

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Corporate Director for Place
to
**Traffic and Parking Working Party and
Cabinet Committee**
on
16th June 2016

Report prepared by: Cheryl Hindle-Terry
Team Leader Parking, Traffic Management and Road Safety

Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders – Various Locations
Executive Councillor: Cllr Cox
A 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.

3.3 All schemes approved by the Traffic & Parking Working Party/Cabinet Committee are added to the on-going work programme for implementation unless members have indicated a higher order of priority.

4. Other Options

4.1 The Officers comments reflect their assessment in terms of the compliance with the agreed policy criterion. Members may wish to consider level of support, representations from residents and ward councillors to assess if there is a justification to depart from the policy on exceptional basis.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

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

6. 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 When recommended for action, waiting restrictions have been assessed using the criteria agreed by this Committee designed to reflect the powers delegated to the Council acting as the Traffic Authority. Where action is not recommended, the requests or proposals do not meet this agreed criteria and as such, the circumstances set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.3.2 The recommendations set out against each of the advertised proposals states whether the proposal meets this criteria and the relevant recommendation. When approved by the Cabinet Committee for advertisement, the formal statutory consultative process has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the legislation however for consistency, the original recommendation is stated.

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 When a request is recommended for progression, the proposal meets the requirements set out in the agreed criteria and will have been assessed on both safety and traffic related benefits.

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. To be provided at the meeting.

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

The Council's agreed policy criterion 4th January 2016

a) Junction Protection

- 1) 10m of yellow lines at junctions to improve safety, accessibility of the emergency vehicles and compliance with the Highways Code.
- 2) The function has already been delegated to officers by the T& P
- 3) Proposal – To extend this delegation to all junction protections based on officer professional judgement in terms of the length which may vary from location to location.*it may be practical to reduce the length at some junctions while increasing at particularly wide bell mouths.
- 4) Ward members to be informed in advance of implementation

b) Waiting Restrictions

These will only be considered if one of the following criteria is met;

- 1) Where a road safety problem has been identified by collision studies (3Pia in 3 years) and it is clear that an actual reduction in collisions may follow the introduction of such an Order.
- 2) Where evidence of the obstruction of the highway or visibility at junctions occurs on a frequent and severe basis, causing particular difficulties for emergency service vehicles and/or public transport.
- 3) Where commerce and industry are seriously affected by presence of parked vehicles.
- 4) Where the installation of TROs is essential to provide maximum benefit from capital investment.
- 5) On strategic routes and major distributors appropriate waiting and loading restrictions can be used to ensure that adequate road space is available for moving traffic. Waiting restrictions will not be provided for individual private accesses in isolation.
- 6) Cost of schemes and likely savings through accident reduction need to be part of priority

| Road | Proposed By | Proposal | Comments | Officer Comment |
|---------------|-------------|---|---|---|
| Marcus Avenue | Member | Introduction of 'No Waiting' 11am to 12 Noon Monday to Friday | <p>4 letters received 3 in support 1 objection.</p> <p>The concern set out in the letter of objection was that the area has a large no. of elderly residents who require workman to visit their properties if the restrictions proceed will encourage workman to have to leave to park elsewhere and return when able to park and also visitors would not be able to park outside the properties when visiting relatives. From their observations they do not feel that there is a problem with parking because their observations showed a lack of vehicles every weekday.</p> | <p>While there is a level of support from those who responded to the consultation, there is undoubtedly an adverse impact on residents with regard to visitors and workmen. A waiting restriction prohibits all waiting during the hours of operation and general exemptions are not available. Short term exemptions, such as the ability for a builder to park while undertaking works are available for a charge of £30.00 per 7 day period however visitors are not accommodated for. If this is a requirement, a permit parking scheme is more appropriate.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p> |

| Road | Proposed By | Proposal | Comments | Officer Comment |
|-------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| Parkanaur Avenue | Member | Introduction of junction protection 'No Waiting' at Anytime for 10m from Johnstone Road southwards | <p>1 letter of objection received With support from 8 other residents of the road</p> <p>The main concerns raised are that the extension of the double yellow lines by 10m will not help the situation will encourage vehicles to park in a smaller stretch of road.</p> <p>Feel that single yellow lines should be introduced on both sides of Parkanaur Avenue (south of Johnstone Road) with 1 hour parking.</p> <p>If other restrictions in the Thorpe Bay area are brought in they will add to the problem in Parkanaur unless there are similar measures implemented there.</p> | <p>While there is a level of support, the request did not meet the criteria as the junction is currently protected with 15 metres of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now are asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p> |

| Road | Proposed By | Proposal | Comments | Officer Comment |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|---|
| St James Avenue | Member | Introduction of 'No Waiting' 11am to 12 Noon Monday to Friday | <p>1 letter of objection received and 27 letters of support received</p> <p>The letter of objection main concerns is that the proposal does not do enough to solve the problem. Suggest it would be safer to restrict parking to 9am to 1pm on one side and 1pm to 5pm on the other side this makes more sense allowing vehicles pass one another safely and still allow parking.</p> <p>Also suggests where properties have driveways at the rear, parking at least on one side should be allowed perhaps limited to 1 hour no return within 4 hours 9am to 6pm</p> | <p>While there is substantial support for the proposal, the proposal does not meet the agreed criteria for waiting restrictions.</p> <p>As the area is not subject to accidents, and that traffic flow in residential streets is not a consideration, the request does not meet the policy criteria for the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Given Members decision to progress these particular requests to advertisement, Members are now are asked to consider the nature of the representations received in respect of this proposal and whether there is any justification for an exception to the agreed policy applying to waiting restrictions.</p> |
| Burges Terrace | Member | Introduction of 'No Waiting' March to October from 9am to 6pm on the west side between Burges Terrace and Thorpe Esplanade | <p>1 letter of objection received</p> <p>Believes that the restrictions in place are more than adequate for the area. Cannot see why local residents have to make adjustments to their parking facilities to accommodate the Roslin business which is causing a huge inconvenience to the whole community in the area surrounding the hotel.</p> | <p>There is no apparent support for the proposal.</p> <p>Recommend no further action.</p> |