

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party
& Cabinet Committee**

on

1st November 2018

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

**Royston Avenue
Verge Hardening Consultation**

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

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the Traffic Regulations Working Party and the Cabinet Committee to review the results of the resident consultation on the proposed verge hardening scheme on Royston Avenue.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet Committee will:-

- a) **Note the outcome of the consultations as shown in para 6.2 & 8.2 of the report.**
- b) **Note Officers comments and agree implementation of a reduced version of the verge hardening scheme & amended parking restrictions measures (Option B) as detailed in para 7.1 of the report and shown in Appendix 12.5.**
- c) **If approved, further agree that in the event of there being no objections to the proposals, and the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed; &**
- d) **Note that all unresolved objections will be referred to the Traffic Regulations Working Party for consideration.**

3. Background

- 3.1 While there has been an active programme of sign installation and enforcement action in many roads to prevent verge parking, there are some streets where

parking fully on the carriageway is impractical and adversely affects traffic flow. Royston Avenue is one such street where some larger vehicles, particularly buses, are significantly delayed by double parking.

- 3.2 Arriva has raised the issue of services being severely delayed and they have highlighted multiple instances of parked vehicles being struck by buses as they attempt to navigate this road.
- 3.3 The bus operator has assessed whether it would be possible to re-route but has deemed that this is not a viable option due to service demand and journey times.

4. Scheme Proposals

- 4.1 This scheme seeks to eliminate the issues highlighted in section 3.2 by hardening verges so vehicles can park half off the road thus increasing the width available to buses/refuse vehicles. Associated street furniture relocation works are required to maximise the scheme proposals. Additional drainage installations are proposed to ensure that the scheme does not adversely affect the carriageway during periods of inclement weather.
- 4.2 The scheme is constrained, at multiple locations, by the presence of trees. In accordance with SBC policy, these trees are not proposed to be removed. Where it is not possible to harden verges, it is proposed to install No Waiting At Any Time parking restrictions on one side of Royston Avenue which will allow full on carriageway parking on one side of the road, whilst maintaining an adequate carriageway width for the safe passage of larger vehicles.

5.0 Consultation

- 5.1 The consultation was completed in two stages over 4 week periods in October 2017 and July 2018. The consultation documents consisted of letters, plans showing the proposed schemes and questionnaires for residents to complete and return. The consultation packs were hand delivered to all residential and commercial properties on Royston Avenue. A secondary option, in the form of No Waiting At Any Time parking restriction along one side of Royston Avenue, was also offered to residents in the October 2017 consultation. In the July 2018 consultation residents were offered the choice between 2 differing reduced measures options.

6. October 2017 Consultation Outcome

- 6.1 The outcome of the consultation is summarised in the table below:-

Location	No of letters	No of letters returned	Nos supporting Verge Hardening	Nos against Verge Hardening	Comments/Recommendations
Royston Avenue	212	43	22	18	Not all respondents answered this question
% response		20%	51%	42%	Not enough responses

- 6.2 At the Traffic & Parking Working Party, Cabinet Committee meeting on 4th March 2014, it was agreed to use the same policy criterion as the Parking Management Scheme (PMS). This being at least 40% response to consultation and agreement of 70% of those who responded.

As the above threshold for respondents was not met the result of this consultation is inconclusive.

However, the issue of buses causing vehicular damage and the excessive delays they experience is a significant problem that needs to be addressed. Arriva has stated that if no action were taken then they would be forced to review whether they were to continue to provide a bus service along this route. Furthermore, they have indicated that removal of this service could have a negative impact on other services in Sutton Road and Cluny Square.

On examination of the feedback received from residents, it would seem that the main area of concern is based on the following:

- The loss of parking along Royston Avenue.
- The perception that increased carriageway width would increase already (perceived) high vehicle speeds.

An alternative option, included in the consultation, was to provide parking restrictions along one side of the carriageway, meaning that the double parking currently experienced wouldn't be possible and bus services would no longer be detrimentally affected. This option, which would significantly reduce on street parking, was not popular with consultees.

