

**MEETING OF THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
SUB COMMITTEE (TRO OBJECTIONS)**

14 February 2019
MARCONI ROOM, CIVIC CENTRE, CHELMSFORD
CITY COUNCIL
COMMENCING AT 10.00



AGENDA

1. Welcome by Chairman of the Sub Committee
2. Apologies for absence
3. Minutes of the meeting on 6 December 2018
4. Consider representations against proposed TRO for Leamington Road, Cheltenham Road and Tonbridge Road, Hockley, Rochford
5. Consider representations against proposed TRO for Plumberow Avenue, Wimhurst Close and The Acorns, Hockley.
6. Consider representations against proposed TRO for Queens Road and Broad Oak Way, Rayleigh.
7. Consider representations against proposed TRO for Heron Gardens Rayleigh
8. Any other business

MINUTES

of the

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB-COMMITTEE on 6 December 2018 at 3.15pm

Present:

Councillor Ron Pratt (Chairman)	Maldon District Council
Councillor Jon Cloke	Brentwood Borough Council
Councillor Paul Varker	Castle Point Council

In attendance:

Nick Binder	Chelmsford City Council
Karen Bomford	Maldon District Council
Trudie Bragg	Castle Point Council
William Butcher	Chelmsford City Council
Andrew Clay	Chelmsford City Council
Brian Mayfield	Chelmsford City Council
Heather Smith	Basildon Borough Council

1. **Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed those present.

2. **Apologies and Substitutions**

There were no apologies for absence.

3. **Minutes and Matters Arising**

The minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 8 August 2018 were confirmed as a correct record.

There were no matters of business arising.

4. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to change the single yellow line in Butt Lane, Maldon to a double yellow line no waiting at any time restriction.

Two objections, one comment and five representations of support had been received following advertising of the Order. Three members of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order.

The Sub-Committee believed that those who supported the Order and those who opposed it had strong arguments. Members were not convinced that the proposed restrictions needed to extend the whole length of Butt Lane and that provided a scheme could be designed that would enable vehicles to pass safely and would not allow parked cars to block access to properties, some parking should continue to be allowed.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Butts Lane, Maldon be made but that the Technician design a scheme that reduces the extent of the restrictions in the advertised Order with a view to allowing a limited amount of parking in Butt Lane; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(3.18 to 3.35pm)

5. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce a single yellow line, no waiting at any time Monday to Friday 8am to 4pm, parking restriction in King Street, Maldon opposite its junction with Queens Avenue.

Three representations of support and six objections had been received to the proposal. The Sub-Committee considered the representations and the Technician's responses to them and concluded that the points made by the objectors did not carry sufficient weight to warrant the Order not being made.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201* insofar as it relates to King Street, Maldon be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(3.35 to 3.38pm)

6. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to change the single yellow line in Princes Road, Maldon to a double yellow line no waiting at any time restriction.

Two objections, including an 88-signature petition, had been received, with three expressions of support. The Technicians and Lead Officer for Maldon had considered the representations and recommended that the Order should be withdrawn and redesigned. Three members of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order.

In the light of the public representations at the meeting, the Sub-Committee asked that the advertised Order be amended and a lesser scheme designed that would include double yellow lines on the road opposite the entrances to the four properties in Princes Road to protect access to and egress from those properties, and action another review of the area to consider a redesign of the remaining restrictions to provide safe parking and vehicle passing areas.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Princes Road, Maldon be amended and a lesser scheme designed and implemented that would include double yellow lines on the road opposite the entrances to the four properties in Princes Road to protect access to and egress from those properties, and that officers action another review to consider a redesign of the remaining restrictions to provide safe parking and vehicle passing areas.; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(3.38 to 4.00pm)

7. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce a prohibition of waiting in The Street, Purleigh on the bend adjacent to the Bell public house.

The objections received to the Order had led to the Lead Councillor, Lead Officer and Technician recommending that the scheme be withdrawn.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 33) Order 201* insofar as it relates to The Street, Purleigh, Maldon be withdrawn in its entirety; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.08 to 4.10pm)

8. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 34) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce parking restrictions in Millfields access road, Burnham-on-Crouch.

Following representations, it was proposed that the scheme be modified to allow some on-street parking in the road but retain the double yellow lines at the junction, the bends and to create passing places. The weight of public opinion, though, was that all parking restrictions in Millfields should be removed, a view with which the Sub-Committee agreed.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 34) Order 201* insofar as it relates to the Millfields access road, Burham-on-Crouch, Maldon be withdrawn and that an amended proposal be advertised to remove the parking restrictions in Millfields; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.10 to 4.18pm)

9. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 34) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to prohibit waiting on the public highway in the High Street, Burnham-on-Crouch on Tuesdays (market day) from 7am to 2.30pm.

One expression of support and two objections had been received. The Sub-Committee considered the representations and the Technician's responses to them and concluded that the Order should be made as advertised.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Maldon District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 34) Order 201* insofar as it relates to the High Street, Burnham-on-Crouch, Maldon be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.18 to 4.20pm)

10. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 to introduce permit holder parking from Monday to Friday between 8.00-9.30am and 2.30-3.30pm in Alderwood Way and Summerwood Close and no waiting at any time parking restrictions at the junction of Alderwood Way and Benfleet Road.

Two objections and 22 expressions of support had been received following advertising of the Order.

The Sub-Committee considered the representations and the Technician's responses to them and concluded that the Order should be made as advertised.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Alderwood Way and Summerwood Close, and the junction of Alderwood Way and Benfleet Road, Castle Point be made as advertised; and

2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.20 to 4.22pm)

11. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 to introduce a residents' permit parking scheme which would operate from Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) between 10.00-11.00am and 2.00-3.00pm in Konny Brook and Blackwater, Thundersley.

One objection and four expressions of support had been received following advertising of the proposed Order.

The Sub-Committee considered the representations and the Technician's responses to them and concluded that the Order should be made as advertised.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Konny Brook and Blackwater, Thundersley, Castle Point be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.22 to 4.24pm)

12. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 to remove the seasonal yellow line waiting restrictions in May Avenue, Whiteways, Maurice Road, Lottem Road, Hellendoorn Road, Margraten Avenue, Shellbeach Road, Keer Avenue, Weel Road, Gafzelle Drive, Marine Avenue, Station Road and Seaview Road, Canvey Island.

Of the 12 representations received, six supported and six objected to the proposed Order. Two members of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order.

The Sub-Committee considered the representations and the Technician's responses to them and concluded that the Order should be made as advertised.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201* insofar as it relates to May Avenue, Whiteways, Maurice Road, Lottem Road, Hellendoorn Road, Margraten Avenue, Shellbeach Road, Keer Avenue, Weel Road, Gafzelle Drive, Marine Avenue, Station Road and Seaview Road, Canvey Island be made as advertised; and

2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.24 to 4.28pm)

13. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 to introduce double yellow lines in The Avenue, Hadleigh on both sides of its junction with Church Road in a north-easterly then easterly direction to a point in line with the boundary between 9 and 11 The Avenue.

Three expressions of support and 33 objections had been received following advertising of the proposed Order. In the light of that, modifications were proposed to allow 35 metres of unrestricted parking to be provided in The Avenue. Two members of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order, and two further representations, one for and one against, were read out. The Sub-Committee felt, on balance, that the Order should be made with the recommended modification but monitored and reviewed after six months to see what effect it had had.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Castle Point Borough) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No. 41) Order 201* insofar as it relates to The Avenue and Church Road, Hadleigh be made with the following modification to the proposals advertised:

North-west side of The Avenue

Reduce the extent of the No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) restriction to commence from its junction with Church Road north-eastwards for a distance of 15 metres and from a point 50 metres north-east of its junction with Church Road north-eastwards then eastwards to a point in line with the boundary of property numbers 9 and 11 The Avenue

2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.28 to 4.47pm)

14. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads, Zone A, Borough of Basildon) (Parking and Waiting) (Amendment No. 90) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Basildon District) (Parking and Waiting) Consolidation Order 2008 to remove the Permit X areas and merge them with the existing Zone A parking area. This would affect Cherrydown West, Clay Hill Road, Coddendam Green, Codenham Straight, Fauners, Gobions, Langleys, Latchetts Shaw, Takley End, Waldegrave, Witchards and Wynters, Basildon.

Of the 22 representations received to the Order, 22 were objections, two of which had been withdrawn, and one was a comment. The representations had led to a recommendation to the Sub-Committee that the Order be made but modified to exclude the garage and parking areas. One member of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads, Zone A, Borough of Basildon) (Parking and Waiting) (Amendment No. 90) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Cherrydown West, Clay Hill Road, Coddenham Green, Codenham Straight, Fauners, Gobions, Langleys, Latchetts Shaw, Takley End, Waldegrave, Witchards and Wynters, Basildon be made, subject to the removal of the garage and parking areas to make the scheme less restrictive; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.00 to 4.05pm)

15. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads, Zone B, Borough of Basildon) (Parking and Waiting) (Amendment No. 95) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Basildon District) (Parking and Waiting) Consolidation Order 2008 to remove the Permit X areas and merge them with the existing Zone B parking area. This would affect The Gore, Audley Way, Braybrooke, Brempons, Butneys, Culverdown, Hinckfield Place, Landermere, Long Gages, Neville Shaw, Pomfret Mead, Rokells, Roselaine and Roodegate, Basildon.

Seventeen objections, two expressions of support and one comment had been received following advertising of the proposed Order. The representations had led to a recommendation to the Sub-Committee that the Order be made but modified to exclude the garage and parking areas. One member of the public attended the meeting to speak on the Order.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads, Zone B, Borough of Basildon) (Parking and Waiting) (Amendment No. 95) Order 201* insofar as it relates to The Gore, Audley Way, Braybrooke, Brempons, Butneys, Culverdown, Hinckfield Place, Landermere, Long Gages, Neville Shaw, Pomfret Mead, Rokells, Roselaine and Roodegate, Basildon be made subject to the removal of the garage and parking areas to make the scheme less restrictive; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(4.05 to 4.08pm)

The meeting closed at 4.47pm.

Chairman

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP SUB COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

AGENDA ITEM 4

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (VARIOUS ROADS) (DISTRICT OF ROCHFORD) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND PERMIT PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT NO.52) ORDER 201* Relating to Leamington Road, Cheltenham Road and Tonbridge Road, Hockley, Rochford
Report by	South Essex Parking Partnership Manager

Enquiries contact: Nick Binder, South Essex Parking Partnership Manager, 01245 606303, nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk

Purpose

To report the receipt of representations made on part of the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*

Options

The Joint Committee has the following options available:

1. to agree that the proposed Order be made as advertised;
2. to agree that the proposed Order be made subject to modifications which result in less restrictive provisions or reduced scope; or
3. to agree that the proposed Order should not be made.

Recommendation(s)

1. The Order be made as advertised; and
2. The people making representations be advised accordingly.

Consulters

South Essex Parking Partnership

Policies and Strategies

The report takes into account the South Essex Parking Partnership Document setting out how the SEPP will deal with requests for parking restrictions requiring

TROs.

