writing with regards to the above proposed planning parking restrictions in relation to the potential overflow of traffic from the Seafront. I believe that there should be restrictions to all roads within a set distance from the seafront so those visiting the area use the dedicated parking bays as well as the new parking area down by The Shorehouse. Why should those visiting not be expected to pay whereby us residents paying Council Tax be expected to put up with the inconvenience during high season which could result in a vehicle being parked outside my residence for the whole day duration. Regards [redacted]</p>
<p>25<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>Thorpe Bay Gardens. parking Restrictions</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed parking restrictions on the following grounds:</p> <p>: The stated reasons can be applied to any road in the borough. There are no grounds to single out this road as a special case.</p> <p>: we accept that seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable but in the winter it is not reasonable to stop local residents parking and enjoying this walk on the green.</p> <p>: We have already been denied the use of the seats which have been removed on a so called 'temporary' basis.</p> <p>: There is no pressure on parking in the winter and no issue with access to driveways.</p> <p>: as for item d improving the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>This is an insult to local residents who have no prospect of obtaining restrictions to parking in their own roads.</p> <p>: I had to travel [redacted] recently and the vehicle was unable to travel along Marcus Avenue but there was no problem in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>25<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	<p>I cannot express how much I am against the proposed parking restrictions for Thorpe Bay Gardens. This a wide road and the stated reasons are laughable, the reasons could apply to all roads in this borough. During winter months it is unreasonable and totally unnecessary to deprive local residents parking in a quiet, wide road. All that will happen is that parking in nearby roads will be heavier . Especially as they are used throughout the day by learner drivers. [Redacted]</p>
<p>26/08/2021</p>	<p>Representation on</p>

BOROUGH OF SOUTHEND ON SEA  
THE SOUTHEND BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING, LOADING, STOPPING  
AND PARKING PLACES)  
(CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2021 – TT1012 - THORPE BAY GARDENS  
By: [Redacted]  
25 August 2021

1.0 Objection

1.1 As a resident of the area, I object to the introduction of the order on the following grounds:

i. The proposals would unreasonably restrict the use of this public highway for parking for visitors to the surrounding open space and seafront promenade and beach.

ii. There is no justification or authority for any of the 4 statements of reasons presented with the draft order, which are dishonest, deceptive, contrived and contemptuous of residents who wish to reasonably park in this street. This is an abuse of the Council's powers as highway authority.

iii. Considering and progressing such a scheme is a waste of valuable Council resources particularly as there is a backlog in progressing and implementing approved and justified traffic and parking schemes across the Borough.

2.0 Alternative proposal

2.1 I consider that a review of parking restrictions should, instead, result in the removal of the existing seasonal restrictions for which there is no highway justification and unreasonably restricts the use of this public highway for parking in the summer months.

3.0 Commentary

General

3.1 Thorpe Bay Gardens (TBG) is a public highway and therefore should be open for public use and enjoyment by all users unless there are justifiable highway, traffic or parking management grounds for any restrictions to be introduced.

Statement of Reasons

3.2 There is no justification or authority for any of the 4 (a, b, c & c) statements of reasons presented with the draft order which are given as:

a) avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road and preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising;

(b) facilitating the passage on the road of traffic;

(c) facilitate access to driveways; and,

(c) preserving or improving the residential nature of Thorpe Hall Gardens by restricting non-residential parking

3.3 TBG has very little traffic so there are no road safety or traffic flow issues to address.

3.4 TBG is wide enough to accommodate parking both sides whilst accommodating the small level of moving traffic, emergency access in the street, and access to/from vehicle crossovers.

3.5 TBG has residential properties on one side of the street only and all have adequate crossovers and front garden/parking areas large enough to accommodate parking for all residents and their visitors. So there are no issues to address with respect to on-street residential parking management.

3.6 So there are no highway, traffic or parking management reasons for the introduction, or indeed retention, of parking restrictions in this street.

