

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party  
and Cabinet Committee**

on

**1<sup>st</sup> November 2018**

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

---

## Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

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

---

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

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

### **2. Recommendation**

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

**(a) Implement the proposals with the amendment outlined in part 3.3 of this report 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 considered the results of a Member led consultation undertaken in the roads listed in Appendix 2 to this report.

- 3.2 The initial consultation indicated high levels of support in a number of roads with differing views expressed from residents of roads in the west of the consultation area.

- 3.3 The results of the consultation were considered by the Cabinet Committee in March 2018 and it was agreed that due to the levels of support in the majority of the streets and that parking controls were to be implemented in a number of South Essex Homes car parks within the area, the streets listed at Appendix 2 to this report be included in a formal consultation to implement permit parking controls.

- 3.4 The consultation has been completed and the resulting objections and comments to the proposals are shown at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 3.5 Members are requested to consider the comments received and the officer recommendations to remove the streets where support is not evident from the proposal and implement permit parking controls in the remaining streets.
- 3.6 While this will leave several streets at risk of displaced parking, the residents have expressed a clear view opposing controls being introduced in their roads.
- 3.7 Residents in the remaining streets are in favour of controls and welcome measures to increase the opportunity for them to park.

#### **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 while reflecting the desires and views of residents which live in the streets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 5.5.1 None

##### **5.6 Consultation**

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

## **5.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

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

## **5.8 Risk Assessment**

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

## **5.9 Value for Money**

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

## **5.10 Community Safety Implications**

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

## **5.11 Environmental Impact**

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

## **6. Background Papers**

6.1 None

## **7. Appendices**

7.1 **Appendix 1** - Details of representations received and Officer Observations.  
**Appendix 2** – List of streets and outcome of initial Member consultation  
**Appendix 3** – Plan of area

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Albion Road	Members	Implement Permit Parking Controls	<p><b>2 letters of objection received 1 letter included petition containing 32 signatures</b></p> <p>Main points raised include: Use nearby car park that could be made free for location residents; it is not needed and will inconvenience and cost tax payers money; not enough permits to go round; scheme has previously been proposed and residents did not want it then; scheme unnecessary would only mean high costs and inconvenience why should residents have to pay to park in their own road; money making objective by the Council and it is totally wrong and not in the peoples best interests</p>	<p>If residents are not in favour of parking control being implemented in their street, the road can be excluded from the scheme as it is sited on the boundary of the original proposal.</p> <p><b>There is a likelihood of displaced parking migrating into the road from elsewhere in the area but due to the level of support expressed during the original consultation, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented excluding this road.</b></p>
Rayleigh Avenue	Members	Implement Permit Parking Controls	<p><b>3 letters of objection received including 1 letter with a petition with 33 signatures</b></p> <p>Main points raised include – scheme offers nothing of benefit to working residents; times great for those who stay at home but not for those in full time employment; smacks of extra revenue for Council and not in residents interests; would make parking in area worse; a ridiculous plan; should have been a meeting to explain to residents and get their views; not wanted by residents; proposals do not address the real issue of parking in the area as there are too many vehicles and not enough spaces</p>	<p>If residents are not in favour of parking control being implemented in their street, the road can be excluded from the scheme as it is sited on the boundary of the original proposal.</p> <p><b>There is a likelihood of displaced parking migrating into the road from elsewhere in the area but due to the level of support expressed during the original consultation, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented excluding this road.</b></p>