1.	<u>Background</u>															
1.1	<p>The purpose of this Order is to amend The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 as set out below:-</p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road, Hockley.</p> <p>On 6th July 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Leamington Road, requesting a resident permit parking scheme, operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 10am to 11am, to deter all-day non-resident parking. The application is supported by a signed petition from 39 properties.</p> <p>On 20th July 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Cheltenham Road, requesting a resident permit parking scheme, operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 10am to 11am, to deter all-day non-resident parking. The application is supported by a signed petition from 8 properties.</p> <p>Following receipt of both application forms, the SEPP carried out an informal consultation with all residents to seek their view. The results were as follows:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="276 1189 1326 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th>Road</th> <th>Number of properties</th> <th>Number of responses</th> <th>Number in favour of permit parking</th> <th>Number not in favour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Leamington Road</td> <td>64</td> <td>44 (69%)</td> <td>41 (93%)</td> <td>3 (7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cheltenham Road</td> <td>11</td> <td>10 (91%)</td> <td>9 (90%)</td> <td>1 (10%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The results met the SEPP criteria.</p> <p>The request to provide parking restrictions was discussed with Lead Officer and Lead Councillor for parking matters for Rochford and it was agreed to proceed for funding. The scheme will provide permit holder parking from Monday to Friday, between the hours of 10am to 11am.</p> <p>The scheme was costed at £2700 and placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Sub Committee on 8th March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.</p>	Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour	Leamington Road	64	44 (69%)	41 (93%)	3 (7%)	Cheltenham Road	11	10 (91%)	9 (90%)	1 (10%)
Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour												
Leamington Road	64	44 (69%)	41 (93%)	3 (7%)												
Cheltenham Road	11	10 (91%)	9 (90%)	1 (10%)												
1.2	<p>The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 26th July 2018, and copies of the draft Order were sent to a number of organisations including Essex Police, Essex County Council (the highway authority), Essex Fire & Rescue Service, Essex Ambulance Service, the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</p>															

1.3	When the Order was published on 26 th July 2018 a 21 day period of formal public consultation commenced.
1.4	<p><i>Copy of letter sent to residents of Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road on 20th July 2018, prior to publication -</i></p> <p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership will shortly be publishing a proposal for Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road to introduce a permit parking scheme operating Monday – Friday, excluding Bank Holidays, 10 – 11am in with No Waiting at Any Time parking restrictions on the junction of Leamington Road and Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can also be found on the Council’s website from 26 July 2018: https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/parking-and-travel/parking-restrictions/view-current-and-proposed-parking-restrictions/rochford-parking-restrictions/</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day formal consultation period whereby any person may write objecting to the proposal, or write in support.</p> <p>If there are unresolved objections the matter will be reported to the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee for a decision. The Committee can agree to proceed as published and bring the Order into effect, amend the proposal or withdraw it in its entirety.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments on or after the 26 July 2018 you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 17 August 2018.</p> <p>Please note that any previous comments received cannot be taken into account. Therefore, it is essential for you to formally respond, either objecting to or supporting the proposal during the statutory period stated above.</p>
2	<u>Comments</u>
2.1	The details of the representations are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report together with the comments of the Technicians.
3	<u>Conclusion</u>
3.1	Although the correspondents have made a number of points which lead them to believe the Order should not be pursued in whole or part, the Lead Councillor, Lead Officer and Technicians consider that none of them are of sufficient weight to warrant the Order not being made.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of people making representations

Appendix 2 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments

Appendix 3 – Formal complaint

APPENDIX 1

Ref	List of people making representations	Type
1	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 26 th July	Support
2	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 27 th July	Support
3	Email from resident of Tonbridge Road dated 28 th July	Objection
4	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 29 th July	Support
5	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 29 th July	Support
6	Email from resident of Tonbridge Road dated 30 th July	Objection
7	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 31 st July	Support
8	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 2 nd August	Support
9	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 2 nd August	Support
10	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 2 nd August	Support
11	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 2 nd August	Support
12	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 2 nd August	Support
13	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 3 rd August	Support
14	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 4 th August	Support
15	Email from resident of Orchard Avenue dated 4 th August	Objection
16	Email from resident of Tonbridge Road dated 8 th August	Objection
17	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 9 th August	Support
18	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 10 th August	Support
19	Email from resident of Cheltenham Road dated 10 th August	Support
20	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
21	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
22	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
23	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
24	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
25	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
26	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
27	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
28	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
29	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
30	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
31	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
32	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
33	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
34	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
35	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
36	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support

37	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
38	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
39	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
40	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
41	Letter from resident of Leamington Road received on 14 th August	Support
42	Letter from resident of Cheltenham Road received on 14 th August	Support
43	Letter from resident of Cheltenham Road received on 14 th August	Support
44	Letter from resident of Cheltenham Road received on 14 th August	Support
45	Letter from resident of Cheltenham Road received on 14 th August	Objection
46	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 15 th August	Support
47	Email from Orchard Avenue dated 15 th August	Objection
48	Email from resident of Leamington Road dated 17 th August	Support
49	Email from commuter dated 17 th August	Objection

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 26th July 2018

Representations & responses relating to Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road, Hockley.		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	<p>As residents of Leamington Road we look forward to the implementation of the 1 hour restricted parking that has been approved – however, this is an absolute minimum action that will only resolve some of the parking issues experienced.</p> <p>Unlike other nearby roads in the area, Leamington Road has unfortunately evolved over time from a minor local road to the main feed, alongside Plumberow Avenue, for the large housing estate that now exists to the north. The road also feeds 2 local schools, one of which is for younger children and with it additional concerns for a possible serious accident.</p> <p>There are 4 main parking issues:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger of an accident involving a young child. : With the amount of current non-resident parking, and the lack of care of those parking, road visibility is seriously decreased for both drivers and pedestrians. We see daily ‘near misses’ and with the speed of the traffic plus the high volume of school children - an accident is ‘just a matter of time’. 1 hour restricted parking will only <u>partially</u> address this. • All day non-resident parking: Much of the non-resident parking is due to people avoiding the daily parking cost at Hockley Station and leaving their vehicles in our road all day whilst they attend their work in London. These people do not care how they park or who they interfere with and make little attempt to avoid obstructing resident access (see attached photo). 1 hour restricted parking <u>will</u> address most of this. • Local non-resident parking: Most of this issue is caused by an overflow of vehicles from their own local houses and although not residents of Leamington Road think it OK to park in Leamington Road outside of other peoples’ houses – moving their parking problem to someone other than themselves...! This issue occurs at all times of day and night and the 1 hour parking restriction <u>will not</u> address this. 	<p>Partial support noted.</p> <p>The proposal is intended to deter all-day non-resident parking in the road. It is not intended to stop parents parking for brief periods in the morning and afternoon to drop off and collect their children to and from school.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short term parking: In addition to the above issues, the drop off and pick up by parents to the schools plus an overflow from the local doctor's surgery due to its limited parking area all add to the parking concerns experienced by Leamington Road residents by non-resident parking. 1 hour restricted parking <u>will not</u> address this. <p>As we stated at the beginning of this e-mail, we welcome the 1 hour restriction despite it only addressing some of the issues, but to help fix some of the others please ensure that any parking permits are <u>ONLY ISSUED TO REAL RESIDENTS</u> of Leamington Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photographs supplied with the representation but not included because it will identify the residents property. • 	
2	<p>With ref to the proposed parking restrictions we are totally in agreement but would like to propose an amendment that the corner of Cheltenham road and Leamington road are given the same restrictions as the junction of Leamington road and Tonbridge road (ie. "no waiting at any time)</p> <p>This corner during school drop off and pick up times presents a clear danger and hazard as cars are parked all around the corner and on the pavement which blocks the corner causing a danger to both pedestrians, children and traffic travelling past in Leamington road.</p>	Support noted.
3	<p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No 52) Order 201 regarding the South Side of Tonbridge Road 'No Waiting at Any Time' from a point 10 metres west of Junction with Leamington Road eastwards to a point 10 metres east of its Junction with Leamington Road – Your public notice dated 26 July refers.</p> <p>I am writing in connection with the above Order 201, in particular the element relating to the junction of Leamington Road and Tonbridge Road, under which I note it is proposed there is to be 'No Waiting at Any Time' on the south side of Tonbridge Road for 10 metres eastwards and westwards from its junction with Leamington Road.</p> <p>My wife and I have lived at xx Tonbridge Road (situated on the north side of Tonbridge Road directly opposite its junction with Leamington Road) since 1979 and have witnessed the regular parking 'excesses' at this junction over many years causing difficulties for the many trade vehicles and bus service, not to mention private vehicles, using these roads and we fully</p>	<p>Support for the junction protection noted. Request for the double yellow lines to be extended in Tonbridge Road, opposite its junction with Leamington Road.</p> <p>The legal process does not allow us add any new parking restriction once the proposal has been published and the statutory formal consultation has begun. However, if the scheme is implemented and subject to informal consultation with residents, further parking restrictions can be considered.</p>

	<p>support this element of your proposed way forward.</p> <p>However, in my opinion, placing a 'No Waiting at Any Time' order on the south side of Tonbridge Road will merely maintain the past problems experienced through vehicles now parking on the north side of Tonbridge Road, thereby potentially causing continuing movement difficulties at this junction for all types of vehicle.</p> <p>May I respectfully suggest that the 'No Waiting at Any Time' Order be extended to the same distances on the NORTH side of Tonbridge Road at the junction with Leamington Road thereby leaving the whole junction clear of vehicles for 10 metres eastwards and westwards of Leamington Road.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you would consider this proposal and look forward to being advised of your decision in the way forward. In the meantime I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this email.</p>	
4	I am in full agreement with introducing a permit parking scheme for Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road, Hockley.	Support noted.
5	I wish to confirm our support for the proposed parking restrictions for Leamington Road, Hockley.	Support noted.
6	<p>I write with regards to the proposed residents parking scheme in leamington Road, hockley.</p> <p>Firstly I am concerned that as a resident of Tonbridge Road which is also mentioned in the proposal, we have not been consulted in any way with regards to this and the effect it will have upon us. Surely even a letter should have been posed through our doors rather than us having to seek the information out on a Lamp post?</p> <p>Secondly, the restrictions in leamington road will do nothing other than move the problem. Commuters will still park but will now use Harrogate road and Tonbridge road, the only two roads left within the area that won't have parking restrictions. Surely it would make more sense that the whole area is residents parking if this is deemed to be the best idea.</p> <p>The parking on Tonbridge road is bad enough at the best of times, the school runs are horrendous with people parking on junctions, blocking drives and arguing with residents.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to provide 10 metres of double yellow lines in Tonbridge Road, at its junction with Leamington Road. A site notice was placed on the lamp column at this junction which has been read by the objector. The site notice is part of the statutory formal consultation process.</p> <p>There are numerous roads in the area which are not park of the scheme. Apart from Tonbridge Road and</p>

	<p>Moving the commuter parking will only make this worse and residents will still not be able to park outside their properties..... which I believe is the whole point of the residents schemes?</p> <p>Surely with the adverse effect this is going to have on the residents of Tonbridge road there should have been a consultation period and not just laminated signs dotted around!</p> <p>I await your response from a disgruntled resident!</p>	<p>Harrogate Road mentioned by the objector, there is Pulpits Close, Malvern Road, Orchard Avenue, Blackthorn Road, Peach Avenue, Russet Way and Branksome Avenue.</p> <p>If the proposal is implemented there would be a period of monitoring to see what, if any, displaced parking occurs and to where. Subject to informal consultation with residents and a majority being in support of a parking restriction, then further parking restrictions can be considered.</p>
7	We formally respond, requesting that the traffic restrictions are put in place.	Support noted.
8	I agree with the amendment 52 for no parking between 10am-11am, In Cheltenham road & Leamington road.	Support noted.
9	I am a resident of x Leamington Road I am writing to confirm my support of the permit parking scheme.	Support noted.
10	Please accept this email as confirmation that the residents at the above address are very much in support of the proposed permit parking scheme and No Waiting Time restrictions as outlined in your letter dated 20/7/18 with the reference as stated.	Support noted.
11	<p>I am a resident of x Leamington Road, Hockley, Essex</p> <p>I am writing in complete support of Resident Only Parking Permits being enforced down Leamington Road between the hours of 10-11am Monday to Friday (excluding bank holidays)</p>	Support noted.