	<p>3.7 In respect of the 2nd ( c) – residential nature – the vast majority, if not all, of residential streets have parked cars on- street and off-street on forecourts, driveways etc. Parked cars are part of the modern street scene so it is ridiculous to state that preventing on street parking in Thorpe Bay Gardens would preserve or improve its ‘residential nature’. In any case, houses (all of which are well set back from the roadway) are only on one side of the road, the south side being open space with access for use by all the Borough’s residents. So, it is not just a residential road. Traffic Regulation Working Party and Cabinet Committee (TRWPCC) on 10th June 2021</p> <p>3.8 The report to TRWPCC on 10 June 2021 did not highlight or address any highway, traffic or parking management issue to justify the introduction of any restrictions. So, there is no authority for the statement of reasons.</p> <p>3.9 The TRWPCC report seemed to largely refer to a private covenant which, as the report indicates, is not applicable on the public highway or relevant to the Council as highway authority. In any case, as the covenant states ‘ensure as far as reasonably possible, that no parking of cars is permitted on the North side of Thorpe Bay Gardens, eastwards from its junction with St Augustine’s Avenue”, reference is only made to the north side. Also, as there are no highway reasons for restricting parking on this public highway it is clearly not ‘reasonably possible’ for the Council as highway authority to introduce parking restrictions. Honesty</p> <p>3.10 The Council should be honest with its residents and say that there are no highway reasons for these restrictions, the only reasons being that the residents in the street do not wish to have any parking outside their houses or in their street presumably because parking Impacts on their view and brings non- residents into the area which they wish to keep private. If the Council proceed with this then it should, in order to be equitable, offer parking restrictions outside any house whose owner does not like people parking there for whatever reason. But this would be totally ridiculous, as is the TBG scheme. Timescale</p> <p>3.11 The TBG scheme was approved in June 2021 and advertised in July 2021 whilst many other agreed schemes across the borough are stuck in a long list awaiting resources to be progressed and implemented. There has been no reason given for giving priority and special treatment to the TBG scheme proposal.</p> <p>Sent by email to traffweb@southend.gov.uk on 26 August 2021.</p>
27/08/2021	<p>Regarding Scheme: TT1012 Street name: THORPE BAY GARDENS Name: [Redacted] Contact preference: Email Address: [redacted] Postcode: [redacted] Phone: [redacted] Email: [redacted] Comment type: Object Comment: Objection on the grounds that this will force those looking to use the local green and beach to park on surrounding local roads - all of which are becoming busier and faster due to lack of traffic calming measures. If the intent is to encourage more use of the parking bays on the seafront, then perhaps</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>making them much cheaper in the off-seasons would encourage more use and likely increase revenue.</p>
26/08/2021	<p>Sir</p> <p>I suspect that the majority of the freeholders/owners of the houses in Thorpe Bay Gardens were well aware of the parking regulations in force when they purchased their properties &amp; were happy with these provisions, otherwise they would not have completed their purchases.</p> <p>Your suggested proposals of introducing No Waiting Restrictions totally all year round is invalid for this reason &amp; will certainly lead to all of the problems you actually highlight in your paper (a)-(d) throughout all the other roads &amp; avenues within the Burges State.</p> <p>Leave well alone. [redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>We have been informed of the proposed new parking restrictions in the above road and are most unhappy about this.</p> <p>Our property is on the crossroads of [Redacted] and [Redacted] and we have to endure constant movement of cars being parked, cars being driven off, day and night and right through the year. Wouldn't we all like to live on a quiet road without the constant slamming of car doors and loud voices!!</p> <p>There are houses on just one side of Thorpe Bay Gardens. Having driveways on one side means there is less congestion on that road to allow safe parking. Why should parking be pushed back on to other roads? Burges Road, for example, is already a busy road and the speed of traffic is quite alarming on occasions.</p> <p>Thorpe Bay Garden residents requested speed bumps and they were granted. Not satisfied with these, they are now requesting parking to be limited yet further. Next request will be for gates to be installed at each end of the road to keep the road for themselves!</p> <p>Please stop pandering to the residents in this road. We are all having to live with increased traffic and parking problems on our roads. Thorpe Bay Gardens should not be singled out for preferential treatment.</p> <p>Yours faithfully [Redacted]</p>
25/08/2021	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Ref.; TT102</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposal that the Council is putting forward to extend the existing seasonal parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>The grounds that I wish to object are as follows;</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the stated reasons can be applied to any road in the borough, there are no grounds to single out this road as a special case</li><li>• we accept that seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable but, in the winter, it is not reasonable to stop Southend residents parking in this quiet street to walk to the green</li><li>• there is no pressure on parking in the winter and therefore no issue with access to driveways, especially on such a wide road</li><li>• as for item (d), improving the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens, this is an insult to other Southend residents who have no prospect of obtaining restrictions to parking in their own roads, most of which would definitely have far greater parking stress and traffic.</li></ul> <p>As a resident from [Redacted] , just [Redacted] of Thorpe Bay Gardens and Burges road we have no parking restrictions in place and during the summer months find it increasingly difficult to manoeuvre our cars in and out of our driveways safely, sometimes being blocked. We have not got the benefit of a wide road. There is congestion and a much greater chance of accidents resulting.</p> <p>There really is in my opinion no pressure on parking during the off season months in Thorpe Bay Gardens and no reason to single out this road as a special case. This is not a busy road and minimal traffic passes through it.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [Redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I want to object to the Council proposing to extend the existing seasonal restrictions.</p> <p>My objections are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the stated reasons can be applied to any road in the borough, so why Thorpe Bay Gardens think this is a reason when roads near schools are far more at risk.</li><li>* seasonal parking is reasonable but in the winter it is unfair to prevent local people parking in a quiet street just because a few residents have only their own best interests at heart.</li><li>* The access to driveways - there is no issue with what are some of the biggest drives in Southend.</li><li>* item d - this is the most insulting and arrogant point ! This should clearly not in any way be of consideration.</li></ul> <p>They have far far less parking stress given the over large driveways.</p> <p>Allowing this to go ahead will push traffic into other roads and is more likely to cause accidents.</p> <p>Kind regards, [Redacted]</p>

