

Southend-on-Sea City Council

**Agenda
Item No.**

**Report of Executive Director
Neighbourhoods and Environment
to
Cabinet
On
12 January 2023**

Report prepared by: Sharon Harrington,
Head of Traffic & Highways

Approval of the Southend Vision for Parking, Parking Strategy 2023-2033, the Parking Implementation Plan 2023-2033 and Parking Action Plan 2023-2033

Relevant Scrutiny Committee(s): Place Scrutiny
Cabinet Member: Councillor Steven Wakefield

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 Cabinet at its September 2021 meeting agreed a draft parking strategy and authorised public consultation on its content. A report setting out the results and analysis of the public consultation was reported to Cabinet at its February 2022 meeting. At the February meeting, Cabinet resolved:- “that the matter be referred to the Transport, Asset Management and Inward Investment Working Party for consideration.”
- 1.2 The comments of the Transport, Asset Management and Inward Investment Working Party are set out in **Appendix 2** and have been used to inform the finalised parking strategy which is recommended to Cabinet for adoption and approval.
- 1.3 The decision of Cabinet on the 8 November 2022 was called into Scrutiny where Scrutiny Committee held on the 28 November referred the report back to Cabinet for the following reasons:
- Report not clear on what was being proposed.
 - The wording on the Report / Strategy made it seem as though the Committee were agreeing to implementation and policies; whereby the Strategy is a high-level live document outlining issues that have been raised to look into in more detail and bring back outcomes before anything is agreed.
 - Scrutiny Committee requested that the report and Strategy be made clearer on what Cabinet was being asked to agree.

2. Recommendation

Cabinet are recommended to:-

- 2.1 Note the recommendation to agree a programme of works where there was support for them to be considered and items that are continually raised as complaints / concerns as set out in paragraph 3.5 of this report;
- 2.2 Approval of the Southend Vision for Parking, and Southend Parking Implementation Plan 2023-2033 and, Southend Parking Implementation Action Plan 2022-2032 contained in Appendix 3.
- 2.3 Agreement to bring back to Traffic Regulations Working Party the outcomes of the scoping / comprehensive reviews for agreement on the way forward.
- 2.4 Agreement to work with Portfolio holder and Ward Members on any of the items to be progressed if they are Ward Specific.

Background

- 3.1 The operation and management of civil parking enforcement (CPE) is regulated by primary legislation, regulations, and statutory guidance. In 2008, the Department for Transport (DfT) published the Secretary of State's Statutory Guidance, for Local Authorities on Enforcing Parking Restrictions¹. The Statutory Guidance requires local authorities to 'publish and openly promote' its strategies and policies and to undertake public consultation on their content.
- 3.2 Cabinet in September 2021 approved the draft Southend Vision for Parking and draft Parking Strategy and authorised public consultation on their content. **The Parking Strategy, Vision for Parking, Parking Implementation Plan (PIP) and Parking Implementation Action Plan are attached at Appendix 3.**
- 3.3 The adopted Vision for Parking promotes four principles the Council wants to instil across the City. These are:-
 - To provide parking where possible;
 - Control parking where necessary;
 - Enforce parking fairly and consistently;
 - Operate parking efficiently and cost effectively and;
 - Keep maintenance costs and disruption to a minimum.
- 3.4 Public consultation took place from 12th October to 2nd December 2021 via Your Say on the Southend website. The questionnaire asked a series of questions and included some of the issues that are often complained or enquired upon and were designed to inform the decision-making process to finalise a Parking Strategy for the city. There was also a comments section to enable other issues to be recorded. **The analysis of the results of the public consultation is set out in Appendix 2.**

¹ [Statutory guidance for local authorities in England on civil enforcement of parking contraventions - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/421212/Statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities-in-England-on-civil-enforcement-of-parking-contraventions-2018.pdf)

- 3.5 Of the 11 parking related questions contained within the consultation, 10 gained a clear majority of responses in support for the particular proposals to be reviewed in more detail.. Based on these items having majority support it is recommended that these items are agreed to form part of a comprehensive review as priority. Other comments received will be considered at a later date once all priority items are considered and or if there is the necessary budget or funding to do so.