12	I wish to advise you that I fully support the proposal for Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road to introduce a permit parking scheme operating from Monday to Friday excluding bank holidays between 10-11.00am. With waiting at any time parking restrictions on the junction of Leamington Road and Tonbridge Road Hockley	Support noted.
13	This is to confirm that I fully support the car parking strategy to be implemented as soon as possible. Also that only residents of Leamington Road are able to participate in this scheme.	Support noted.
14	This is to confirm that we fully support the parking strategy and that only residents of Leamington Road are able to participate in this scheme.	Support noted.
15	<p>Please take this email as my strong objection to the proposals to introducing a resident's parking scheme in Leamington Road and Tonbridge Road, Hockley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I object due to the adverse knock-on effect this will have to those of us living in Tonbridge and Orchard Avenue. - The restrictions extend into Tonbridge Rd/Orchard Avenue but residents have not been consulted - No notices have been displayed in Tonbridge Rd or Orchard Avenue - School parking is clearly stated as being a very low priority for SEPP 	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Response as reference 6 above.</p> <p>Please note the proposed restriction is to deter all-day non-resident parking and if implemented it will still allow parents to drop off and pick up their children from school.</p>
16	<p><u>Part 2: Complaint and objection re parking scheme proposal for Leamington Road, Cheltenham Road, and Tonbridge Road, Hockley.</u></p> <p>I was surprised and dismayed at this proposal. It is an exact replica of a proposals made about 5 years ago, which was both rejected by residents and withdrawn by SEPP due to a number of procedural errors. Those errors have been replicated this time and this indicates that SEPP are regularly ignoring their own policies. Indeed this repeated failure was confirmed last time in an email from xxxxx confirming that the SEPP committee regularly “nodded through” applications which did not meet the SEPP criteria.</p> <p>As noted above, I still await a response to my questions (and FOI) but the following policy failures have been noted already:</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Full FIO information was provided to the objector on 13th August 2018.</p> <p>The application form, with petition, received by the SEPP demonstrates there is support from residents. There is no 50% support required at this stage. On receipt of the application form the SEPP carried out an informal consultation with all residents of Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road to seek their views on</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TrafficReg advise that the proposal is supported by a petition signed by 39 people. Most councils normally treat petitions as if they are a single signature. Clarification is also awaited of the number of households this represents but it is obvious that this does not meet SEPP's criteria of 50% support. There are 93 houses in the 3 roads covered by this proposal, plus some in Orchard Avenue, so it should not have been put forward. 2. The proposal extends in to Tonbridge Road but residents of this street have not been advised or consulted on the proposal. Neither have residents in Orchard Avenue who will also be affected. 3. The knock-on effect on Tonbridge Road and Orchard Road has not been considered. 4. Only a single notice has been put up in Tonbridge Rd, none in Orchard Rd 5. SEPP policy states the process of introducing a parking restriction is considered to be absolutely necessary. There is only minor inconvenience and that is mostly near the Leamington Road/Greensward lane junction along the <u>side</u> gardens of houses facing on to Greensward Lane. A scheme covering 3 roads and 93+ houses is huge overkill. <p>Further objections are likely if and when SEPP responds to my requests for information.</p> <p>These failures to comply with SEPP policy were all apparent last time – nothing has changed. Given the clear repetitive pattern of SEPP ignoring its own policies, my intention is to take this complaint to the Ombudsman, but I would hope that SEPP will again recognise their serious failures and withdraw the proposal forthwith.</p> <p>Second email received on 16/08/2018 –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is clear from your documentation that the proposals covering Leamington Road, Harrogate Road and Tonbridge Road is being treated as a single scheme, but residents of Tonbridge Road have not been consulted. This is clearly discriminatory. 2. A similar scheme was proposed in 2013/4. I, and a number of other Tonbridge Road and Orchard Avenue residents, objected for similar reasons, including the knock-on implications. Those objections should be held on file. Why were they not considered and known previous objectors consulted? 3. There is no evidence of any form of site survey being undertaken. Hence there is no reference or consideration given to the school footpath, which runs parallel to Leamington Road from Tonbridge Road and acts as a shortcut to the school and station. Nick Binder inspected this footpath when he visited in 2013/4 and should be 	<p>consideration to provide a resident permit parking scheme.</p> <p>The response rate for Leamington Road was 69% (with 93% of respondents in favour and Cheltenham Road received a 91% response rate with 90% of respondents in favour. This meets the SEPP criteria.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to provide 10 metres of double yellow lines in Tonbridge Road, at its junction with Leamington Road. A site notice was placed on the lamp column at this junction which has been read by the objector. The site notice is part of the statutory formal consultation process.</p> <p>If the proposal is implemented there would be a period of monitoring to see what, if any, displaced parking occurs and to where. Subject to informal consultation with residents and a majority being in support of a parking restriction, then further parking restrictions can be considered.</p> <p>There are many unrestricted roads in the area, such as Tonbridge Road, Harrogate Road, Pulpits Close, Malvern Road, Orchard Avenue, Blackthorn Road, Peach Avenue, Russet Way and Branksome Avenue.</p>
---	--

<p>aware of the issue and the knock-on implications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The SEPP Technician acknowledges that there is a “possible” knock on impact from the scheme but there is no mention of this in the summary dated 20 September 2017. In the absence of any evidence that the technician was aware of the footpath, this impact is highly likely to have been under-estimated. We already get school &/or station parking outside our house and this will grow unacceptably under the scheme. Some of the displaced parking will actually be closer to their destination! This is contrary to SEPP policy 7.4.4. and it is not appropriate to wait and review the impact in a year or two as suggested by SEPP. 5. The Fol item headed “Item 332” also acknowledges the risk of knock-on parking but omits any detail. It states that the scheme would “not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads” but there is no evidence to support this. Why was this risk not investigated properly? 6. There was a serious accident, about a month ago, in Tonbridge Road by the school path exit. This resulted in a youth being airlifted to a London Hospital with serious head injuries. Additional parking will further obscure the unmarked school path entrance/exit making the road even more dangerous. The safety implications of this scheme have not been considered. 7. There is no evidence of any support from the ward councillors and Cllr Steptoe response makes clear his support is dependent on no objections from the ward councillors. So no councillors actually support the proposals! Failure by ward councillors to respond are being treated as support! This reflects SEPP's known policy of 'nodding through' applications which do not meet SEPP criteria. 8. There is no evidence of any response from ECC Highways regarding this scheme. 9. The Technician's report claims the scheme meets SEPP policies but this is not fully correct e.g. All properties have driveways (7.4.3.); the knock on effect has not been fully considered (7.4.4). The report is misleading. 10. The Freedom of Information Response dated 13 August 2018 makes clear that monitoring the 'knock-on' impact is a future activity. A SEPP email response, dated 16 August 2018, to an objection, states “If the proposal is implemented the parking would be monitored to see what, if any, displace parking occurs and to where”. There is no suggestion this has already been considered and both serve to reaffirm SEPP's approach is contrary to policy 7.4..4. 11. SEPP Policy 3.17 allows for schemes to be modified and this course of action is applicable in this case. It would also allow the scheme(s) to be consolidated as required by SEPP policy. 	<p>For the official response to the Stage two complaint see Appendix 1.</p>
--	--

17	I am in full support of the proposal for parking restrictions and permit scheme in my road, as I have had great difficulty in access in and out of my property. I do hope the proposal is passed.	Support noted.
18	I am writing regarding REf: SEPP/RDC/AM52 - Parking Restrictions in Leamington Road Hockley, and would like to add the support of this as the residents MR & Mrs xx of xx Leamington Road. Look forward to this restriction being enforced.	Support noted.
19	With reference to the proposed restrictions for parking in Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road operating Monday - Friday excluding Bank Holidays 10 - 11 I confirm that we are in total agreement and support the proposal. We would however add that "the Turning Circle" at the end of Cheltenham Road is a "Parking area" which it should NOT be as it prevents cars and other vehicles from turning safely especially as it breaks the footpath leading from Greensward Lane through to Tonbridge Road and clearly should be "NO PARKING OR WAITING AT ANY TIME	Support noted,
20	Yes please. (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
21	Yes. (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
22	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
23	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
24	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
25	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
26	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
27	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
28	Yes I agree with permit parking (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
29	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
30	Yes I agree (individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
31	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
32	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
33	I am in support of the parking restriction. Please can you tell me how I may get a permit. (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
34	I am in support. (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
35	I am in support of the parking restrictions (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
36	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
37	I am in full support of the parking permit scheme (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.