<p>30/08/2021</p>	<p>Your reference: TT102</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>As a local resident, I am writing to object to your proposal to change parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens on the following grounds:</p> <p>(1) the stated reasons for the proposed change can be applied to any road in the borough, why is this road being singled out as a special case?</p> <p>(2) while seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable, in winter is it reasonable to stop Southend residents parking in this quiet street to access the green or seafront?</p> <p>(3) there is no pressure on parking in the winter and therefore no issue with driveway access.</p> <p>(4) improving the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens is an insult to other Southend residents who have no prospect of obtaining restrictions to parking in their roads many of which have far greater parking stress and traffic.</p> <p>(5) this proposal will lead to the displacement of traffic into other roads such as Burges Road. The junction of St.Augustines and Burges Road is already the scene of many accidents. The front garden wall at number [Redacted] has been rebuilt many times in the [Redacted] I have lived here. I also have experience of a car coming from the direction of the seafront and failing to stop at the Burges Road junction, damaging my [redacted].</p> <p>(6) Burges Road is frequently used as a rat run by cars and motorcycles, extra cars parking could make this situation even more dangerous.</p> <p>I await your reply with regard to the above</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
<p>26/08/2021</p>	<p>Thorpe Bay Gardens, Parking Restrictions Ref Case TT1012</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions on the above case. Regarding the stated reasons for the change, we disagree with the argument viz:.</p> <p>These reasons can be applied to any road in the borough &amp; there is no reason to single out this road.</p> <p>Seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable, but in the winter it is unreasonable to preclude Southend &amp; Thorpe Bay residents from parking to walk on the greensward &amp; promenade.</p> <p>The road is sufficiently wide for there not to be an issue for access to driveways.</p>



Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>As to improving the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens, this is a blatant introduction of elitism where other Southend residents have no prospect of obtaining restrictions to their own roads which have far greater stress &amp; traffic</p> <p>We have cars parking outside [redacted] house in [redacted] regularly, but the are never there for long periods, so we are happy that people can have leisure time visiting the sea front at Thorpe Bay &amp; it is good for local clubs &amp; businesses.</p> <p>He present parking arrangements to the above area are quite satisfactory.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [Redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>I strongly object to these proposals. There is no thought to the knock on effect they have on Marcus Avenue and other roads north of Burges Road. Marcus Avenue is a narrow road similar to others and is a direct 'rat run' between Burges Road and Acacia Avenue.</p> <p>Due to summer restrictions alone we have experienced blocked driveways, litter, speeding cars, damaged walls, abuse from non residents and 2 near road accidents involving children and passing cars!</p> <p>You are not resolving a problem but transferring it to other smaller roads which cannot accommodate the volume of cars and visitors.</p> <p>To single out Thorpe Bay Gardens is absurd and there is no valid reason to do so as it is wider, has speed bumps(at considerable cost) and is a dead end!</p> <p>Remember residents north of [Redacted] pay more council tax collectively than those on The Gardens and we have as much say as they do or are they classified as privileged? I hope not!</p> <p>Yours faithfully, [Redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens. My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reasons given for the changes apply to any road in the Borough and there is no reasonable excuse to single out this particular road for special treatment.</li> <li>- The restrictions will simply displace parking into nearby roads which are less able to accommodate the excess cars than Thorpe Bay Gardens – the Gardens have houses on only one side of the road unlike those which would be affected having houses and drives on both sides – the proposals therefore would increase any perceived problem rather than reduce it.</li> <li>- Item D is a significant insult to all other residents of Thorpe Bay who do not live in Thorpe Bay Gardens and who would be penalised with their 'residential nature' sacrificed.</li> <li>- Application of the restrictions year round is unnecessary as there is very little demand for parking outside of the summer season and access to driveways is not hindered.</li> </ul>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>I trust that the Council will consider these objections as reasonable and reject the proposed changes.</p> <p>Yours,</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>It has just come to my notice that there are plans to make the no waiting period from 0800 to 2200, an all year round restriction. While seasonal restrictions can be reasonable this extension is entirely unnecessary!</p> <p>The stated reasons can be applied to any road and there are no grounds to single out this wide, and in winter very quiet road as a special case. Residents can easily access their driveways. Vehicles can pass each other with ease. This is safer for pedestrians than the rest of the town. There is more room on this road than most roads in the borough.</p> <p>This road contains many of the most expensive properties in the borough and it appears that they want special treatment. Are we spoiling their view? The council should be concentrating on improving things in the more congested areas of the town, not wasting time on those who already have the best houses, best view, widest and safest road.</p> <p>As a [Redacted] resident myself I am well aware that I am very lucky to reside here. I would be appalled if this is granted.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
29/08/2021	<p>We are residents in [Redacted] , and I wish to record my objections to the proposal on the grounds of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The report proposing the restrictions states that further restrictions may be required in other roads south of Burges Road. This will lead to traffic displacement into surrounding roads including [Redacted], where we are already experiencing some minor problems.</li> <li>2. I accept that seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable, but in winter it is not reasonable to stop Southend or local residents parking in this quite street to walk on the green.</li> <li>3. There is no pressure on parking in winter so therefore no issue with access to driveways.</li> <li>4. The reasons stated can be applied to any of the roads in the Borough, and there should be no grounds to single out this road as a special case.</li> </ol> <p>[Redacted]</p>
25/08/2021	<p>Dear sirs</p> <p>I am writing in connection with the above parking restrictions on Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p>