If there is a rationale to consider implementation, individual items will require further consultation before being considered as policies which will be subject to Cabinet approval. The PIP will be a live document and will ever evolve dependent on change and if urgent issues arise. The items which received a majority in support are as follows;

Emissions-based parking charges

54% support/strongly support, 36% against, and 10% had no opinion.

Extending parking controls where there is significant night-time activity –

52% support/strongly support, 38% against, and 10% had no opinion.

Limiting the number of resident permits per household

50% support/strongly support, 42% against, and 8% had no opinion.

Stronger parking controls around schools

82% support/strongly support, 11% against, and 7% had no opinion.

Phasing out cash payments for parking

51% support/strongly support, 41% against, and 8% had no opinion.

A city-wide review of all limited waiting bays

78% support/strongly support, 7% against, and 15% had no opinion.

A city-wide review of business parking and loading provision

74% support/strongly supported, 4% against, and 22% had no opinion.

The conversion of controlled parking zones (CPZ) to shared use bays

57% support/strongly support, 30% against, and 13% had no opinion.

A review of existing town centre loading bays to provide more parking bays–

59% support/strongly support, 19% against, and 22% had no opinion.

A review of the Seafront and consideration of partial pedestrianisation ie: events that happen annually

61% support/strongly support, 29% against, and 10% had no opinion.

- 3.6 The parking related question where there was an indeterminate response neither for nor against is still recommended to be included in the scoping / comprehensive review. This is due to continuous complaints received and whereby budgets are continually overspent excessive budget used to on repairing damage; is:-

Options to convert verges damaged by parked vehicles to parking bays

– 49% support/strongly support, 45% against, and 6% had no opinion.

The response both for and against is considered to be indeterminate (too close between those for and against) and accordingly, the option to consider alternative uses for damaged grass verges will need to be considered within the comprehensive review and or scoped .

Additional comments

- 3.7 In addition to the fixed questions there was an opportunity for participants to make comments and suggestions. A total of 135 individual responses were received covering a range of subjects. Of the comments made, the five main threads were:-
- Improve public transport;
 - Increase electric charging points;
 - Park & Ride;
 - Parking Costs;
 - Review of all double yellow lines.
- 3.8 Improving public transport sits outside the remit of the parking strategy except for the provision or enforcement of bus stops/bus stop clearways which is a parking enforcement function.
- 3.9 Park and Ride can seem to be an effective tool in the management of traffic in and around towns. Such schemes are effective where there is extensive demand from commuters working in a town centre who are travelling into the centre to park at the beginning of the day, parking all day and then leaving in the evening. This is not the pattern in Southend where the main employment for residents is outside the City In these circumstances Park and Ride would not be beneficial.
- 3.10 The review of double yellow lines, parking costs and electric vehicle charging provision are covered within the Parking Implementation Plan as this sets out the operational approach for delivery.
- 3.11 Although the response rate on the initial consultation was low; it must be noted that this was just asking the views of the City's Residents and Businesses about issues they would like the Council to investigate. Should any of the scoping / comprehensive reviews give the data / evidence that implementation should be considered there will be a need to follow statutory guidelines with future consultation.

4. The Parking Implementation Plan (PIP)

- 4.1 The adoption of the Parking Strategy provides the over-arching principles for the development of the Parking Service for the next decade 2023-2033. The operational delivery of the Parking Strategy is set out in more detail in the Parking Implementation Plan (PIP).
- 4.2 The PIP provides greater detail on the approach we will adopt for the delivery of the Parking Strategy and twenty-two specific statements setting out how the Parking Service will deliver the objectives. The PIP is a **living document** setting out the operational approach and indicative timeframes for achieving its objectives. It is recognised that these may vary or change over time. The PIP will be reviewed and updated annually. The progress on the delivery of the PIP and any updates of

the PIP will be reported for information to the first quarter meeting of the Traffic Regulations Working Party in its new scrutiny role of the Service.