Claremont Road	Members	Implement Permit Parking Controls	<p><b>3 letters of objection received</b>  main points raised include not a problem in the road cannot see reason for permit parking; injustice having to pay to park in their own road; with Doctors and Police Station being developed into flats will impact on parking in street and a lot of residents would not be able to park with less than 5 bays proposed in the street will not benefit residents;</p>	<p>If residents are not in favour of parking control being implemented in their street, the road can be excluded from the scheme as it is sited on the boundary of the original proposal.</p> <p><b>There is a likelihood of displaced parking migrating into the road from elsewhere in the area but due to the level of support expressed during the original consultation, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented excluding this road.</b></p>
Carisbrook e Road	Members	Implement Permit Parking Controls	<p><b>4 letters of objection received including 1 with a petition with 46 signatures</b>  main points raised include: will not alleviate any parking concerns; congestion is only in evening times; will serve little to no purpose other than to take payment from local residents; scheme does not address any issue; nothing more than a stealth on resident's; reconsider plan and consult local residents further; scheme not necessary; times of operation incorrect parking problems worse during evenings; Residents do not support</p>	<p>If residents are not in favour of parking controls being implemented in their street, the road can be excluded from the scheme as it is sited on the boundary of the original proposal.</p> <p><b>There is a likelihood of displaced parking migrating into the road from elsewhere in the area but due to the level of support expressed during the original consultation, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented excluding this road.</b></p>
Rochford Avenue	Members	Implement Permit Parking Controls	<p><b>2 letters of objection received 1 letter containing a petition with 32 signatures:</b>  main objections include little room for manoeuvre; 100 visitor permits would be insufficient for number of visitors required to care for resident as might not be eligible for carers permit; parking problems caused by residents returning home after work</p>	<p>If residents are not in favour of parking control being implemented, the road can be excluded from the scheme as it is sited on the boundary of the original proposal.</p> <p><b>There is a likelihood of displaced parking migrating into the road from elsewhere in the area but due to the level of support expressed during the original consultation, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented excluding this road.</b></p>

<b>Salisbury Avenue</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Implement Permit Parking Controls</b>	<b>6 letters received – 2 support</b> - but should be 7 days a week 24 hrs a day as there are problems from nearby private housing development and <b>4 letters of objection</b> – main points include times of waiting restrictions for refuse collections; special cases that may not be covered by terms and conditions of the scheme – 1 parking of private ambulance not registered to the address which can vary each day, other is partner visiting but vehicle not registered at the address; 3 cars and lots of visitors - total amount of visitor permits would not be enough	The majority of these issues are possible to address excluding the number of visitor permits available. The maximum number of visitor permits for each residents is 100 per year. The limit was introduced to high levels of abuse in a number of areas and the difficulty of auditing paper based visitor permits. These permits will be available online early next year allowing for far better controls to be introduced and it may be possible to increase the maximum numbers of permits available.  Due to the level of initial support and the small number of objections, recommend that the amended proposal be implemented.
<b>Hamlet Court Road</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Implement Permit Parking Controls</b>	<b>4 letters of objection received</b> main points raised include totally against the scheme not required by residents; poorer families may not be able to afford cost of parking; believes times are wrong parking problems more in evenings.	Evening parking is highly likely to be residents vehicles. The car park is free to use after 6pm. Due to the level of initial support and the small number of objections, recommend that the amended proposal be implemented.
<b>Windsor Road</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Implement Permit Parking Controls</b>	<b>1 letter of objection</b> to the revocation of the alternative monthly parking restriction	We have recently amended the traffic flows to one-way to maximise parking following a resident petition.  As the proposal is supported by the majority of residents, it is recommended to proceed with the amended proposal.
<b>Osborne Road</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Implement Permit Parking Controls</b>	<b>2 letters of support received</b> – main reasons are that it would get rid of commuter parking.	Recommend to proceed with amended proposal.

<p><b>Various Roads (not in scheme area)</b></p>	<p><b>Members</b></p>	<p><b>Implement Permit Parking Controls</b></p>	<p><b>10 letters of objection received</b>  main comments include: live outside of scheme and believe problem will move into their roads where parking is already difficult</p>	<p><b>The majority of objections are from residents in Hainault Avenue. If the amended proposal is agreed, this will negate these objections as the roads near to Hainault Avenue will not be subject to controls.</b></p> <p><b>Recommend to proceed with amended proposal.</b></p>
--	-----------------------	---	---	--