	<p>I am a resident of [Redacted] on the [redacted] of [redacted] and already it can be difficult for my visitors to park despite several spaces on my property due to people parking for the beach and feel that this may become a year round issue if the new restrictions go ahead. Given that the parking on Thorpe Bay gardens is only on the south side I do not see that this can cause any issue for those residents and furthermore I do not see why that road should be treated any differently to other surrounding roads which are already impacted year round.</p> <p>In addition I have always enjoyed parking along Thorpe Bay Gardens in the winter months to look at the sea and enjoy the view as at [redacted] this is the only way in the winter months that I can enjoy this view</p> <p>I strongly request that you reconsider this proposal so that parking remains available in the winter months for myself and others to enjoy</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
26/08/2021	<p>We are writing to comment on the proposal to amend the parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>From: [redacted]</p> <p>We object to the introduction of the draft order on the following grounds:</p> <p><b><u>Objections</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There seems no justification for any of the 4 statements of reasons presented with the order.</li> <li>2. The proposals would unreasonably restrict the use of the public highway for parking for locals and visitors.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Comments</u></b></p> <p>Thorpe Bay Gardens is a public highway and therefore should be open for public use unless there are justifiable highway, traffic or parking policy grounds for any restrictions to be introduced.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road in question has very little traffic so there does not appear to be any road safety or traffic flow issues to address.</li> <li>2. The road is wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides, the moving traffic, emergency access, and access to/from driveways.</li> <li>3. The properties have enough off road parking areas to accommodate parking for residents. If a perceived lack of residential parking is sufficient to introduce parking restrictions these would be in force in almost every street in the borough.</li> <li>4. So there seems to be no highway or parking policy reasons for the introduction, or indeed retention, of general parking restrictions in this street.</li> <li>5. The private covenant, which is not applicable on a public highway, only covers the north side of the street.</li> <li>6. The final statement of reason for the introduction of the restriction is "preserving or improving the residential nature of Thorpe Hall Gardens by restricting non-residential parking". I am sure there are many residents in the borough who could have their</li> </ol>

	<p>residential nature of their road improved by imposing parking restrictions. But this is simply not a possible option.</p> <p>7. We feel that this is a public road offering access to the green space of Thorpe Bay Gardens. Putting these proposals in place would prevent members of the public from parking for short periods of time in the evening to enjoy the green space and views of the estuary.</p> <p>8. Imposing parking restrictions until 10pm, will surely increase costs for council parking enforcement as these traditionally end at 6pm.</p> <p><b>Alternative proposals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If the council feels that abiding by the private covenant is required. Then they could impose these restrictions on the North side of the road only and remove the current restrictions on the South side of the road.</li> <li>2. A further option is to ban overnight parking on the North and South side to deter camper vans etc.</li> </ol> <p>Regards, [Redacted]</p>
27/08/2021	<p>Information has been received from your councillor [redacted] that you intend to restrict parking all year in Thorpe Bay Gardens. I am astounded at the reasons you give for doing this. This road is one of the quietist in the area. There are no problems with this road whatsoever. This is yet another example of trying to close this road entirely to the general public and create a private road to themselves. What with removing the seats and installing speed bumps the residents of these expensive houses seem to have a good deal of sway with local councillors to warrant this totally unnecessary attention. This latest demand warrants some enquiry into why so much attention is focussed on a particularly quiet stretch of road. I expect this matter to be fully and openly discussed in a proper manner, not passed like the seat removals and speed bumps. [redacted]</p>
24/08/2021	<p>We have been made aware of parking restrictions being extended to encompass the whole year and would like to register our objection to this most strongly,</p> <p>There have been always been restrictions in Thorpe bay Gardens, now further restrictions and even more being proposed.</p> <p>What entitles these residents to live in a comparatively quiet, very low traffic road to now have all parking banned ?</p> <p>They had speed humps installed in a matter of weeks of an incident, ridiculous on a road such as this, but of course its Thorpe bay gardens !!</p> <p>We live in [Redacted] and apart from continual parking on both side of the road it is notorious for speeding, some cars go past my house at 60mph, if ever speed humps were needed its in this road, regular speed checks, with the heavy parking and speeding accidents are inevitable,</p> <p>We object most strongly to your proposals to 'preserve or improve the residential nature of Thorpe Bay Gardens ' what about the residential nature of Burges Road, we are only a matter of yards away yet are being treated as second class residents. Why cant there be shared restrictions between the roads in the area ? Why should all the resources be used on one part of a</p>