38	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
39	I am in support of the permit parking (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
40	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
41	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
42	Yes agreed (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
43	Yes (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
44	100% in agreement (Individual returned SEPP letter with comment)	Support noted.
45	Times should be school times between 8.30 to 9.30 and 14.30 to 15.30 not 10-11	Objection noted. The legal process does not allow us add any new parking restriction once the proposal has been published and the statutory formal consultation has begun. The proposal is to deter all-day non-resident parking whilst still allowing parents to stop for brief periods in the morning and afternoon to drop off and collect their children.
46	<p>We are writing to say that we are in favour of the parking restrictions that is proposed for our road at the above address and also Cheltenham Road and Tonbridge Road. The reason is because of the inconvenience caused by Commuters who use these roads as a car park. They cause chaos to delivery Vehicles/Refuge collectors and the parents who take their Children to the two schools that are nearby, bringing the roads into gridlock at times. Sometimes they overlap our driveways and leave their cars over night. Just recently a child was knocked down at the junction of the road joining Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>We understand Double yellow lines are to be placed on the corners of Tonbridge Road that we are in complete favour of as it is impossible to see around the corner when driving into Tonbridge Rad. We should also like the same done on the corners of Cheltenham</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The legal process does not allow us add any new parking restriction once the proposal has been published and the statutory formal consultation has begun.</p>

	<p>Road/Leamington Road to prevent the dangerous parking by the Parents when bringing their Children to and from school. They themselves cause a danger to other Children.</p> <p>Opposite our Property the parents park on the pavement. We should like to see a 'No Parking on verge' notice asking them to stop this as other Parents and Children and pedestrians are forced to walk around them into the already busy road. Then maybe We and our neighbours would be able to drive out of our Driveways unhindered.</p>	
47	<p>We have seen signs proposing to introduce a resident's parking scheme in Leamington Road and "No waiting at any time" restrictions at the junction of Leamington Road and Tonbridge Road.</p> <p>This will mean that the nearest parking for the two schools and the station will be Tonbridge Road and Orchard Avenue. As a resident on the corner of Orchard Avenue I am already affected by cars parking outside our house for the school and this will only serve to exacerbate the issue further. I therefore strongly object to this proposal and also question why we haven't been informed.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to provide 10 metres of double yellow lines in Tonbridge Road, at its junction with Leamington Road. A site notice was placed on the lamp column at this junction which has been read by the objector. The site notice is part of the statutory formal consultation process.</p> <p>There are numerous roads in the area which are not part of the scheme. Apart from Tonbridge Road and Harrogate Road mentioned by the objector, there is Pulpits Close, Malvern Road, Orchard Avenue, Blackthorn Road, Peach Avenue, Russet Way and Branksome Avenue.</p> <p>If the proposal is implemented there would be a period of monitoring to see what, if any, displaced parking occurs and to where. Subject to informal consultation with residents and a majority being in support of a parking restriction, then further parking restrictions can be considered.</p>
48	<p>I am definitely for the parking permits for Leamington Road as it is so bad.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

49	<p>I write in relation to the planning application affecting Leamington Road, Hockley. Please find attached a picture of the application request for clarity.</p> <p>I represent a family of 4 living in South Fambridge, with a child diagnosed with learning disabilities.</p> <p>Our children attend Plumberow Primary Academy & we commute to London, albeit not every day. Therefore, we are sure that this planning application is aimed at people like us. However, I thought we should take the time to write to you to express the “other” viewpoint.</p> <p>Whilst we do not commute every day, we do park our car on Leamington Road or the surrounding neighbourhood. We do this for the following reasons:</p> <p>The NHS has spent a significant amount of money in advertising encouraging people to walk more – therefore, by parking in this area, this provides 20 minutes of exercise each day supporting a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>The station car park is not safe - One of our household used to cycle to the station. This was until his bike was stolen. We were told by the staff at Hockley station that the CCTV never works & sure enough there was no footage of the crime. Therefore, we were the victims of a crime whereby we had absolutely no recourse or protection. The thief was never caught & we were out of pocket (as well as being inconvenienced) in order to replace the bike. I’m sure you will therefore understand our reticence at parking our car in a carpark where it’s not safe & there are no measures to protect the public’s cars / bikes. We have also seen damage to cars having been broken into whilst parked at this car park.</p> <p>Expense – Not all people working in London receive big salaries. It costs about £30 to travel to & from London & to park the car in an unsafe car park costs £7.10. This is extortionate for a car park which is outside the main commuter belt.</p> <p>Other considerations:</p> <p>The infrastructure for South Fambridge is far from adequate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is no bus route from the village, meaning that we have no choice but to 	Objection noted.
----	---	------------------

use our car.

- o There is no footpath into the village from Ashingdon Road making it unsafe to walk to the nearest bust stop which is 1.5 miles away.
- o Parking around Plumberow Primary Academy is already very difficult. I accept that for school drop up & pick-ups the restrictions will not be in place, however, when there are events at the school (such as Grandparent events, Christmas plays, teacher meetings, sports day) this is already difficult & the restrictions being imposed will make it almost impossible to access these events. I am aware of parents receiving parking tickets when attending sports day last year as they parked on Hamilton Gardens.
- o I understand that restrictions are also planned for Plumberow Avenue – this will mean that there will be virtually nowhere to park for these events.
- o As a parent of a disabled child, it's important that I reduce the amount of roads that we cross. My son has no understanding of danger (including road danger) and I am concerned that if we are forced to walk further – he may encounter an accident. Please remember that I cannot safely get my children to school by public transport as this is not provided close to the village.
- o I have lived in South Fambridge for 10 years & since then a number of parking restrictions have been implemented in Hockley. The problem the residents of Leamington Road now encounter are more people parking as the options available for parking are becoming smaller & smaller. Were more roads available, parking would be spread out affecting less people.
- o I accept that we chose to live where we do. We were attracted to the semi-rural, riverside location. Many people come into the village to walk along the river with their dogs. Unfortunately, some of them feel it acceptable to allow their dogs to foul the pathway, yet the council does nothing to control this. As a result, we enjoy river walks less. Perhaps we should ask for restricted parking in the village to keep out the inconsiderate visitors to our village.

	<p>We always ensure that we park considerately, although, I appreciate that this cannot be said for everyone, and, I do understand the frustration for the local residents.</p> <p>Perhaps the council could work to provide better infrastructure for people living in semi-rural locations and work with NCP / the rail companies to provide affordable & safe parking, rather than just penalise local residents. This may encourage more people to park in the car parks rather than on the roads. Thank you for taking the time to read my feedback & look forward to hearing from you.</p>	
--	--	--

APPENDIX 3

1. It is clear from your documentation that the proposals covering Leamington Road, Harrogate Road and Tonbridge Road is being treated as a single scheme, but residents of Tonbridge Road have not been consulted. This is clearly discriminatory.

Firstly, there are no proposed parking restrictions for Harrogate Road. I am assuming you mean Cheltenham Road. A permit parking scheme is being proposed for Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road only. A prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) is being proposed at the junction of Tonbridge Road and Leamington Road. Apart from erecting site notices for junction protection we do not informally consult with residents when consideration is given to junction protection which will reinforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code "DO NOT stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. The statutory formal advertising process provides the opportunity for anyone to submit representations against a proposed scheme and your objections have been received as part of this process.

2. A similar scheme was proposed in 2013/14. I, and a number of other Tonbridge Road and Orchard Avenue residents, objected for similar reasons, including the knock-on implications. Those objections should be held on file. Why were they not considered and known previous objectors consulted?

In 2013/14 an informal consultation took place with residents of Hampstead Garden, Leamington Road, Harrogate Road and Cheltenham Road with a proposal to implement a resident parking scheme to address issues with all day non-residential parking. Following the informal consultation, it was initially agreed that a resident parking scheme would be proposed for Hampstead Gardens and part of Leamington Road (the Greensward Lane end) to address issues with all day non-residential parking. This proposal was modified to withdraw Leamington Gardens from the scheme and to only include Hampstead Gardens before it was submitted to the Sub Committee for funding approval; this was following some concerns raised by some residents in Tonbridge Road and Orchard Avenue. It was acknowledged by officers at the time that the consultation results for the whole of Leamington Road were marginal and fell slightly short of the suggested 50% response rate, albeit the residents in the half of the road with the parking problem were in a high percentage of support. It was therefore agreed with all interested parties that if the proposal was advertised and approved by the Joint Committee a period of monitoring would take place to evaluate any displacement of parking once the scheme in Hampstead Gardens was implemented. The formal statutory advertisement provides the opportunity for any member of the public to submit representations against the proposed scheme.

3. There is no evidence of any form of site survey being undertaken. Hence there is no reference or consideration given to the school footpath, which runs parallel to Leamington Road from Tonbridge Road and acts as a shortcut to the school and station. Nick Binder inspected this footpath when he visited in 2013/4 and should be aware of the issue and the knock-on implications.

Following the implementation of the resident parking scheme in Hampstead Gardens, there was a period of monitoring during 2015 and 2016 where site visits took place and the results were plotted on site visit plans (these plans are included in the FOI information submitted to you). Following these initial visits, a further 7 informal site visits took place when the Technician was in the area. This was to evaluate if the parking trend had increased or decreased from the 2015/16 site visits. The following is taken from the completed TRO assessment form:

The attached site visit plans show typical examples of the parking situation which has been monitored informally to July this year (2017). The parking trend remains the same with a concentration of vehicles in the southern half of the road.

4. The SEPP Technician acknowledges that there is a “possible” knock on impact from the scheme but there is no mention of this in the summary dated 20 September 2017. In the absence of any evidence that the technician was aware of the footpath, this impact is highly likely to have been under-estimated. We already get school &/or station parking outside our house and this will grow unacceptably under the scheme. Some of the displaced parking will actually be closer to their destination! This is contrary to SEPP policy 7.4.4. and it is not appropriate to wait and review the impact in a year or two as suggested by SEPP.

When the matter was referred to the SEPP Sub Committee on 8th March 2018 to seek funding the following was part of the Leamington Road report which is an extract from SEPP policy 7.4

* The introduction of a scheme would not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads – (Technicians response) may displace parking to nearby roads.

It is acknowledged that if a scheme is implemented in Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road to deter all-day non-resident parking, a period of monitoring would take place to see what, if any, displaced parking occurs, and to where. If displaced parking was to occur then consideration can be given to providing parking restrictions for residents in that road or roads, provided the majority are in favour.

5. The Fol item headed “Item 332” also acknowledges the risk of knock-on parking but omits any detail. It states that the scheme would “not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads” but there is no evidence to support this. Why was this risk not investigated properly?

Likewise, there is no evidence to suggest that Tonbridge Road will be subject to unacceptable problems if the scheme in Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road is implemented. Until any scheme is implemented we do not know the consequences, that is why a period of monitoring would take place.

6. There was a serious accident, about a month ago, in Tonbridge Road by the school path exit. This resulted in a youth being airlifted to a London Hospital with serious head injuries. Additional parking will further obscure the unmarked school path entrance/exit making the road even more dangerous. The safety implications of this scheme have not been considered.

The scheme being proposed for Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road would operate from 10am to 11am and therefore it will not apply at the peak school times in the morning and afternoon. Unfortunate as it is, the accident occurred recently, long after all of the information had been gathered and agreed. There are no recorded road traffic collisions in Tonbridge Road from 31/05/15 to 31/05/2018 (ECC data - <http://www.essexworkstraffweb.org.uk/main.html>)

It is our understanding the recent road traffic collision involved a cyclist and motor car and was not related to parked vehicles.

Essex County Council are still responsible for considering traffic measures that meet their safety criteria and following this accident they may wish to review the access to this unmarked path.

7. There is no evidence of any support from the ward councillors and Cllr Steptoe response makes clear his support is dependent on no objections from the ward councillors. So, no councillors actually support the proposals! Failure by ward councillors to respond are being treated as support! This reflects SEPP's known policy of 'nodding through' applications which do not meet SEPP criteria.