- 4.3 It must be noted that the PIP is about the principles for the Parking Service to review specific issues that have been raised through Complaints, Members and other channels. It is a delivery plan for exploration and review, NOT for implementation. Should implementation of any of the items in the PIP be required then the Council's governance and decision-making process in addition to any statutory obligations will be followed.

5. Transport, Asset Management and Inward Investment Working Party comments

- 5.1 The February Cabinet decision was to refer the proposal to adopt the Parking Strategy, Vision for Parking and Parking Implementation Plan to the Transport, Asset Management and Inward Investment Working Party for consideration. The Working Party considered the proposals at its 6 September 2022 meeting. **The comments of the Working Party are summarised in Appendix 2.**

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

The adoption and publication of the Southend Parking Strategy and Parking Implementation Plan are statutory requirements for local authorities operating civil parking enforcement. They are seen as key contributors to the Southend 2050 Road Map particularly in the ability to influence modal shift to other modes of more sustainable transport.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 While statutory guidance has removed the requirement that local authorities operate their parking accounts to be 'at least self-financing' it remains 'best practice'. Civil enforcement authorities cannot adopt policies that are designed as income generation, nor should policies be adopted meaning non-motoring residents are subsidising parking for residents who chose to own and run a vehicle. The Southend Parking Strategy objective is to continue to operate the Southend Parking Account, so it remains in surplus for the next decade. All aspects of service delivery set out in the PIP will have to be self-contained within the parking account to ensure that no additional funding is required to support any elements of the parking strategy.

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 Adopting the recommendations will ensure the authority is compliant with statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under section 87 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. The Secretary of State requires civil enforcement authorities to openly publish its policies and strategies and to consult the public on the content. After adoption and publication, the Parking Strategy document will need to be kept under review to ensure it is consistent with current guidance.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 Public consultation was carried out via the Council's 'Your Say' Southend platform and ran from 6 October to 2 December 2021. A number of social media reminders and a press release were circulated during the consultation period with the aim to encourage public engagement.
- 9.2 2,600 people accessed the online consultation and 1,400 people visited the consultation page and viewed the survey and associated documents. 206 people took the time to respond online. The analysis was based on a clear majority with an 8% or greater differential between for/against. Where the differential was less than 8% the results were considered indeterminate. **The analysis of the results of the public consultation can be found in Appendix 1.**
- 9.3 The low numbers engaging and responding to the public consultation is disappointing particularly after the amount of effort put in to publicising the consultation through press and social media. The low engagement/response rate may have been influenced by a number of factors:-
- Only running an online consultation;
 - The number of questions may have been a detraction;
 - The strategy proposals were not contentious.
 - The recipient had no immediate issue or opinion
- 9.4 While parking issues at local level can be very contentious and result in significant public engagement, response rates to higher level parking policies are generally less contentious resulting in lower response rates. Low response rates to parking policy consultations is a national trend and can give rise to questions about the reliability of the results as a means to inform the decision-making process. It is also worth noting that the parking strategy does not contain anything contentious
- 9.4 Some years ago the London Borough of Wandsworth commissioned MORI to undertake research on the viability of low parking response rates. The research involved 'door knocking' all households in a number of locations where parking consultation had taken place to assess if a greater number of responses changed the overall response rates between the ratio of the yes/no/don't know response rates. The result of the research showed the response rate ratio remained within 1-2 percentage points irrespective of a low or high overall response rate.
- 9.5 It is reasonable to assume that similar results to what MORI found in Wandsworth would be applicable to other parking consultations in other boroughs. It is therefore reasonable that the Wandsworth research would also apply to the ratio of response rates of the recent parking consultation in Southend. On this basis the analysis of the results of the consultation are considered to be valid and can be used to inform the decision-making process in this report.

10. Equality analysis

- 10.1 The equality analysis is set out in **Appendix 4** to the report.

