

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

to

**Traffic Regulation Working Party and Cabinet
Committee**

on

7th March 2019

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 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

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

Road	Proposed By	Proposal	Comments	Officer Comment
Wells Avenue	Councillor	Introduction of Residents Permit Parking Scheme	<p>26 letters of Support, and 1 letter of support from the Airport,</p> <p>Main comments are in favour of scheme; some have asked why should residents pay for the permits; and also could it be Monday to Friday</p> <p>7 general comments received in support but would like to see different times for the scheme</p> <p>6 letters of objection received Main comments include Unfair tax on residents; would like it to be different times; would have an effect on trade at local shops adjacent to road; would not stop people parking to use the airport; shop owners would need to find alternative parking; would have a detrimental effect on more people than it would benefit; would prefer parking restrictions; would cause cost implications to those residents with additional vehicles; not a problem outside their property; should be able to park in front of their house without charge; will only move parking to other roads not in the scheme; if scheme is approved, dropped kerbs should be provided for residents free of charge; problem has been</p> <p>Additionally 26 comments were received submitted by a third party of which 18 residents agreed for their comments to be considered of these 15 were generally in support of the scheme, but would like the hours and days of operation reviewed;</p> <p>3 were against parking permits; side roads need to be included; and times need to be reviewed</p>	<p>This proposal was considered at the Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet Committee on 1st November 2018 . Officers advised, in line with the agreed Policy, that a resident permit parking area based on individual roads would only lead to displacement to adjacent streets. Members decided to proceed to advertise the proposal for Wells Avenue.</p> <p>It is unclear from the both the informal and formal consultations as to a general consensus on the times of operation.</p> <p>49 comments are in general support of the concept of permit parking controls with 9 comments not in support.</p> <p>There are concerns that introducing permit parking controls in isolated streets will displace the parking and lead to further requests to extend controls rather than addressing issue on an area wide basis.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider the proposal, the comments received and any presentations at the meeting.</p>

<p>Rochford Road Service Roads</p>	<p>Councillor</p>	<p>Provision of Residents Permit Parking Scheme</p>	<p>1 letter of support – with airport parking becoming worse to park in Rochford Road; due to airport charges and Rochford Rd being free</p> <p>3 letters of objection received main points raised include</p> <p>Something needs to be done; but why should residents pay to park on their own street; permit parking scheme is unnecessary most properties are either bought or rented that do not have driveways for many reasons mostly financially – now want to inflict more costs on the residents; there is not a problem; parking problems decrease property values; it is making life difficult and more expensive for all thereby worsening quality of life of residents in the road; generally against the scheme; has elderly visitors to home that need to park nearby</p> <p>1 general comment agrees we need some form of parking but hours need to be modified</p> <p>Additionally 33 comments were received submitted by a third party of which 14 residents agreed for their comments to be considered of these</p> <p>9 were generally in support of the scheme, but would like the hours and days of operation reviewed; slip road to be one way;</p> <p>5 were against parking permits; additional costs for residents; why should they have to pay to park; restrict hours of scheme; Council tax is high enough without having to pay for parking permits; problems due to airport charging too much for parking; people should not have to pay to have visitors.</p>	<p>This proposal was considered at the Traffic Regulations Working Party and Cabinet Committee on 1st November 2018 . Officers advised, in line with the agreed Policy, that a resident permit parking area based on individual roads would only lead to displacement to adjacent streets. Members decided to proceed to advertise the proposal for Rochford Road Service Roads.</p> <p>It is unclear from the both the informal and formal consultations as to a general consensus on the times of operation.</p> <p>11 comments are in general support of the concept of permit parking controls with 8 comments not in support.</p> <p>There are concerns that introducing permit parking controls in isolated streets will displace the parking and lead to further requests to extend controls rather than addressing issue on an area wide basis.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider the proposal, the comments received and any presentations at the meeting.</p>
<p>Wick Chase junction Glynde Way</p>	<p>Councillor</p>	<p>Introduction of no waiting junction protection</p>	<p>1 letter of objection received</p> <p>The resident's property is on the east side of Wick Chase at its junction with Glynde Way. The resident is elderly and has difficulty walking. The proposed restrictions and parking by non-residents will force her to park further away from her property. She has requested that the double yellow lines be reduced to 5m along her frontage.</p>	<p>The junction has a fairly wide bellmouth and if 5m of restrictions are provided, the current issue of vehicles being parked immediately on the junction would not be resolved. The proposal is for 12m of junction protection in Glynde Way which could be reduced to 10m.</p> <p>Recommend to agree to a reduced length of 10 metres.</p>