Ward Councillors and the Essex County Councillor were sent copies of the proposal on 18th July. No objections have been received from the Councillors, and they are not treated as a support unless they submit comments to that effect.

I am confident that the Joint Committee Member for Rochford has discussed these proposals with the necessary ward members and he has a full understanding of their position in relation to this proposed scheme.

8. There is no evidence of any response from ECC Highways regarding this scheme.

Essex County Council were sent copies of the proposal on 12th July and no comments have been received regarding the proposal. It is therefore taken that they have no objections to the proposal.

9. The Technician's report claims the scheme meets SEPP policies but this is not fully correct e.g. All properties have driveways (7.4.3.); the knock-on effect has not been fully considered (7.4.4). The report is misleading.

When the matter was referred to the SEPP Sub Committee on 8th March 2018, to seek funding, the following is taken from the report which was presented to Joint Committee Members and highlights areas of the guidance that are fully met and areas that do not fully meet the document guidance

SEPP policy 7.4 –

- * The majority of residents have **no** off-street parking facilities available to them – (technician response) - not met.
- * The introduction of a scheme would not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads – (technician response) may displace parking to nearby roads.

10. The Freedom of Information Response dated 13 August 2018 makes clear that monitoring the 'knock-on' impact is a future activity. A SEPP email response, dated 16 August 2018, to an objection, states “If the proposal is implemented the parking would be monitored to see what, if any, displace parking occurs and to where”. There is no suggestion this has already been considered and both serve to reaffirm SEPP's approach is contrary to policy 7. 4..4.

There is no evidence that if the scheme is implemented in Leamington Road there would be unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.

11. SEPP Policy 3.17 allows for schemes to be modified and this course of action is applicable in this case. It would also allow the scheme(s) to be consolidated as required by SEPP policy.

This refers to the process once a proposal has been formally published. At the Sub Committee Meeting the members can modify a scheme which has been published, provided the modification is a lesser restriction than the one published. It does not allow anything new to be added. If, following consideration of the objections, the recommendation is to proceed with the scheme and the Joint Committee decide to approve this scheme, there is also the option for the Joint Committee to action an immediate review of the adjoining roads with the option to immediately conduct an informal consultation with residents, if it can be determined that a concentrated movement of vehicles has displaced into any particular road(s).

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP SUB COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

AGENDA ITEM 5

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (VARIOUS ROADS) (DISTRICT OF ROCHFORD) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND PERMIT PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT NO.52) ORDER 201* Relating to Plumberow Avenue, Wimhurst Close and The Acorns, Hockley.
Report by	South Essex Parking Partnership Manager

Enquiries contact: Nick Binder, South Essex Parking Partnership Manager, 01245 606303, nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk

Purpose

To report the receipt of representations made on part of the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*

Options

The Joint Committee has the following options available:

1. to agree that the proposed Order be made as advertised;
2. to agree that the proposed Order be made subject to modifications which result in less restrictive provisions or reduced scope; or
3. to agree that the proposed Order should not be made.

Recommendation(s)

1. The Order be made subject to the following modifications:
 - a) Plumberow Avenue: The single yellow line scheme pulled back to commence 22 metres north of its junction with The Acorns (as advertised) and terminate at the junction of Plumberow Mount Avenue (keeping the double yellow lines on all junctions).
 - b) Wimhurst Close: The Monday – Friday, 10 – 11am single yellow line scheme to be retained on the south side and the north side amended to operate Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm.
 ; and
2. The people making representations be advised accordingly.

Consulters	South Essex Parking Partnership
-------------------	---------------------------------

Policies and Strategies
 The report takes into account the South Essex Parking Partnership Document setting out how the SEPP will deal with requests for parking restrictions requiring TROs.

1.	<u>Background</u>																				
1.1	<p>The purpose of this Order is to amend The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 as set out below:</p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Plumberow Avenue, Wimhurst Close and The Acorns, Hockley.</p> <p>On 17th October 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Plumberow Avenue, requesting the recently introduced parking restriction in part of Plumberow Avenue be extended, because it has displaced parking. The application is supported by a 16 property signature.</p> <p>In line with the request, an informal consultation has been carried out with the affected residents of Plumberow Avenue up to the junction with Appleyard Avenue and the residents of the two adjoining cul-de-sacs, Wimhurst Close and The Acorns. The proposal was to implement No Waiting Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm on the west side and No Waiting Monday – Friday 10am – 11am on the east side (single yellow lines) including The Acorns and Wimhurst Close. Additionally, it was proposed to implement No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow line) restrictions on the junctions of Wimhurst Close, Plumberow Avenue, Mount Avenue, Orchard Avenue and Appleyard Avenue. The consultation results were as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Road</th> <th>Number of properties</th> <th>Number of responses</th> <th>Number in favour</th> <th>Number not in favour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Plumberow Avenue</td> <td>56</td> <td>36 (64%)</td> <td>32 (89%)</td> <td>4 (11%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wimhurst Close</td> <td>6</td> <td>5 (83%)</td> <td>4 (80%)</td> <td>1 (20%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Acorns</td> <td>11</td> <td>4 (36%)</td> <td>4 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour	Number not in favour	Plumberow Avenue	56	36 (64%)	32 (89%)	4 (11%)	Wimhurst Close	6	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	The Acorns	11	4 (36%)	4 (100%)	0
Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour	Number not in favour																	
Plumberow Avenue	56	36 (64%)	32 (89%)	4 (11%)																	
Wimhurst Close	6	5 (83%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)																	
The Acorns	11	4 (36%)	4 (100%)	0																	

	<p>The majority of responses/support came from the section of carriageway between the northern end of the existing parking restrictions and Plumberow Avenue and also Wimhurst Close. Although the response rate for The Acorns did not meet the criteria it is recommended to include it, if a proposal is published. If there are substantial objections it can be withdrawn.</p> <p>The request to provide parking restrictions was discussed with Lead Officer and Lead Councillor for parking matters for Rochford and it was agreed to proceed for funding.</p> <p>The scheme was costed at £4500 and placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Sub Committee on 8th March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.</p>
1.2	<p>The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 26th July 2018, and copies of the draft Order were sent to a number of organisations including Essex Police, Essex County Council (the highway authority), Essex Fire & Rescue Service, Essex Ambulance Service, the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</p>
1.3	<p>When the Order was published on 26th July 2018 a 21 day period of formal public consultation commenced.</p>
1.4	<p><i>Copy of letter sent to all residents of The Acorns and Wimhurst Close; and Plumberow Avenue numbers 81-191 odds and 118-200 evens, on 20th July 2018, prior to publication -</i></p> <p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership will shortly be publishing a proposal for Plumberow Avenue to introduce No Waiting Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm parking restrictions on the west side and No Waiting Monday – Friday 10am – 11am parking restrictions on the east side (single yellow lines), including The Acorns and Wimhurst Close. Additionally, it is proposed to introduce No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow line) parking restrictions on the junctions of Wimhurst Close, Plumberow Mount Avenue, Orchard Avenue and Appleyard Avenue.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can also be found on the Council’s website from 26 July 2018: https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/parking-and-travel/parking-restrictions/view-current-and-proposed-parking-restrictions/rochford-parking-restrictions/</p>

	<p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day formal consultation period whereby any person may write objecting to the proposal, or write in support.</p> <p>If there are unresolved objections the matter will be reported to the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee for a decision. The Committee can agree to proceed as published and bring the Order into effect, amend the proposal or withdraw it in its entirety.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments on or after the 26 July 2018 you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 17 August 2018.</p> <p><u>Please note that any previous comments received cannot be taken into account. Therefore, it is essential for you to formally respond, either objecting to or supporting the proposal during the statutory period stated above.</u></p>
2	<u>Comments</u>
2.1	The details of the representations are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report together with the comments of the Technicians.
3	<u>Conclusion</u>
3.1	<p>Although the correspondents have made a number of points which lead them to believe the Order should not be pursued in whole or part, the Lead Councillor, Lead Officer and Technicians consider that the Order be made subject to the following modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Plumberow Avenue: The single yellow line scheme pulled back to commence 22 metres north of its junction with The Acorns (as advertised) and terminate at the junction of Plumberow Mount Avenue (keeping the double yellow lines on all junctions). b) Wimhurst Close: The Monday – Friday, 10 – 11am single yellow line scheme to be retained on the south side and the north side amended to operate Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm.
<u>List of Appendices</u>	
Appendix 1 – List of people making representations	
Appendix 2 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments	
Appendix 3 – Formal complaint	

APPENDIX 1

Ref	List of people making representations	Type
1	Email from a local councillor dated 18 July 2018	Support
2	Email from a local councillor dated 25 July 2018	No objection
3	Email from a resident of Wimhurst Close dated 26 July 2018	Support
4	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 26 July 2018	Support
5	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 27 July 2018	Support
6	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 27 July 2018	Support
7	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 28 July 2018	Support
8	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 29 July 2018	Support
9	Letter from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 24 July 2018	Objection
10	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 31 July 2018	Support
11	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 31 July 2018	Support
12	Email from a resident of Wimhurst Close dated 04 August 2018	Support
13	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 06 August 2018	Support
14	Letter from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 04 August 2018	Support
15	Email from a resident of Wimhurst Close dated 08 August 2018	Objection
16	Letter from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 06 August 2018	Support
17	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 14 August 2018	Support
18	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 17 August 2018	Support
19	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 19 August 2018	Support
20	Email from a resident of Tonbridge Road dated 17 August 2018	Objection
21	Letter & 15 property petition from residents of Plumberow Avenue dated 08 August 2018	Objection
22	Email from a resident of Plumberow Avenue dated 16 September (4 weeks after the closure date)	Objection

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 26th July 2018

Representations & responses relating to Plumberow Avenue		
Ref	Representation –	Technician response -
1	Agree with the recommendations	Support noted.
2	I have no objections to the applications relevant to my Ward (Hockley).	No objection noted.
4	<p>Email 1: I am pleased this work is finally going to happen. However, I sincerely hope we do not have a repeat of the debacle that occurred the last time this type of work was carried out in our road. No cones were put out prior to the contractors turning up. What did your department think would happen to all the commuters that normally park there. The contractors painted between the cars, it was farcical. I contacted your department to inform them of the situation. I also asked who would be paying for the number of return visits to finish the work and, I was told it would be rate payers. Why weren't the contractors made to pay for not putting out cones. This situated was reported on local radio, television and newspapers along with videos and photos, for a number of days. A statement from Chelmsford City Council was issued to the local media. Hopefully all the above will be avoided with the benefit of hindsight and forward planning.</p> <p>Email 2: Plumberow Avenue, Hockley and associated side roads as indicated on the letter referenced in previous correspondence.</p>	Support noted.
5	In reply to your letter dated 20th July, I write to fully support your plans for the restrictions in my road. Commuters regularly disregard the residents and often part park over our driveways. The amount of vehicles parked are causing "blind spots" for the residents' access and egress from their drives. Plumberow Avenue is quite a long road and therefore a "fast" road. Before I moved here I understand there was a nasty accident just near to my drive. There are national car parks near the station and also in village. but obviously these are being ignored by some of the commuters who use Hockley station and therefore leave their vehicles parked in	Support noted.