Background Papers Parking Strategy 2021-2031

Appendices

Appendix 1

Analysis of the results of the parking consultation

Appendix 2

- Minutes of highways, transport & parking working party meeting

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA CITY COUNCIL
Meeting of Highways, Transport & Parking Working Party
Date: Tuesday, 6th September, 2022
Time: Virtual Meeting via MS Teams
Present: Councillor D Shaliballi (Chair)
Councillors M Henry, A. Burt, D. Crowe, T. Cole, M O'Connor,
A Thompson and C. Walker
In Attendance: J Burt, L. Doherty, N Hobden, T Row and A Turk
Start/End Time: 6.30 pm - 8.20 pm
1 Apologies for absence & Substitutions
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Gatten (Chair), Councillor
Walker and Fairs, (Councillor Councillor Fairs)
2 Declarations of Interest
No interests were declared at the meeting.
3 Parking Strategy
Pursuant to Minute 726 of the meeting of Cabinet held on 22nd February 2022, the
Working Party received a report of the Executive Director (Highways, Roads and
Environment) on the results of the public consultation on the draft Parking
Strategy and Parking Implementation Plan. The contents of the working Party
would be referred to Cabinet for consideration at its meeting in November 2022
with the final draft Parking Strategy and Parking Implementation Plan.
The Working Party discussed the report in some detail. It was noted that the level
of response to the consultation had been relatively low, although this was not
unusual. The Working Party felt that there was some inconsistency in applying
the criteria to determine the proposals to be progressed in the strategy. It was
agreed that the proposals set out in the strategy would be re-examined
immediately but would be progressed in a phased, structured way over time. The
report to Cabinet would be amended to reflect this including the effects of the
current cost of being cited. The Parking Strategy was a live document and would
be updated as appropriate to reflect the current situation and resource data being
in use at the time.
With reference to the aspiration to move to cashless payments for parking, it was
suggested that a proven approach to implementing this should be considered.
This was suggested given the poor implementation of the system at Southend,
including the failure to create during the 10-15 mins free of payment time
leading to thousands of the facility for all cash payments for parking were
withdrawn. The Working Party was advised that the removal of cash payments
would not be overnight but would be phased in over many years as the demand
and use of cash decreases and disappears. The Executive Director

Appendix 3

- Southend Parking Strategy 2022 -2032 (including the Vision for Parking)
- Southend Parking Implementation Plan 2022 -2032
- Parking Implementation Action Plan

Appendix 4

- Equality Analysis

Parking Strategy Questionnaire

Results.

Questions 1 – 2 were address based questions and are not shown here

3. Do you support the concept that the most polluting vehicles should pay more than less polluting vehicles?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	44	22.8%
Agree	59	31.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	10.1%
Disagree	35	18.5%
Strongly disagree	33	17.5%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

4. Do you support the concept of extended parking controls in areas with a large evening/night-time activity, subject to local consultation?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	49	25.9%
Agree	49	25.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	10.1%
Disagree	45	23.8%
Strongly disagree	27	14.3%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

5. Do you support the concept of limiting the number of permits per household as a means of increasing parking capacity?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	41	21.7%
Agree	54	28.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	7.4%
Disagree	45	23.8%
Strongly disagree	35	18.5%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

6. We propose to review all schools and the surrounding streets with the vision of installing stronger parking controls in the area? Is this something you would support in principle?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	101	53.4%
Agree	54	28.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	14	7.4%
Disagree	10	5.3%
Strongly disagree	10	5.3%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

7. We propose phasing out all cash payments within the lifetime of this Strategy for paid parking and rely on card only and mobile enabled technologies. Is this something you would support in principle?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	49	26%
Agree	47	25%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	8%
Disagree	30	16%
Strongly disagree	47	25%

Optional question (188 response(s), 4 skipped)

8. Do you support the principle that where there is evidence of ongoing damage and safety conflicts for pedestrians that grass verge areas are considered for other use, eg: formalised parking bays (hardstanding); increasing the footpath width even if ...