Details of submissions to  
Public Consultations

Appendix C

	<p>road, what did the speed humps cost ? money was very quickly found for that. Preferential treatment of the highest level, outrageous. [Redacted]</p>
27/08/2021	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>We would strongly reject the proposal to change the parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>The four reasons stated for a change in parking restrictions would apply to a greater extent to the roads in which the traffic will be displaced, these roads are narrower than Thorpe Bay Gardens and therefore reasons 'a to d' would be an even greater problem in these roads (Burges, Marcus and St Augustine, StJames and Dungannon Drive).</p> <p>There are more driveways in these roads and therefore more chance of an obstruction. We note that reason 'd' surely applies to the Burges Estate as a whole and not just Thorpe Bay Gardens.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
31 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We read the notice today that there are going to be parking restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens. Can you please tell us why! Its a wide road and plenty of room for passing traffic. I would just like to know why!</p> <p>Waiting to hear from you, many thanks. [redacted]</p>
26 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>It is my understanding that it proposed to change the current parking restrictions along Thorpe Bay Gardens from St. Augustines Avenue east toward Maplin Way from those presently in place (seasonal parking) to all year round 8.00am to 10.00pm. restrictive parking. I strongly disagree with this change, for whilst the present seasonal restrictions are perfectly acceptable, a change as proposed, would cause disruption, disturbance and inconvenience to residence living in roads leading off Thorpe Bay Gardens during the quieter winter period. This change is totally unnecessary and hasn't been thought through!!</p> <p>I trust the respective authority will reconsider the proposal.</p> <p>I cannot express how much I am against the proposed</p>
28 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am home owner of [redacted] Thorpe Bay, Southend.</p>

It came to my knowledge that the Council is proposing to extend the existing Seasonal Parking Restrictions in Thorpe Bay Gardens.

I accept that seasonal parking restrictions are reasonable, but in winter, it is not reasonable for Southend residents parking in the quiet street to walk on the green.

Hence I would object to the Southend Council's new proposals.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

5

Report of Executive Director  
(Neighbourhoods & Environment)

to

Traffic Regulations Working Party  
and Cabinet Committee

on

13 September 2021

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

---

## Update on Outstanding Schemes

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 on the progression of traffic regulation order requests in respect of various proposed waiting restrictions and schemes by Ward

### 2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the report be noted.
- 2.2. That Councillors be reminded to inform the service area by email to [traffweb@southend.gov.uk](mailto:traffweb@southend.gov.uk) if there are any schemes missing or to add new scheme requests.

### 3. Background

- 3.1. To update the members of the current work programme

### 4. Scheme update

- 4.1. An update on the current schemes by Ward is shown in Appendix 1

### 5. Corporate Implications

- 5.1. Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map.  
Ensuring traffic flow and parking is managed while maintaining adequate access for emergency vehicles, general traffic flow, improved sightlines at junctions and accesses and to maximise the turnover of spaces and available

parking at the various locations. This is consistent with the Council's Vision and Corporate Priorities of Safe, Prosperous and Healthy.

## **6. Financial Implications**

- 6.1. Costs for implementation and processing the traffic regulation orders/schemes, if approved, will be met from capital funding that has been agreed for the provision of waiting restrictions.

## **7. Legal Implications**

- 7.1. The statutory consultative process for traffic regulation orders will be followed. Any objections received will be responded to by the service area. Elected Members will be included in the circulation of the Notice of Proposal and any comments received will be considered as part of the statutory consultation process.

## **8. People Implications**

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

## **9. Property Implications**

- 9.1. None

## **10. Equalities and Diversity Implications**

- 10.1. Any implications will be considered in designing and implementing the schemes.

## **11. Risk Assessment**

- 11.1. The proposals will be designed to improve highway safety and traffic flow and as such are likely to have a positive impact by reducing accidents.

## **12. Value for Money**

- 12.1. Works associated with the implementation of schemes will be undertaken by the Council's term contractors, selected through a competitive tendering process to ensure value for money.