	the surrounding roads all day long. As far as I am concerned, the situation at the moment is a dangerous one with more accidents waiting to happen.	
6	<p>As a resident of Plumberow Avenue I am writing to you to support the proposed waiting restriction in Plumberow Avenue and it's junctions.</p> <p>There are many hazards in our road and one of them is parked cars from non-residents causing road users to travel on the wrong side of the road down a hill and indeed outside the parade of shops parking also forces road users on the wrong side very close to the junction with Orchard Avenue.</p> <p>There have been several accidents at this junction as road users turning left out of Orchard Avenue into Plumberow Avenue do not expect road users to be on the wrong side of the road. The limited restrictions should stop all day parking and allow road users to travel on the correct side of the road they are travelling in.</p> <p>Of course, as a resident at times it will cause my family a problem but we are willing to work around this to make the road safer.</p>	Support noted.
7	I am sending this email in support of the proposed change in parking restrictions in Plumberow Avenue and the surrounding areas.	Support noted.
8	I am sending this email in support of the proposed change in parking restrictions in Plumberow Avenue and the surrounding areas.	Support noted.
9	<p>I am writing to you with respect to the above parking proposals and wish to make an objection. I live in a flat above the shops, known as Apex Court, and as a car owner, have nowhere to park my vehicle other than on the street outside on the west side of Plumberow Avenue. Your proposals would severely inconvenience me as I would be forced to park my car some distance away, possibly in Plumberow Mount Avenue, which is already quite crowded with on-street parking. I work part-time and my car is often on the street during the times of your proposed restricted times. Should your proposals go ahead I would have to have the inconvenience of having to move my car and the possibility of not finding anything nearby.</p> <p>Whilst I do not object to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' areas, I cannot agree to your other proposals. Extending the time restricted section down to Plumberow Mount Avenue would have the effect of shifting those that park on the street to nearby non restricted areas, making residents parking more difficult than it is now.</p> <p>The vast majority, if not all of the properties (save the four residents here at Apex Court) have driveways attached to their properties and will not be affected in the same way as those of us at</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal is for tidal 'No Waiting' parking restrictions operating Monday – Friday 10 – 11am on one side and 11am – 12pm on the other, unlike most of the other roads in the area which have Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm on both sides.</p> <p>Whilst there is some inconvenience to residents, the tidal times do allow for some flexibility in parking for residents as they, and their visitors, are not totally precluded from parking for one</p>

	Apex Court. There is no provision in your proposals for properties without off-street parking. I look forward to hearing from you.	hour per day as in the other roads. The introduction of these parking restrictions would have the effect of removing commuter parking, thus ensuring that there was more available parking space for residents and their visitors. It is acknowledged that the introduction of any parking restrictions may displace some vehicles elsewhere, however there is parking provision at the railway station for commuters.
10	The proposal for no waiting along Plumberow Avenue. Hockley is very welcome. Please can the issue of speed limit enforcement be looked into, as the 30mph limit is generally ignored, and it seems a fatal accident will be the only time anything may be actioned.	Support noted. Essex Police are responsible for speed enforcement.
11	I am sending this on behalf of Mr & Mrs XXXX who live at XX Plumberow Avenue, Hockley (as they do not have access to a computer). They wish to express their full support for the parking restrictions applied for in Plumberow Avenue and surrounding areas. They have lived here for many years and are very concerned about the commuters parking so near to driveways that it is impossible to get a clear view when leaving their drive. They can see the danger for everyone concerned if the parking restrictions are not approved. They are also of the opinion that there are two national car parks within walking distance from Hockley Station which could be used.	Support noted.
13	Further to your letter dated 20 th July 2018 I wish to confirm we are in favour of the parking restrictions proposed down Plumberow Avenue and the surrounding roads. It is becoming increasingly difficult to reverse off our drive and get from one end of the road to the other due to the number of cars parked there, very often all day. To confirm, we are in favour of the proposals for parking restrictions.	Support noted.
14	We of the above address, are in support of the proposal above.	Support noted.

16	<p>With reference to your letter of the 20th July, kindly note that I agree to the introduction of 'No waiting' on Monday/Friday etc.</p> <p>This is needed to stop commuters to London, parking their cars and causing congestion on the road. This in turn leads to dangerous driving by some road users trying to speed past all the line of parked cars.</p> <p>Because of the above, cyclists ride at speed on the pavements, down the hill, which is very dangerous when cars are reversing from driveways onto the road.</p> <p>I fully support all the restrictions proposed.</p>	Support noted.
17	<p>Email 1:</p> <p>We have read your proposals for changes and new parking restrictions in relation to Plumberow Avenue and surrounding side roads.</p> <p>We can understand the need for new restrictions as the road has become quite hazardous to negotiate with parking by commuters from Monday to Friday.</p> <p>However, this will inevitably lead to people then parking in Orchard Avenue, which has a sharp bend, which means drivers heading towards Plumberow Avenue have their view totally obscured with oncoming traffic if vehicles are parked on this bend. It is also now a bus route on two days of each week so we can anticipate congestion and difficulties occurring in future.</p> <p>Email 2:</p> <p>It isn't an objection as we use Plumberow Avenue every day and agree restrictions are required for road safety. We emailed our observations that commuters will just park at the next available road.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the introduction of any parking restrictions may displace some vehicles elsewhere, however there is parking provision at the railway station for commuters.</p>
18	<p>I would like to support the proposal to extend yellow parking lines outside my property due to the danger of driving in and out of our drive as the cars/vans park and we can't see oncoming traffic. It is a long road and traffic is fast moving.</p>	Support noted.
19	<p>I have been monitoring the parking over recent weeks in the proposed new yellow line area of Plumberow Avenue. The cars have all been parked on one side of the road and the numbers have varied between 6 and 12. I live at 129 Plumberow Avenue and drive up and down this road daily and have never found any problems, but was told by your department that yellow lines were needed because of congestion. I have off street parking so don't park in the road, but some of my neighbours who live in flats have nowhere else to park but the street.</p> <p>I think the whole yellow lines thing stems from a few selfish people who have off road parking of their own but don't like to see someone else parked outside their house. As far as congestion is concerned, it is not a problem.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal is for tidal 'No Waiting' parking restrictions operating Monday – Friday 10 – 11am on one side and 11am – 12pm on the other, unlike most of the other roads in the area which have Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm on both sides.</p>

		<p>Whilst there is some inconvenience to residents, the tidal times do allow for some flexibility in parking for residents as they, and their visitors, are not totally precluded from parking for one hour per day as in the other roads.</p>
20	<p>I wish to object to the proposed parking scheme in Plumberow Avenue, Hockley because the 'knock-on' effect has not been properly evaluated and it will adversely impact shopping at the small local parade of shops.</p>	<p>Objection noted</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the introduction of any parking restrictions may displace some vehicles elsewhere, however there is parking provision at the railway station for commuters.</p> <p>The proposal is for tidal 'No Waiting' parking restrictions operating Monday – Friday 10 – 11am on one side and 11am – 12pm on the other, unlike most of the other roads in the area which have Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm on both sides.</p> <p>Therefore, parking on-street will always be available for motorists who wish to use the shops (which also have a car park).</p>
21	<p>We are writing to you with respect to the above parking proposals and wish to make objections. Some of us live in flats above and behind the shops, known as Apex Court and as vehicle owners, have nowhere to park other than on the street outside on the west side of Plumberow Avenue.</p> <p>Your proposals would severely inconvenience us as we would be forced to park our vehicles some distance away, possibly in Plumberow Mount Avenue, which is already quite crowded with on-street parking. Our vehicles are often on the street during the times of your proposed</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal is for tidal 'No Waiting' parking restrictions operating Monday – Friday 10 – 11am on one side and 11am – 12pm on the other, unlike most of the other roads in the area</p>

	<p>restricted times. Should your proposals go ahead we would have the inconvenience of having to move our vehicles and the possibility of not finding anything nearby.</p> <p>The shops at Apex Court provide a valuable service to the community and their trade may be affected by the proposals as there is often not enough parking available in the spaces provided at the front. Vehicles of those using the shops are often parked on the street. Your proposals may well dissuade people from using the shops as nearby parking may not be available.</p> <p>Whilst we do not object to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' areas, we cannot agree to your other proposals. Extending the time restricted section down to Plumberow Mount Avenue would have the effect of shifting those that park on the street to nearby non-restricted areas, making residents parking more difficult than it is now.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>which have Monday – Friday 11am – 12pm on both sides.</p> <p>Whilst there is some inconvenience to residents, the tidal times do allow for some flexibility in parking for residents as they, and their visitors, are not totally precluded from parking for one hour per day as in the other roads.</p> <p>The introduction of these parking restrictions would have the effect of removing commuter parking, thus ensuring that there was more available parking space for residents and their visitors.</p> <p>Being tidal, the restrictions will always allow for parking beside the shops on one side of the carriageway or the other which will ensure that their customers will not be inconvenienced and their trade unaffected. Space should always be available if there is no commuter parking.</p>
--	--	---

Representations & responses relating to Wimhurst Close		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
3	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 20 July 2018, regarding proposed Parking restrictions for Plumberow Avenue, Hockley and joining side roads.</p> <p>I write to advise you that both my wife and myself are in total agreement with the proposal.</p>	Support noted.
12	<p>I refer to your letter dated 20th July 2018 advising of the implementation of parking restrictions on the aforementioned roads.</p> <p>I can confirm I AM IN FAVOUR of the proposals. The parking and traffic situation since your first notification at the end of last year has worsened. The parking issue has increased as more and more vehicles park for the whole day, to avoid the expense of the Station car park.</p> <p>When the children are going to and coming home from school, the situation is at it most</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Consideration can be given to amending the restriction to be tidal i.e. one side Mon – Fri 10 -11am</p>

	<p>dangerous. Motorist speed in either direction to get past the parked cars to avoid having to stop, for on-coming traffic.</p> <p>As far as Wimhurst Close is concerned it is very much the opinion of the residents that a residence parking permit should be introduced.</p>	<p>and the other Mon – Fri 11am – 12pm.</p>
15	<p>I would like to register my opinion on the parking proposal for Wimhurst Close, Hockley.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions would have serious detrimental effect on my household.</p> <p>I would hope that we are able to have parking permits.</p>	<p>Objection noted</p> <p>The proposed parking restrictions are for one hour per day in Wimhurst Close, parking would still be available on one side of the adjacent Plumberow Avenue (albeit that the vehicle would have to be moved for one hour).</p> <p>Consideration can be given to amending the restriction to be tidal i.e. one side Mon – Fri 10 -11am and the other Mon – Fri 11am – 12pm.</p>

APPENDIX 3

Response to formal complaint

1. No survey: A copy of street maps does not constitute a "survey". You may recall that during the 2013/14 Leamington Rd proposal, you personally agreed that the survey in that proposal was "not fit for purpose". So why have you stopped undertaking surveys?