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	44	23.2%
Agree	49	25.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	11	5.8%
Disagree	43	22.6%
Strongly disagree	43	22.6%

Optional question (190 response(s), 2 skipped)

9. Do you support the principle that the Council undertake a review of all limited waiting bays with the vision to change the restrictions to something better suited to the location?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	55	29.1%
Agree	93	49.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	28	14.8%
Disagree	7	3.7%
Strongly disagree	6	3.2%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

10. Do you support the principle that the Council undertake a review of the seafront to look at times when certain areas may be pedestrianised at specific times of the day (with deliveries unaffected)?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	64	34%
Agree	52	27%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	10.1%
Disagree	27	14.4%
Strongly disagree	26	13.8%

Optional question (188 response(s), 4 skipped)

11. Do you support the principle of shared use bays within controlled parking zones; this would permit visitors to pay to park when there are free bays within the zone?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	42	22.2%
Agree	65	34.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	25	13.2%
Disagree	34	18%
Strongly disagree	23	12.2%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

12. Do you support the principle a review be undertaken to look at the implementation of more parking bays in the town centre and restricting times for deliveries?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	47	24.9%
Agree	65	34.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	42	22.2%
Disagree	28	14.8%
Strongly disagree	7	3.7%

Optional question (189 response(s), 3 skipped)

13. Do you support in principle a review of all business and loading bays to ensure they are in the right place and service the right groups?

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Strongly agree	44	23.8%
Agree	93	50.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	40	21.6%
Disagree	6	3.2%
Strongly disagree	2	1.1%

Optional question (185 response(s), 7 skipped)

14. If you feel there are any issue you feel we should consider as part of the strategy, please state here in no more than 100 words.

Comments	
1.	Allow churches etc visitor permits. Needed for community activities, weddings, funerals, worship
2.	More areas need to be converted to non traffic areas except for buses, deliveries and taxis,
3.	churches which serve the community in different ways should have easy access to permits
4.	I think that you need an overall strategy for Parking before you start asking us for fine tuning.
5.	As a resort town why extort so much from visitors parking!!
6.	Address the problem of vehicles parked partially (or wholly) on the pavement with FP notices
7.	All vehicles parked overnight on public spaces should pay a fee.
8.	Restrict all parking one side of the road on all bus routes
9.	Questions assume people will use individual vehicles. Plans should encourage public transport
10.	No residents parking zones 9am to 5.30pm this leaves street parking empty during shopping times.
11.	Sunday free parking
12.	Using colour coded bays, for pay & display, permit,& free parking, making bays longer.
13.	Review the parking permits for businesses where they may only go into the office couple times a week
14.	Do not turn grass kerbs into parking for cars stop cars vans parking on the pavement.
15.	We need more short stay free parking bays around town centre particularly the sea front end.
16.	Greater emphasis to be placed on curbing car use and better public transport provision
17.	End1 hour a day parking nr stations replace with Red pkg scheme to include ALL Ed's nr stations.
18.	We need much more focus on delivery hubs/cargo bikes and reducing car numbers, not increasing them
19.	None of this will help congestion or emissions unless park and ride is seriously considered.
20.	So many roads have unnecessary parking restrictions whilst other roads have none and needs a review
21.	review all double yellow lines to see if they can be removed or reduced to provide more parking.
22.	look at Burges Terrace to Warwick Road to amend the parking from March to Oct to July to Sept only
23.	Charging for electric vehicles, especially for residents with no parking, driveways or garages.
24.	Improve the bus service to get people out of their cars
25.	Lower parking charges on Belton Way its not used much now because of cost
26.	Intro of controlled Parking Zone @ Burdett Avenue + St John's Road. Use of carparks for business.
27.	I live in Burdett Avenue and I cannot easily park my care either night or day ,We need residence par
28.	Residents parking in Burdett Avenue. We have campaigned for resident parking and is supported