## **13. Community Safety Implications**

- 13.1. The proposals if implemented are likely to lead to improved community safety.

## **14. Environmental Impact**

- 14.1. There will be no significant environmental impact resulting from the advertising of traffic regulation orders.



## **15. Background Papers**

15.1. None

## **16. Appendices**

16.1. Appendix 1 –Current Status of Schemes underway (Scheme Update – September 2021)

16.2. Appendix 2- Current status of Schemes awaiting consultation (Scheme Update September 2021)

## Appendix 1

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>
307	Leighcroft Gardens	Requested Junction Protection	Belfairs	Advertised, PTO1009 16 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.
275	Middlesex Avenue	Requested Junction Protection	Blenheim Park	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
357	Hazlewood Grove, Priorywood Crescent	Requested Junction Protection	Blenheim Park	Advertised, PTO1009 16 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.
120	Crosby Road	Review Current parking restrictions Monday-Friday 13:00 – 15:00 Both Sides	Chalkwell	Advertised PTO1010 28 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2021.
238	London Road	Poor Visibility outside Number 1163, implement DYL double yellow lines / parking controls	Chalkwell	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
158	Ambleside Drive	Review current Waiting Restrictions	Cross wards	To Be Implemented	Works Ordered	Works ordered with contractor 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2021.
317	Green Lane	Issue with parking on Bend; poor access and visibility	Eastwood Park	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
318	Ringwood Drive	Issue with parking on bend; poor access and visibility	Eastwood Park	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
319	Sairard Gardens	Issue with safety access for Emergency Vehicles, on bend outside number 29	Eastwood Park	Advertised, PTO1013 13 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	Objections report to be drafted for working party once consultation period is closed.	Scheme was readvertised due to advertisement issue with PTO1011. Consultation period to close 3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2021.
326	Dandies Drive	Requested Junction Protection	Eastwood Park	Advertised, PTO1009 16 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.
359	Willow Close/ Rayleigh Road Service Road	Double yellow lines to protect build out; outside parade of shops	Eastwood Park	Advertised, PTO1013 13 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	Objections report to be drafted for working party once consultation period is closed.	Consultation period to close 3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2021
121	Seaview Road	Review double yellow lines	Leigh	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
196	London Road - Scarborough Drive	At the Crossing Point between Church and Car Park	Leigh	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
219	Canonsleigh Crescent	Requested Junction Protection	Leigh	To Be Implemented	Works Ordered	Lining works have started, rear of the school needs to be completed, SBC may possibly fund a TTRO to allow contractor to finish off works as cars were parked on last attempt.
322	Queens Road	Requested Junction Protection	Leigh	Advertised, PTO1009 16 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.
320	Service Rd - Alexandra Street	Double yellow lines / No waiting at any time, behind 59-67	Milton	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
328	Ashburnham Road	Reduce double yellow lines adjacent to 18 Hamlet Road	Milton	Advertised, PTO1013 13 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	Objections report to be drafted for working party once consultation period is closed.	Consultation Period to close 3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2021.

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>
216	Earls Hall Avenue	Reduce DYL double yellow lines	Prittlewell	To Be Implemented	Works Ordered	Works ordered with contractor 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2021
154	Rampart Street	Request for Pavement Parking 8am – 6pm	Shoeburyness	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
159	Glynde Way	Request to install Double Yellow Lines	Southchurch	To Be Implemented	Works Ordered	Works ordered with contractor 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2021.
300	Barnstaple Close	Amend SYL single yellow lines in Barnstaple Close. Look at with other closes in area - SYL to address Commuter parking	Southchurch	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	To look at with other closes in area - SYL to address Commuter parking Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021. Currently drafting objections report.
272	Thorpe Hall Avenue	Extended the Double Yellow Line Restriction, Requested extension of double yellow lines	Thorpe	To Be Implemented	Works Ordered	Works ordered with contractor 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2021
214	Thorpe Bay Gardens	Remove Seasonal restrictions; introduce limited waiting Monday – Sunday 8am – 10pm	Thorpe Bay	Advertised, PTO1012 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation period closes 20 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.
205	Western Road	Requested Junction Protection.	West Leigh	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
303	Thames Close	DYL Double yellow lines around the Thames Close	West Leigh	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
315	Belfairs Drive	Requested removal of parking restrictions	West Leigh	Completed	Completed	Works ordered with contractor 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2021
366	West Street	Existing double yellow lines faded or possibly removed by fault. Request to re install double yellow lines.	West Leigh	To Be Implemented	Works to be ordered	Update given 18 <sup>th</sup> August 2021, works to be ordered by end of August 2021.
145	Bunters Avenue	Double Yellow Lines on Southern Kerb lines	West Shoebury	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
270	Maya Close	Requested Junction Protection	West Shoebury	Advertised, PTO1011 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.
312	Bishopsteignton	DYL Double yellow lines in Turning Head	West Shoebury	Advertised, PTO1009 16 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	Objections Report to be heard by working party	Consultation closed 6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.