Included in the Freedom of Information request (IR6502- Ref4), sent to you on 7 September 2018, was a copy of the Technician Assessment Form which I have attached as **Appendix 1** to this letter. Page 2 of the form shows the date and time of the observations made during the site visits; the maps show the locations of the parked vehicles logged during these visits. In addition, members of the public send in examples of photographic evidence of the reported parking problems which can be verified during these site visits. Together this forms

the survey information for the purpose of this work. In 2013/14, Nick Binder acknowledged during a meeting with you, that during the assessment for Hampstead Gardens and surrounding roads that the amount of site visits for Leamington Road had not been fully recorded and captured on the assessment form, unlike the Hampstead Garden assessment form, which at the time captured more detail.

2. Support by local councillors: Clearly the FoI process was deficient for Mrs Weston but since when did a 'no response' become a positive response?

Ward Councillors and the Essex County Councillor were sent copies of the proposal on 18th July. No objections have been received from the Councillors, and they are not treated as a support unless they submit comments to that effect.

3. Knock-on parking: Without a survey it is clear there will not be "any evidence". Again, this is a case of 'no response' being taken as a positive.

The area has been monitored and the parking patterns have been identified and we feel this provides us with sufficient information to make the proposals. It is not practical to seek and identify the motorists of the parked vehicles and ask where they are likely to go should a parking restriction be implemented. Therefore, the true extend of vehicle movements and driver behaviours cannot be fully established. When a new parking scheme is implemented a period of monitoring will always take place.

4. No ECG response: Again, a negative being taken as a positive. However in this case there is no evidence that ECC were advised of the proposal.

Essex County Council were sent copies of the proposal on 12 July 2018 and no comments have been received regarding the proposal. It is therefore taken that they have no objections to the proposal.

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP SUB COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

AGENDA ITEM 6

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (VARIOUS ROADS) (DISTRICT OF ROCHFORD) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND PERMIT PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT NO.52) ORDER 201* Relating to Queens Road and Broad Oak Way, Rayleigh.
Report by	South Essex Parking Partnership Manager

Enquiries contact: Nick Binder, South Essex Parking Partnership Manager, 01245 606303, nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk

Purpose	To report the receipt of representations made on part of the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*
Options	The Joint Committee has the following options available: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to agree that the proposed Order be made as advertised; 2. to agree that the proposed Order be made subject to modifications which result in less restrictive provisions or reduced scope; or 3. to agree that the proposed Order should not be made.
Recommendation(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Order be withdrawn with consideration given to the residents being consulted on a permit parking scheme instead; and 2. The people making representations be advised accordingly.

Consulters	South Essex Parking Partnership
-------------------	---------------------------------

Policies and Strategies
The report takes into account the South Essex Parking Partnership Document setting out how the SEPP will deal with requests for parking restrictions requiring

TROs.

1.	<u>Background</u>
1.1	<p>The purpose of this Order is to amend The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 as set out below:-</p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Queens Road and Broad Oak Way, Rayleigh.</p> <p>On 3rd October 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Queens Road requesting the existing prohibition of waiting (single yellow line operating Mon-Sat 11am-Noon) is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to prevent vehicles parking both sides of the road on this busy section of carriageway. Vehicles are parking half on the footway causing obstruction to resident's driveways, and pedestrians and congestion for through traffic. The application is supported by 34 of the 40 affected residents and the local Councillor.</p> <p>There has been one serious accident recorded at this location on 29/08/2015 involving 2 vehicles and 2 casualties.</p> <p>An informal consultation has been undertaken with the affected residents of Queens Road on the proposal to amend the parking restrictions with the following results: 24 of 40 (60%) responded, 16 of 40 (40%) did not respond. 15 of 24 (62.5%) in favour of amending the single yellow line to double yellow lines on the south-eastern side. 9 of 24 (37.5%) against amending the single yellow line to double yellow lines on the south-eastern side. The results meet the SEPP criteria for progression.</p> <p>The request to amend the parking restrictions was discussed with Lead Officer and Lead Councillor for parking matters for Rochford and it was agreed to proceed for funding.</p> <p>The scheme was costed at £3500 and placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Sub Committee on 8th March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.</p>
1.2	<p>The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 26th July 2018, and copies of the draft Order were sent to a number of organisations including Essex Police, Essex County Council (the highway authority), Essex Fire & Rescue Service, Essex Ambulance Service, the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</p>
1.3	<p>When the Order was published on 26th July 2018 a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced.</p>

1.4	<p><i>Copy of letter sent to residents of Queens Road 20th July 2018, prior to publication -</i></p> <p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership will shortly be publishing a proposal for Queens Road to amend the existing No Waiting Monday – Saturday 11am – 12pm parking restriction to a No Waiting At Any Time parking restriction on the south east side of the carriageway from a point 57 metres north east of the junction with Eastwood Road north eastwards to the junction with Broad Oak Way.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can also be found on the Council’s website from 26 July 2018: https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/parking-and-travel/parking-restrictions/view-current-and-proposed-parking-restrictions/rochford-parking-restrictions/</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day formal consultation period whereby any person may write objecting to the proposal, or write in support.</p> <p>If there are unresolved objections the matter will be reported to the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee for a decision. The Committee can agree to proceed as published and bring the Order into effect, amend the proposal or withdraw it in its entirety.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments on or after the 26 July 2018 you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 17 August 2018.</p> <p><u>Please note that any previous comments received cannot be taken into account. Therefore, it is essential for you to formally respond, either objecting to or supporting the proposal during the statutory period stated above.</u></p>
2	<u>Comments</u>
2.1	The details of the representations are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report together with the comments of the Technicians.
3	<u>Conclusion</u>
3.1	Although the correspondents have made a number of points which lead them to believe the Order should not be pursued in whole or part, the Lead Councillor, Lead Officer and Technicians consider that this scheme should be withdrawn, and consideration given to the residents being consulted on a permit parking scheme instead.
<p><u>List of Appendices</u></p> <p>Appendix 1 – List of people making representations</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments</p>	


APPENDIX 1

Ref	List of people making representations	Type
1	Email from local councillor dated 18 th July 2018	Support
2	Email from local councillor dated 25 th July 2018	Support
3	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 27 th July 2018	Objection
4	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 28 th July 2018	Support
5	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 30 th July 2018	Support
6	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 6 th August 2018	Support
7	Letter from resident of Queens Road dated 7 th August 2018 with a petition signed by 15 residents (11 properties) and 44 family and friends.	Objection
8	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 15 th August 2018	Objection
9	Email from resident of Queens Road dated 17 th August 2018	Objection

APPENDIX 2

**REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT –
26th July 2018**

Representations & responses relating to Queens Road		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	Agree with the recommendations	Support noted
2	Totally support Queens Road and Broad Oak Way. As you are aware there have been many issues down these roads.	Support noted
3	<p>I wish to object to the proposal to create a no waiting area on the South East side of Queens Road Rayleigh for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. It will create a greater "rat run" down the road, making it more likely that there will be an accident causing serious injury or death. Currently there is a significant problem with drivers speeding down the road. The fact that outside of parking restriction times there are cars parked on both sides of the road creates a natural restriction of sorts to reduce the level of speeding. If there is always a clear path on one side of the road with cars on the other it will encourage drivers to speed down that part of the road in an attempt to avoid having to slow for traffic coming the other way, making it more likely that accident or injury will result.</p> <p>3. It will make it more likely that drivers will park across my driveway blocking me in. If the number of spaces for cars to park on the road are reduced in this way then more cars will need to park on my side of the road. As there is currently a problem with them parking across my drive this will only increase with reduced availability.</p> <p>3. It will be more likely that cars will park on my side of the road, and the habit has become for them to park half on the road and half on the pavement. As someone who is visually impaired it causes me a problem already having cars parked on the pavement on my side of the road, and again this problem is only likely to increase if my side of the road is the only one available.</p> <p>For these reasons the proposal will not meet the reasons given on the "Statement of Reasons" but in 2 and 3 merely move them to the other side of the road.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that removal of vehicles from one side of the carriageway may increase the speed of vehicles.</p> <p>There is legislation in place for specific instances of vehicles blocking driveways, the SEPP enforcement team have the powers to issue PCN's for these.</p> <p>The Police have retained the powers to deal with any vehicle that is parked dangerously or obstructively.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>We write in support of the proposal to amend the existing No Waiting Monday - Saturday 11am – 12pm parking restriction to a No Waiting At Any Time parking restriction on the south east side of the carriageway from a point 57 metres north east of the junction with Eastwood Road north eastwards to the junction with Broad Oak Way.</p> <p>At the present time, simultaneous parking on both sides of the road, outside the times of the current restrictions, including parking partly on pavements, seriously restricts traffic flow for cars and can completely prevent the passage of commercial and emergency vehicles. Pavement parking causes difficulties for mobility scooter users and parents with prams and young children. It is a safety issue for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposal will prevent obstructive parking, assist with the general flow of traffic, improve access for emergency and refuse vehicles and make it much safer for pedestrians. Attached are photographs illustrating some of the situations that have occurred in recent times and reinforce the need for change to the existing regulation.</p> 	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>I write in response to your letter dated 26-07-2018. I am a resident at x Queens Road, Rayleigh and write to comment on the proposed change of parking regulations in my end of the road. We are a mainly residential road (with car wash & MOT centre on the corner adjacent to Eastwood Road, with one access from Queens Road). Just beyond the corner of Queens Road there is small terrace of shops, on the Eastwood Road - with extremely limited parking. Opposite this end of Queens Road is a Health Clinic which holds a variety of clinics including blood tests – the clinic has virtually no parking for staff or patients. As a result there is often a considerable amount of parking, on both sides of Queens Road.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

	<p>When vehicles park opposite one another there is limited space for larger vehicles to get past – particularly delivery vans and, even more importantly, emergency vehicles. The parking at present is both short-term (under 30 minutes) and much longer-term (most of the day apart from the one hour currently banned on each side of the road). The problems caused by the situation I've outlined above include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is frequently used as a cut-through, which gives a slalom affect as cars weave between parked vehicles. • There have been occasions when emergency vehicles have been unable to get through and have lost time whilst they knock on resident's doors trying to find who is responsible for any of the parked vehicles and could move them. More frequently delivery drivers knock, for the same reason, as they cannot get past. • I am not a car driver but am aware how difficult it can be for residents/visitors to get in/out of their own driveways, due to the parking both sides • As a part-time wheelchair user I have extreme difficulty safely crossing the road as I often have to come out onto the road between parked cars before I can see or be seen. <p>I would thus like to support the proposed parking change of regulations banning parking on one side of Queens Road, permitting it on the other but maintaining the current one-hour ban that side.</p> <p>However, I would like to express one concern, namely that if the parking becomes more limited I am anxious that residents on the permitted side of the road may have increased trouble with people parking across their own access driveway. I know this is illegal if there is a vehicle parked on their driveway but that is not the case if there is no vehicle parked; it's then just bad manners. As a non-driver with disabilities I rely on people being able to access my drive to collect/drop me – I cannot walk very far at all so if they have to drop me further along the road that would cause me significant problems. Despite my concern expressed above I feel that the proposed changes in regulation will bring more benefits than problems.</p>	
6	<p>I am writing with reference to your letter dated 20 July 2018, regarding the proposed amendment to No Waiting at any time on the south east side of Queens Road. My wife and I live at x Queens Road and both whole heartedly support the proposed change. We previously submitted our support for this proposal several months ago and if anything the parking situation at times has got even worse. People regularly park almost opposite each other along the road, leading to vehicles weaving dangerously in and out to avoid each other and regularly leaving barely enough room for particularly HGVs to pass. The road is regularly used as a "rat run" to avoid Rayleigh High Street and when presented with parked vehicles, vehicles often mount the kerb to avoid hitting other cars coming the other way. Vehicles also are regularly parking on the</p>	Support noted.

