

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

**Traffic and Parking Working Party  
& Cabinet Committee**

on

**8<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

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

---

## **Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders**

**Eligible for call-in to Place Scrutiny Committee**  
**Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox**  
**Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

---

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

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

### **2. Recommendation**

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

**(a) Implement the proposals without amendment; or,**

**(b) Implement the proposals with amendment; or,**

**(c) Take no further action**

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

### **3. Background**

- 3.1 The Cabinet Committee periodically agrees to advertise proposals to implement waiting restrictions in various areas as a result of requests from Councillors and members of the public based upon an assessment against the Council's current policies.

- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached **Appendix 1** were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make representations in respect of the proposals. This process has resulted in the objections detailed in **Appendix 1** of this report. Officers have considered these objections and where possible tried to resolve them. Observations are

provided to assist Members in their considerations and in making an informed decision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

None

##### **5.6 Consultation**

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

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

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

##### **5.8 Risk Assessment**

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

## **5.9 Value for Money**

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

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

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

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

None

## **7. Appendices**

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



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

<b>Road</b>	<b>Proposed By</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>Glen Road</b>	<b>Member/Resident</b>	<b>Reduce existing restrictions operational from 8am to 6pm daily alternate months to 10am – 4pm Monday to Friday</b>	2 letters of objection, Objects as the road is narrow, HGV's will have access concerns Will not deter commuters, like to see 1hour parking scheme	The road is narrow but as a cul de sac, traffic is generally light. No support for the proposal, to introduce restrictions in an isolated road to deter commuter parking is contrary to current policy.  <b>Recommend no further action.</b>
<b>The Drive</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction opp No 10 to 14 and o/s 48</b>	2 letters received, one support & one objection. Objection - this will help commuter parking.  Letter of support - agree with proposals	No comments from properties directly affected. The proposal is designed to accommodate visitors during the 1 hour in which parking is prohibited.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b>
<b>Leasway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction o/s No 4</b>	1 letter of objection received, Objection as this will attract commuter parking	Objection is from the property directly affected however removal of this small section will allow for residents and their visitors to park.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b>
<b>The Crossways</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Remove section of restriction</b>	1 letter of objection received, Road too narrow, busy road, dangerous location, close to driveway	Allowing a small area of parking will likely reduce speeds. Area not directly outside of any properties.  <b>Recommend to proceed with advertised proposal.</b>

<p><b>High Cliff Drive</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Passing gap by having double yellow line at various locations in the street</b></p>	<p>5 letters of objection received &amp; 1 letter supporting proposals. Object due to parking displacement, no need for passing gap. Objection passing gap will create less parking, make road one-way working. Objection, as this will create more parking pressure. Objection, passing gap would be too small, need to have a one-way system. Objection would make parking worse, need to have a one-way system in place. Support the proposals. No objection.</p>	<p>Residential street with light traffic however passing gaps would alleviate occasional issues. The small number of residents suggesting one-way traffic is insufficient to consider such a proposal would be supported.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action in regard to waiting restrictions and to propose ward Councillors consider one-way traffic suggestion with residents survey.</b></p>
<p><b>Woodfield Gardens</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Double yellow line at bend</b></p>	<p>4 Letters received, 1 objecting to the proposals. Would like to have a 1 hour parking scheme. Objection as this will not help, would like restrictions to deter commuter parking. Would like to have single yellow line outside driveway to deter commuter parking. Would like to see yellow lines to deter commuter parking.</p>	<p>The road is narrow but as a cul de sac, traffic is generally light. No support for this proposal but to introduce restrictions to deter commuters in an isolated road is contrary to current policy.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<p><b>Kent View Road</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Short term parking bay o/s No 28 and o/s No 18/20. 2 hour limited waiting restriction.</b></p>	<p>4 letters received of objection and 1 letter of support. Objections mentions commuter parking due to lack of enforcement. elderly residents will find it difficult to cross the road. the tranquil character of road will change detrimentally due to increased traffic demand.</p>	<p>Objections are from properties adjacent to the proposed area of parking bay.</p> <p>While additional parking limited to 2 hours would be useful in the area to accommodate visitors to the properties parking is available nearby.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<p><b>Hall Park Avenue</b></p>	<p><b>Officers</b></p>	<p><b>Remove existing parking restriction near Kings Road</b></p>	<p>1 letter received of objection, Parking space could be very dangerous.</p>	<p>Proposed space is located approximately 15 metres from the junction and not considered to be</p>

				<p>dangerous. The proposal is designed to accommodate resident's visitors.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b></p>
<b>The Ridgeway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>New parking bay near to Hall Park Avenue</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received. Objection, due to narrow road and volume of traffic.</p>	<p>Road is of sufficient width to accommodate this additional parking however, parking is located nearby for local businesses.</p> <p><b>Recommend no further action</b></p>
<b>Mount Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Relocate parking area further from junction with Leigh Road</b>	<p>1 letter of support received. 1 letter of objection – reduction of parking</p>	<p>Objection appears to result from misunderstanding of proposal. No reduction in parking, relocation of yellow line and parking area only to maintain clear area approaching junction adjacent to raised crossing area.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>
<b>Meadway</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking</b>	<p>1 letter received of support.</p>	<p><b>Recommend to proceed with proposals.</b></p>
<b>Hall Park Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking</b>	<p>1 letter of objection received.</p>	<p>The proposal is designed to accommodate visitors during the 1 hour in which parking is prohibited.</p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with advertise amendments.</b></p>

<b>Cliff Avenue</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Reduce existing restriction to provide parking bay</b>	1 letter received. Concerned about access for refuse vehicles	Road is of sufficient width to accommodate parking and larger vehicle access.  <b>Recommend to proceed with proposal.</b>
<b>Cliffs Pavilion Parking Bays</b>	<b>Cliffs Pavilion</b>	<b>To introduce Pay and Display Parking on land around the Cliffs Pavilion (car park and slip road</b>	5 letters of objection received from residents of San Remo Mansions, main concerns raised include visitors to the Cliffs Pavilion park in San Remo Parade and the introduction of the parking fees will increase and make parking worse for the residents; San Remo Parade should have been included in the nearby residents parking scheme; parking is already difficult especially when performances and events are on residents are blocked in and cannot get out due car owners being at shows; the residents have and try to work with the Cliffs Pavilion and have made the best of a not ideal situation so leave as it is; allow them to have permits for nearby car park	Residents were consulted as to being within the scheme prior to the resident parking controls being introduced. Support was not forthcoming and the road was removed from the scheme area.  Colleagues at the Cliffs Pavilion are supportive of assisting residents with parking issues while ensuring the car park remains available for theatre visitors.  <b>Recommend to proceed with proposals and formally propose the inclusion of this street within the existing permit parking controls.</b>
<b>Cliffs Pavilion Permit Parking Scheme (Amendment No. 3)</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Extension to the Cliffs Pavilion Area Residents Permit Scheme.</b>	15 Letters of support  8 Letters of Objection main reasons being loss of parking and no provisions for business permits from 2 businesses in the area.	The proposal follows a survey of residents where the majority supported parking controls. Business permits will be available.  No parking provision will be lost in the area.  <b>Recommend to proceed with the advertised proposal.</b>