## Appendix 2

RAG Status	Description of RAG Status
G	The scheme has been validated as being feasible, and is available for working party/cabinet committee consideration
A	The scheme has been commissioned for a feasibility study which needs completing before any working party consideration
R	A scheme which is against policy or where there is no appropriate engineering solution
V	A scheme request has been received and is in the initial validation process

Scheme Number	Scheme Name	Description	Ward	Scheme Stage	Next Stage	Comments	RAG
371	Elmsleigh Drive - North end	Requested Zebra Crossing	Belfairs	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Site Survey/ further investigation required		V
366	Highbank Close	Double yellow line refresh and extension requested at junction with Eastwood Road North	Blenheim Park	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2021.	V
363	Cranley Road	Resident has requested for a Resident parking scheme to be introduced	Chalkwell	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2021.	V
311	A127 Prince Ave Slip Road & Westbourne Grove	Review weight restrictions	Cross Wards	On Hold	On Hold	Awaiting completion of A127 Bell works	V
175	Eastwood Park	Introduce limited waiting 3 hours.	Eastwood Park	Feasibility Study	Study needs completing, ward Councillors to be consulted with regarding scheme.	Agreed 17 <sup>th</sup> June 2021 at working party to hold this scheme.	A
184	Bellhouse Road	Requested Box Junction	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Send engineers a feasibility request.	Update given regarding box junctions 18 <sup>th</sup> Aug 2021; now to be passed to engineers for feasibility study by end of August 2021.	V
370	Lambeth Road / Hudson Road	Suggested JP extension review gave a few location examples where it would be beneficial	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Send engineers a feasibility request.	Requested review of multiple JPs; to be passed to engineers for feasibility study by end of August 2021.	V
252	Seaway Car Park	Revoke Off Street amendment	Kursaal	On Hold	On Hold	Awaiting planning permission for site	
200	New Road	Requested Pedestrian Crossing between Church and car park	Leigh	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required		V
358	London Road - 1076-1078	Remove limited waiting bay and replace with a loading bay	Leigh	In Validation	Informal consultation with ward Cllrs	Pay and display bays instead of limited waiting bay to be discussed further	V
255	St Vincents & adjoining roads (Milton Resident Permit Scheme)	Double yellow lines request on bend due to poor visibility	Milton	In Validation	Await feasibility study report. Design needed.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
278	Cambridge Road	Pedestrian Crossing/ Zebra Crossing	Milton	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required		V
368	Park Lane	Width Restriction requested	Milton	In Validation	Site Survey/ further investigation required	Update given width restriction requests 18 <sup>th</sup> Aug 2021; now to be passed to engineers for feasibility study by end of August 2021.	V