There is anecdotal evidence that Royston Avenue has an existing speed problem that has the potential to worsen should the proposals in their current form be implemented. Therefore, officers have undertaken a speed survey along Royston Avenue, the results of which did not support the claim that traffic was travelling at excessive speeds. The proposals were re-examined and assessed with this new information and in conjunction with the feedback received from the consultation. This has enabled a redesign of the scheme and 2 reduced options were included in the secondary consultation document sent to residents in July 2018.

7. Revised Scheme Options A & B

- 7.1 It is proposed that the scheme is revised to concentrate on the length of road where the vehicular damage has occurred and where buses are significantly delayed. Therefore, there is a change in scope of the scheme to focus only on the worst 'pinch points' on Royston Avenue.

Essentially these new proposals are reduced measures, to varying degrees, from the original consultation drawings we sent previously. The key features amended are shown below and in Appendices 12.4 & 12.5:

Option A

Eastern side of Bournemouth Park Road

- Only harden verges in close proximity to bus stops.
- Only provide parking restrictions at junctions.

Western side of Bournemouth Park Road

- A reduction to the width of the proposed verge hardening which will allow the passage of buses but reduce the overall increase in available carriageway width (except opposite bus stops).
- Change to proposed parking restrictions to single yellow lines restricted to bus service hours only.

Option B

Eastern side of Bournemouth Park Road

- Only harden verges immediately opposite bus stops.
- Only provide parking restrictions at junctions.

Western side of Bournemouth Park Road

- Only harden the verge opposite the bus stop.
- Removal of additional parking restrictions.

7.2 If agreed, officers propose to use a bituminous surface for verge hardening. There will remain areas of grass verge to ensure drainage is not adversely affected by the increase in hard surfaces.

8. July 2018 Consultation Outcome

8.1 The outcome of the consultation is summarised in the table below:-

Location	No of letters	No of letters returned	Nos selecting Option A	Nos selecting Option B	Nos selecting no action	Comments/ Recommendations
Royston Avenue	212	21	6	14	1	Majority selecting Option B
% response		10%	28%	67%	5%	Not enough responses

8.2 The response rate from this consultation was approximately half of that of the first. The threshold for respondents, as shown in para. 6.2, was not met and the result of this consultation was also inconclusive. Furthermore, although Option B was clearly the most popular scheme with residents, the number of consultees supporting this proposal was not over the required threshold of 70%.

Working Party members should be aware that although the criteria has not been met to progress this scheme, this issue needs to be addressed and implementing the most supported scheme, Option B from the July 2018 consultation, is the minimum requirement to reduce bus service delays.

9. Reasons for Recommendations

- 9.1 To reflect the outcome of both consultations and ensure best use of limited resources on justifiable projects that address and resolve network management issues.

10. Corporate Implications

10.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 10.1.1 Local Transport and Implementation Plan, Safe and Prosperous.

10.2 Financial Implications

- 10.2.1 There are maintenance implications with the works although these are likely to be minimal with the limited number of verge hardening areas.

10.3 Legal Implications

- 10.3.1 All changes are to comply with the relevant legal requirements as appropriate

10.4 People Implications

- 10.4.1 All necessary works will be undertaken by existing staff.

10.5 Property Implications

- 10.5.1 None.

10.6 Consultation

- 10.6.1 Refer to section 6.1 of this report for the outcome of the consultation.

10.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 10.7.1 The prioritisation of the Traffic & Parking Working Party's programme is on the basis of improving safety, reducing accidents or improving pedestrian/traffic flows. The objectives of improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

10.8 Risk Assessment

- 10.8.1 None.

10.9 Value for Money

- 10.9.1 All works are undertaken by the Council's term contractors which have been through competitive tendering process.

10.10 Community Safety Implications

- 10.10.1 The prioritisation of the Councils' Working Party's programme is on the basis of reducing accidents or improving traffic flows and takes into account the implications for community safety.

10.11 Environmental Impact

- 10.11.1 All schemes are designed to improve quality of local environment

11. Background Papers

- 11.1 None

12. Appendices

- Appendix 1 October 2017 Consultation Response Analysis
- Appendix 2 Plan