

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

**Traffic Regulations Working Party
and Cabinet Committee**

on

7th January 2019

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

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders

**Cabinet Member : Councillor Moring
Place Scrutiny Committee
Part 1 Public Agenda Item**

1. Purpose of Report

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

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Traffic Regulation 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 Regulation Working Party, following consideration of the representations received and agree the appropriate course of action.**

3. Background

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

- 3.2 The proposals shown on the attached **Appendix 1** were advertised through the local press and notices were displayed at appropriate locations informing residents and businesses of the proposals and inviting them to make representations in respect of the 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.

- 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.

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

ROAD	PROPOSED BY	PROPOSAL	COMMENTS	OFFICER COMMENT
Eastwoodbury Lane	Members	No Waiting 12 Noon to 2pm daily	5 letters of objection received – main points raised include- have lived in area for a number of years and not been a problem; will impact on visitors; struggle to see why restrictions are required; would cause parking problems in other roads; why should residents suffer because of the airport parking; permit parking like Eastwoodbury Service Rd is required; stop airport users parking not residents; see no reason for 7 day week restrictions 5 is sufficient to act as deterrent to non-residents ; nowhere for residents to park at weekends; ridiculous to have a 2 hour ban on the whole road; where are you suppose to park; you would have to clock watch ready to move your car	<p>There does not appear to be support for the proposal.</p> <p>While part day restrictions resolve issues with long term parking, there is an inevitable impact on residents as the restriction applies to all motorists.</p> <p>The wider area has been consulted on their views as to permit parking controls and no overall support was evidenced.</p> <p>As there are no comments supporting the introduction of the restriction, no further action is recommended.</p>
Eastwoodbury Crescent	Members	No Waiting 12 Noon to 2pm daily	2 letters of objection received – main points raised include - unable to park outside their own home, other residents take up space on the road; would like permit parking; questioning times suggest 1-4 daily; would this be enforced; where are residents supposed to park; its problems from airport parking which needs sorting; Airport take no notice	<p>There does not appear to be support for the proposal.</p> <p>While part day restrictions resolve issues with long term parking, there is an inevitable impact on residents as the restriction applies to all motorists.</p> <p>The wider area has been consulted on their views as to permit parking controls and no overall support was evidenced.</p> <p>As there are no comments supporting the introduction of the restriction, no further action is recommended.</p>

<p>Alton Gardens</p>	<p>Members</p>	<p>No Waiting 12 Noon to 2pm daily</p>	<p>4 letters of objection received – main points raised include- would be unable to park near to their house; airport parking is the problem; would like residents parking permits; would affect quality of life; proposals will affect a number of houses and flats; would not be able to leave cars when going to work as they would need to be moved; idea is absurd; would be unable to have family and visitors therefore a gross infringement of the residents rights; will only shift problem further along road/area if they go in let residents have exemption permits; and permits for visitors; would like residents permits; there is a need for restrictions but not for residents; would have a large effect on property as only property that would be affected as near to church hall and empty property; would be willing to pay for permit parking; cul-de-sac would become busier leaving less room for residents; a residents scheme would be more beneficial to residents and allow their vehicles within a reasonable distance from the residents properties and would stop non-residential parking; parking in Alton Gardens and neighbouring roads will be more of a problem once the residents parking scheme for Eastwoodbury Service Road comes into effect. By placing a residents scheme into 1 road only pushes the problem onto other residents when all are suffering the effects of the airport holiday and commuters.</p> <p>1 letter of objection from Church in Alton Gardens – main comments include what is the purpose of the order; church is in use during proposed times so would disadvantage their users; times are inconvenient for Sunday services; will be looking at rebuild church/community hub during 2019 – would again be inconvenient for users and for church minibus; would cause users to park outside residents homes; church has worked hard to respect spaces outside residents homes but proposals as they stand will make it impossible;</p> <p>1 letter of objection from KMAC at the Church – main comments include – being able to park throughout the day for staff and clients; would have a major negative impact of the services provided</p>	<p>There does not appear to be support for the proposal.</p> <p>While part day restrictions resolve issues with long term parking, there is an inevitable impact on residents as the restriction applies to all motorists.</p> <p>The wider area has been consulted on their views as to permit parking controls and no overall support was evidenced.</p> <p>As there are no comments supporting the introduction of the restriction, no further action is recommended.</p>
-----------------------------	----------------	--	--	---

<p>Palmeria Avenue, Station Road & Holland Road Permit Parking Scheme (Cliffs Pavilion Area)</p>	<p>Member</p>	<p>Permit Parking Places & Shared use parking and pay by phone parking</p>	<p>3 letters of objection and 1 letter of support received – main points of objections raised include – Due to many properties in multiple occupancy, the likelihood is that demand for permits could outweigh available space for parking. Also as a property developer, tradesmen would need to visit the area on a regular basis and permit parking would cause difficulties; Objection to shared use section in Station Road, is concerned that due to the pay and display element there may be little or no opportunity for residents and visitors to park; Scheme is a bad idea as there never has been a problem parking in Palmeria Avenue.</p> <p>Letter of support – pleased with at the proposed residents parking management scheme lives in Holland Road and would be most welcome solution to the current nightmare of finding a parking space</p>	<p>Following an informal consultation led by residents, 88% of residents support the idea of permit parking within the area. The proposals include the creation of additional parking on Station Road to be shared pay and display/permit parking.</p> <p>Permit parking will reduce pressure created by non-resident parking which can occur all day due to the proximity to the station and the Cliffs Pavilion.</p> <p>Recommend to implement the proposals as advertised given the evidenced support from residents.</p>
--	---------------	--	--	---