29.	Permit parking for residents. To encourage people to use public transport and walking. Much greener.
30.	Resident parking scheme for Burdett Avenue URGENT
31.	You should implement a Park and Ride service to reduce the traffic flow in the town centre.
32.	Living near schools & London Rd, we need permit parking! Large car parks nearby are not being used.
33.	Review 1 hr no parking on Chalkwell Hall & Marine estates. Consider resident permit zones in Leigh
34.	Give parking permits to residents down Burdett Avenue, parking fees from workers using our street
35.	Resident parking permits needed in Woodfield Road.
36.	Older people don't have mobiles or your e payments, they often drive older cars this won't help them
37.	Dropped kerb policy revised to allow for more at home electric chargers. + more public chargers.
38.	You don't mention disabled parking on this survey. We need to be able to park on seafront to enjoy.
39.	Make parking cheaper for working people. Make spaces big enough for modern cars. Keep cash payments.
40.	Disabled parking. Some car parks do not have disabled bays; why? Wheelchair must not be excluded.
41.	I will not park anywhere that I have to pay for parking on my phone I am sure I am not the only person
42.	Surely this survey is too ambiguous to make constructive answers
43.	Stop cars parking on single yellow lines on Sunday, or any day of the week
44.	Incentivise greater use of public transport & restrict town centre parking. Prioritise buses over car
45.	Parking for residents in and around Leigh Broadway has become impossible residents need permits asap
46.	Better traffic flow would stop pollution, stop trying to slow traffic down everywhere!!
47.	I think a permit scheme in Salisbury Avenue would benefit residents as evening parking is impossible
48.	A special reduced daily rate for people that work in the town centre. £5.00 per day would be better
49.	Charges at car parks near local shops, eg Thorpe Bay Broadway. Too expensive for 5/10 mins
50.	Seasonal park n ride option for seafront
51.	Introduce park and ride at Leigh station with enhanced, 10min train service between Leigh – Southend
52.	Introduce 20mph limits in residential roads
53.	Milton shows high number of unused resident bays which could be filled with shoppers or workers.
54.	Local people should have reduced fees for the Southend parking pass and visitors from outside the area
55.	Please ensure all reviews and potential changes are accessible and allow provisions for Blue Badge
56.	Park and ride scheme stop airport expansion stop building flats/new homes this town is full
57.	Compensation to homeowners if changes in residential areas negatively impacts property values.

58.	Lighting in car parks. I noticed how bad the lighting was on Alexandra St car park at 5.30pm
59.	Split the seafront zone on parking pass to allow 3 hours at East beach and Chalkwell
60.	We need to keep as much green verge as possible or we risk becoming a lifeless concrete jungle.
61.	Allow St Bernards school free parking in Cambridge rd so residents can park around school.
62.	Price of parking has risen excessively with little change in service. I avoid going to Southend now
63.	We need to put the protection of environment and green space, and the safety of pedestrians, first.
64.	We need to encourage people out of cars. The bus network should be improved. Park & Ride even better
65.	Make it cheaper. Parking is too expensive.
66.	We should not pay for parking on a Sunday make it free Sunday's are a sacred day
67.	Consideration please to extending resident only parking to the whole of Westbourne grove
68.	Charges and restrictions are unfair when there is no alternative
69.	I think there are too many double yellow lines in the area that really should be single yellow lines
70.	Don't penalise drivers. Public transport is poor especially for limited mobility people
71.	Park and ride. Public transport investment. Replace Mobon with a better alternative for end users.
72.	There should resident parking available to people who live in town
73.	Remove car free buildings and issue resident permits to anyone paying Council Tax in Southend
74.	remove parking restrictions on bank holidays in Thorpe bay and /or for residents
75.	Bus stop at The Woodcutters is a waste of valuable park8ng space. Change to a mixed bag.
76.	Please review the traffic calming measures to ensure they do not continue to create gridlock.
77.	Just admit it's a revenue raising exercise, look at aircraft, full power on take off over the town.
78.	Some roads need to allow parking with 2wheels on the pavement or there's no room for trucks to pass
79.	Consider I
80.	In certain town centre locations people often park without permits or they park blocking the way
81.	Southend is not London. It'll never have the public transport infrastructure to justify its strategy
82.	We need visitors so there must be plenty of cheap parking available. EV points in residential areas
83.	More flats built, no where to charge electric cars, until that's put right, no point
84.	More resident parking zones should be implemented - especially in areas close to car parks
85.	Permit parking, marked bays Electric charging points more accessibility for older properties.

