

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda  
Item No.

Report of Corporate of Place  
To  
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet  
Committee**  
On  
**19<sup>th</sup> September 2016**

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

---

**Petition Requesting Parking Controls  
Eastwood Boulevard**

**Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox**  
***A Part 1 Public Agenda Item***

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received from 19 residents of Eastwood Boulevard for parking controls be considered on both sides of the street during the periods 8am to 10am and 3pm to 4pm Monday to Friday.

**2. Recommendation**

**That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:**

- a) **Note the petition and thank the residents for taking the time to compile the petition; and agree to;**
- b) **Decline the request to propose waiting restrictions for the reasons set out below;**
- d) **Suggest that ward Members consider whether area wide parking controls would be appropriate and undertake any necessary consultations in accordance with the Policy.**

**3. Background**

- 3.1 All requests for waiting restrictions are considered against the agreed policy criterion which require that at least one of the following criteria must be met;
- Where a road safety problem has been identified by collision studies (3 personal injury accidents 3 years) and it is clear that an actual reduction in collisions may follow the introduction of such an Order.
  - 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.

- Where commerce and industry are seriously affected by presence of parked vehicles.
  - Where the installation of TROs is essential to provide maximum benefit from capital investment.
  - 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.
  - Cost of schemes and likely savings through accident reduction need to be part of priority consideration.
- 3.2 Eastwood Boulevard runs from Cavendish Gardens to Kenilworth Gardens and features properties on one side of the street with Westcliff High School boundary to the other side of the street. The street is not designated as a distributor route but can be subject to fairly high traffic volumes during peak periods.
- 3.2 Its proximity to the schools, all with sixth form units attracting large numbers of older pupils along with high parking demand during the morning and afternoon pick up periods.
- 3.3 Residents have complained of parking associated with the schools and the petition requests the proposal for waiting restrictions to deter this.
- 3.4 The accident history for the street has been investigated and no personal injury accidents have been recorded in the three year period from March 2013 to March 2016.
- 3.5 The street is a bus route subject to a very regular service however; no issues have been identified by the bus operators as to parking causing delays to the service or other inconvenience caused by parked vehicles.
- 3.6 There are concerns that by proposing waiting restrictions in isolated streets, parking is merely displaced to adjacent roads and as such, it is generally recommended that where a local destination is the cause of parking issues, area wide controls in the form of permit parking schemes are more appropriate to prevent parking displacement.

#### **4. Other Options**

- 4.1 Agree to the petitioners' request. The Council is required to consider petitions related to parking controls and the location has been assessed using the agreed policy criterion related to waiting restrictions. The location does not meet the criteria and action in these circumstances could be considered as acting outside of powers delegated to the traffic authority under the Road Traffic Regulation Act.

#### **5. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 5.1 The requirements of the policy requirements agreed by the Cabinet Committee in January 2016 have not been met.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

### *6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities.*

6.1.1 The criteria used to assess waiting restrictions meets the objectives of the Local Transport and Implementation Plan and the Council's aims of being a Safe and Prosperous Southend.

### *6.2 Financial Implications*

6.2.1 Any costs are met through existing budgets.

### *6.3 Legal Implications*

6.3.1 None.

### *6.4 People Implications*

6.4.1 None.

### *6.5 Property Implications*

6.5.1 None.

### *6.6 Consultation*

6.6.1 None. However; if ward Members wish for the wider area to be considered for permit parking controls, consultation in accordance with the policy requirements will need to be undertaken.

### *6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications*

6.7.1 None. However; waiting restrictions are proposed to manage parking, reduce accidents and/or improve traffic flows. The objectives of managing parking and improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities and childcare responsibilities.

### *6.8 Risk Assessment*

6.8.1 None.

### *6.9 Value for Money*

6.9.1 N/A

### *6.10 Community Safety Implications*

6.10.1 None. However, waiting restrictions are proposed to reduce accidents or improve traffic flows. The objectives of improving safety takes account of implications for community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

6.11.1 None

**7. Background Papers**

7.1 None

**8. Appendices**

There are no appendices.