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>RAG</u>
369	Manor Road	Double yellow lines requested as drop kerb for access to flats is being parked over, H bars that are there are not deterring drivers	Milton	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
372	Princes Street	Requested Resident Parking Scheme	Milton	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2021.	V
367	Salisbury Avenue	Requested Junction Protection	Prittlewell	In Validation	Include in Tranche 3 of the junction protection programme	Awaiting traffic and working party decision, can be added into the Tranche 3 piece of work, Newlands Road/Salisbury Avenue to Tranche 3 of JP Programme, then having the rest of the area as Parking Permit Area.	A
324	Shoebury Avenue	To look at with other closes in area - single yellow lines to address commuter parking	Shoeburyness	In Validation	Send to engineers for feasibility study	Update given 18 <sup>th</sup> August 2021. This will be passed to engineers by end of August 2021.	V
215	Radar Close (Ekco Estate)	Requested Junction Protection	St Laurence	Validation	Include in Tranche 3 of the junction protection programme	To be included in Tranche 3 of the Junction Protection programme of works	V
263	Lundy Close	Double yellow lines on North Side, relocate disabled bay and unrest bays on southside, double yellow lines opposite parking bay	St Laurence	On Hold	Await completion of building works	Third party building works in progress	
340	Cluny Square	Introduce limited waiting bays outside Shops	St Lukes	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2021.	V
352	Lornes Close	Introduce a no waiting at any time restriction DYL	St Lukes	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
364	Stock Road	Traffic at Waste Centre Business owner suggested DYL, signage and a box junction	St Lukes	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
365	Station Avenue, East Street	Lack of adequate resident parking, residents parking scheme or part time limited waiting restriction	St Lukes	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
310	Colbert Avenue	Restrictions on the north Side, No double yellow lines opposite junction protection.	Thorpe	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
336	Rochford Avenue	Requested Junction Protection review - It is a minor amendment and will need to be reviewed to ascertain if it can be removed or shortened to alleviate parking problems	Victoria	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers	Feasibility request sent to engineers 7 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>RAG</u>
		without causing any issues of safety.					
350	Salisbury Road - North end	Request removal of parking restrictions	West Leigh	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
101	Delaware Road, Parking Area	Waiting Restrictions requested	West Shoebury	In Validation	Await feasibility study report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2021.	V
376	Clifton Road/ Manor Road/ Seaforth Road	Traffic Calming Measures - Requested traffic calming measures at entrance and exit of junction	Milton	In Validation	Await feasibility report from engineers.	Feasibility request sent to engineers 10 <sup>th</sup> August 2021.	V
377	Bellhouse Crescent/ Bell house Lane	Requested double yellow line extension in Bellhouse Crescent junction with Bellhouse Lane	Leigh	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Site visit to be completed by officers to determine current restrictions in place. Send engineers feasibility request once clear. Site Visit will be completed by end of August 2021.	V
378	St Lawrence Gardens/ Lambeth Road	Double yellow lines requested on the junction	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Include in Tranche 3 of the junction protection programme	To be included in Tranche 3 of the Junction Protection programme of works	V
379	Willow Close	Double yellow lines requested along whole length of the close due to narrow Highway	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Feasibility request drafted 18 <sup>th</sup> August 2021. Will be sent to engineers with next batch of requests by end of August 2021.	V
380	Marshall Close/ Vardon Drive	Double yellow lines requested due to continuous road damage and difficulty accessing driveways.	West Leigh	In Validation	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Feasibility request drafted 18 <sup>th</sup> August 2021. Will be sent to engineers with next batch of requests by end of August 2021.	V
273	Mountdale Gardens, Suffolk, Norfolk, Kent, Surrey Avenues	Review Restrictions, Parking at school drop off and pick up times	Blenheim Park	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Await study from Consultation and engagement team		A
330	Poppyfield Close	Double Yellow line requested	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Feasibility request drafted August 2021. Will be sent to engineers with next batch of requests by end of August 2021.	
379	Willow Close	Requested double yellow lines whole length of close	Eastwood Park	In Validation	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Officers have reported continuous damage to roads and kerbs due to difficulty accessing the road. Requested restrictions from parking within 32m of the junction and further parking restrictions	V
380	Marshall Close/ Vardon Drive	Requested double yellow line	West Leigh	In Validation	Send feasibility request to engineers.	Feasibility request drafted 23 <sup>rd</sup> August 2021. Will be sent to engineers with next batch of requests by end of August 2021	V

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>RAG</u>
335	Highwood Close	Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (Permit Area)	Blenheim Park	Update awaited from relevant officer			V

Road Safety

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>RAG</u>
332	Barrowsands	Speeding Vehicles	Thorpe	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Speed survey commissioned	Last survey was done in 2017, 85% adhered to speed limit. Work scheduled within team's current workload	A
141	Earls Hall School Area	Speeding Vehicles	Prittlewell	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Speed survey commissioned	Work scheduled within team's current workload	A
201	New Road/ Cliff Road/ Grande Parade	Speeding Vehicles	Leigh	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Speed survey commissioned	Work scheduled within team's current workload	A
191	Eastern Esplanade	Zebra Crossing Requested	Thorpe	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Site Survey/ further investigation required	Pedestrian survey to be arranged	V
183	Shoebury Common Road	Pedestrian Crossing Requested	Thorpe	Site Survey / Further Investigation Required	Site Survey/ further investigation required	Pedestrian survey to be arranged	V

Highways Maintenance

<u>Scheme Number</u>	<u>Scheme Name</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Scheme Stage</u>	<u>Next Stage</u>	<u>Comments</u>
345	Corner of Cranleigh Avenue	Parking Controls / No Entry Signs requested	Chalkwell	TRO in place, passed to Highways inspectors	Highway's inspector to take appropriate action after review / site survey	Raised to highways inspectors for a review on necessary signage at location.
375	Seaforth Road	Lack of Clear Markings	Milton	Passed to Highways inspectors	Highway's inspector to take appropriate action after review / site survey	Raised to highways inspectors to take appropriate action.
373	Seaforth Road/ Argyll House	Request to install signage	Milton	TRO in place, passed to Highways inspectors	Highway's inspector to take appropriate action after review / site survey	Raised to highways inspectors for a review on necessary signage at location.
374	Seaforth Road	Report of poor road surface	Milton	Passed to Highways inspectors	Highway's inspector to take appropriate action after review / site survey	Raised to highways inspectors to take appropriate action.
362	St Augustine's Avenue	Request to install signage	Thorpe	TRO in place, passed to Highways inspectors	Highway's inspector to take appropriate action after review / site survey	Raised to highways inspectors for a review on necessary signage at location.

This page is intentionally left blank