86.	More on-street charging points.
87.	Residents parking permit areas to be extended as we are on edge of one and road is difficult to park
88.	The need for more blue badges within the borough.
89.	Boscombe Road being one of the last roads to have residents parking scheme. Awful for the residents
90.	Southend's shopping and entertainment offer is poor compared to other areas like Basildon, Chelmsford
91.	Parking restrictions should be introduced to improve traffic flow. Hamstel Road is good example.
92.	There is a lack of Blue Badge spaces and not enough clarity over when Badge holders can park for free
93.	the fact that this is only available on-line totally skews and invalidates the survey.
94.	I think that the roads along the seafront (I.e Seaforth) should have residential parking
95.	I work at the hospital and a parking review for staff is desperately needed.
96.	More permit restricted parking in residential areas to restrict households with multiple cars
97.	Better and safer cycling paths and cycle parking lockups for car free journeys
98.	Turn white line road markings to yellow otherwise they are of no use or benefit.
99.	Have you considered a park and ride scheme for visitors? This would reduce traffic coming into town.
100.	Residents of warrior house, Southchurch road should be able to park in warrior square
101.	The whole multi zone parking day pass scheme is a joke and so complicated
102.	Make city more accessible, cheaper parking, better road access. Don't penalise residents
103.	Current parking charges are far to high, particularly along the seafront.
104.	Surprised there are no qs about the cost of parking in eg Belton Hills - huge own goal by council
105.	Conversion of redundant bus stops to parking i.e. Hamlet Court Road.
106.	Cost of parking in Southend is outrageous. Support the town and cut charges
107.	More trees in all available areas! Don't penalise the poorest who are unable to switch to electric.
108.	Introduce residents parking in roads that have a one hour parking ban in the middle of the day.
109.	Security in parkings
110.	Night parking on double yellows & corners, no traffic Wardens so people take advantage. Dangerous
111.	More Electric charging points in the ratio of two per ten parking bays in council car parks.
112.	Some roads need double yellows down one side of road to keep traffic flowing.
113.	Less charge

114.	Do not go to a cashless payment system. This limits parking to those that have smartphone/bank acco
115.	Parking bays in Leigh to encourage considerate parking.
116.	Change the minimum size of a parking space/drop curb for residents will half your parking problem!!
117.	We are not rich to pay for parking everywhere. If I have to pay for parking I don't go there, simple
118.	Insufficient designated disabled parking bays on roads in town & along the seafront as well as SGH
119.	The parking strategy MUST include Leigh! One way streets and use of verges.
120.	Delivery trucks parking up on the pathways, blocking the path for pedestrians and destroying surface
121.	Grass verges important, barren town unappealing. Don't remove them, fine people for ruining them!!
122.	Food delivery agents need access to food outlets in high street without paying every time
123.	More delineated bays. Better enforcement of parking on verges and junctions. Charging Leigh parking
124.	Review of resident parking options in streets around Leigh and parking options for visitors
125.	Word your survey better
126.	Parking is so damn exp in Southend
127.	Allow parking on grass verges (Eastwood Road SS9) for accident/emergency i.e. puncture/broken down
128.	Please look at parking cost. We need people in the town not restricted by the high cost of parking
129.	Parking is abysmal in Westcliff often impossible to park in your own road let alone near own home.
130.	we need more disabled bays, disabled should be able to park in residents permit parking bays free to
121.	I feel very strongly that parking controls are CAUSING the problems around Earls Hall Primary School
132.	It would be nice to see free parking on Sundays in evenings and Xmas time in Southend.
122.	The cost of the parking on Belton way is unreasonable
134.	Parking charges are iniquitous. Penalises visitors. Makes town look greedy and unwelcoming.
135.	A citizen's charter for positive parking. Also low rise multi storey car park in Leigh