	<p>kerb presenting a hazard to pedestrians and elderly people on mobility scooters. We have had one head on crash outside x Queens Road in recent years and numerous near misses and we are concerned that the quantity of traffic will soon lead to a fatality.</p> <p>We have also had two instances of ambulances being unable to proceed up the road due to inconsiderate parking. We feel that this road should be open and free to traffic at all times and not be used as free parking for people using the local vets, tanning studio, shops, etc and clinic.</p>	
7	<p>Please accept this letter as total disapproval of the proposed change to the parking restriction in Queens Road, Rayleigh. For the reasons as follows:</p> <p>When the current 'no parking' is in force, i.e. 10-11am on our side and 11-12noon the other side, at least it allows some parking (whatever side) for our families, visitors and deliveries.</p> <p>If there is no parking on the other side at all times, then our side will always be taken up by people going into the High Street or the Clinic (which is at the top of our road). Also, families, visitors and deliveries for the other side will always be using our side of the road. Can you imagine at the weekends when friends and families visit, how unfair it will be for our side to always be taken. What will happen between 10-11am Monday to Saturday when there will be no parking on both sides of the road? Are we all friendless in that hour, do our families abandon us and aren't we allowed any deliveries?</p> <p>If there are changes to be made, then why not make the top of the road (by Eastwood Road) double yellow lines and the junction of Broad Oak Way double yellow lines, as this is where unfortunately some thoughtless people park, making it very dangerous to turn in and out of. Let it be noted that at the top of Queens Road there are double yellow lines, but some motorists choose to ignore them. Just think of the extra revenue the council would have if it was monitored more – and the cars that are parked on the pavement!</p> <p>Queens Road is also used as a 'rat run' so if one side is always clear, then the traffic coming from Eastwood Road will always be waiting for the traffic coming up, and very few abide by the speed limit of 30mph already, so if there is a clear run on one side, can you imagine the speed some drivers will go (not everybody breaks the limit, but a lot of drivers unfortunately have total disregard to any sort of speed limit!) Has anyone thought of speed bumps along the road – Would that help? At least with parking on both sides, everyone has the same waiting for</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there will be one hour per day (Monday – Saturday) when vehicles are prevented from parking on both sides of the carriageway, vehicles are permitted to park during the restricted times for the purposes of making deliveries or dropping off/picking up passengers.</p> <p>There are already extensive double yellow lines at the junction with Eastwood Road, as mentioned the same restriction on the junction with Broad Oak Way would be an improvement.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that removal of vehicles from one side of the carriageway may increase the speed of vehicles.</p>

	<p>oncoming traffic, and it cuts down on the excessive speed that will undoubtedly happen.</p> <p>Whoever put this idea forward I'm sure has this wonderful thought of no vehicles parked outside their property. In an ideal world yes, it would be nice for all of us to have lovely clear roads, but the reality is there are too many cars on this planet, and they have to be somewhere, whether we like it or not!</p> <p>Please reconsider what is proposed, as I cannot see this would be an improvement, but a complete disaster, and with the 'clear' road and definite speeding by some motorists, it will only be a matter of time before someone, be it a child or adult will be knocked down. Many thanks for your time in reading this letter and I trust and hope that the final decision will be of benefit to us all.</p> <p>Petition against proposal signed by 15 residents (11 properties) and 44 family and friends.</p>	<p>Initially SEPP received a request from residents for this amendment which was accompanied by a petition in support signed by 33 of the 40 affected properties. A subsequent informal consultation was supported by 15 of 24 responses received.</p>
8	<p>As in the petition. we signed, we stated that Yes, something needs to be done about the parking on this road. But we feel this idea will cause more accidents...</p> <p>Parking on one side will only increase the speed of cars as there would be no obstruction to slow them down. The people pulling out of their drive ways will find that their vision will be blocked by parked cars, which is already happening, the speeding cars that drive down our road will be able to go faster. It will be very dangerous for anyone trying to pull out. The slamming of car doors right outside the properties on the north west side of the road is also very disturbing for the residents. Especially when it is early hours or Late at night. Many of the bungalows have bedrooms at the front. At the moment when cars park on the other side it gives us a break from this disturbance, which can be very stressful when trying to relax. Something has to be done, but we feel the speeding of the cars on this road needs to be addressed, parking on one side only, will only increase the problem and we fear a nasty accident may occur.</p> <p>Also there are a lot of young children walking to school on this road, the proposed plans will encourage cars to speed more, there is no safe crossing for them, this is a safety issue .</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that removal of vehicles from one side of the carriageway may increase the speed of vehicles.</p> <p>Vehicles may currently park on either side of the road outside of the operational hours of the existing restrictions. If the scheme is implemented, then the scenario outlined may be the case.</p>
9	<p>We would like to object to these changes as we believe, as long term residents, that this will only make the parking and speeding issues worse.</p> <p>We have noticed the following issues, which need to be addressed as a whole:</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changes in the use of the clinic at the top of Queens Road junction on Eastwood Road. This has resulted in a large influx of cars – both patients and staff regularly using Queens road for long term parking. This needs to be addressed, in particular the careless parking across or partially across resident’s driveways. The clinic provides no parking, although there are ample car parks in the Town. 2. Speeding on Queens Road. When parking is restricted to one side of the road, it creates a straight clear run for vehicles, which in turn has created an opening for careless drivers to speed. The speeding is being facilitated by a multitude of car drivers. This is getting worse and our concerns are that an accident will happen. Please also note the demographics of Queens Road is changing from an elderly population to young families. 3. Queens Road is being used more and more regularly as a cut through for traffic and we have noticed a considerable increase in vehicles using our road. <p>We believe and having spoken to many other residents who also hold the same view, that parking on both sides of the road should be facilitated. This will cause all traffic usage on Queens Road to be slowed down considerably and indeed, reduce the use of Queens Road as a cut through as it no longer is a quick option. Clearly, we have no issue with a tolerance of parking and give and take, people have always used Queens Road to park and use the amenities on the High Street etc., but not at the levels they have become.</p> <p>We would also suggest that ‘Residents Parking’ be strongly considered as a way of solving many of the issues that are occurring to the satisfaction of the residents and the safety of our Road.</p>	<p>The SEPP have no involvement with planning issues. There is legislation in place for specific instances of vehicles blocking driveways, the SEPP enforcement team have the powers to issue PCN’s for these.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that removal of vehicles from one side of the carriageway may increase the speed of vehicles.</p> <p>With increased car use this is an issue on most roads.</p> <p>Initially SEPP received a request from residents for this amendment which was accompanied by a petition in support signed by 33 of the 40 affected properties. A subsequent informal consultation was supported by 15 of 24 responses received. Vehicles parked on both side does provide natural traffic calming</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a permit parking scheme could be considered but this was not what was requested by the residents. In June 2015 residents were consulted on amending the restrictions to a permit parking scheme, 13 of 21 properties that</p>
---	--

		responded for this section of Queens Road were in favour of retaining the existing restrictions while the remaining 9 were in favour of amending to a permit parking scheme.
--	--	--

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP SUB COMMITTEE

14 February 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (VARIOUS ROADS) (DISTRICT OF ROCHFORD) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND PERMIT PARKING PLACES) (AMENDMENT NO.52) ORDER 201* Relating to Heron Gardens, Rayleigh.
Report by	South Essex Parking Partnership Manager

Enquiries contact: Nick Binder, South Essex Parking Partnership Manager, 01245 606303, nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk

Purpose

To report the receipt of representations made on part of the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Permit Parking Places) (Amendment No.52) Order 201*

Options

The Joint Committee has the following options available:

1. to agree that the proposed Order be made as advertised;
2. to agree that the proposed Order be made subject to modifications which result in less restrictive provisions or reduced scope; or
3. to agree that the proposed Order should not be made.

Recommendation(s)

1. The Order be made as advertised; and
2. The people making representations be advised accordingly.

Consulters

South Essex Parking Partnership

Policies and Strategies

The report takes into account the South Essex Parking Partnership Document setting out how the SEPP will deal with requests for parking restrictions requiring TROs.

1.	<u>Background</u>
1.1	<p>The purpose of this Order is to amend The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order 2008 as set out below:</p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Heron Gardens, Rayleigh.</p> <p>On 17th October 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a local councillor with a petition signed by 3 of the 5 affected properties of Heron Gardens requesting a one hour parking restriction, beyond the end of the double yellow lines, to deter inconsiderate commuter parking causing obstruction to delivery and other vehicles accessing this area of the estate, also obstructing pedestrians by vehicles parking half on the footway.</p> <p>This is the only junction/entry point for access to the estate and also that a sharp blind bend is a little further on, double yellow lines should be implemented from the junction with Kestrel Grove south and eastwards to a point in line with the boundary between property Nos.9 & 11.</p> <p>The request to provide parking restrictions was discussed with Lead Officer and Lead Councillor for parking matters for Rochford and it was agreed to proceed for funding.</p> <p>The scheme was costed at £2800 and placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Sub Committee on 8th March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.</p>
1.2	<p>The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 26th July 2018, and copies of the draft Order were sent to a number of organisations including Essex Police, Essex County Council (the highway authority), Essex Fire & Rescue Service, Essex Ambulance Service, the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</p>
1.3	<p>When the Order was published on 26th July 2018 a 21 day period of formal public consultation commenced.</p>
2	<u>Comments</u>
2.1	<p>The details of the representations are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report together with the comments of the Technicians.</p>
3	<u>Conclusion</u>

3.1	Although the correspondents have made a number of points which lead them to believe the Order should not be pursued in whole or part, the Lead Councillor, Lead Officer and Technicians consider that none of them are of sufficient weight to warrant the Order not being made.
<u>List of Appendices</u> Appendix 1 – List of people making representations Appendix 2 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments	

APPENDIX 1

Ref	List of people making representations	Type
1	Email from a local councillor dated 26 th July 2018	Support
2	Letter from resident of Heron Gardens dated 26 th July 2018	Objection
3	Email from resident of Heron Gardens dated 6 th August 2018	Objection
4	Email from resident of Heron Gardens dated 8 th August 2018	Objection
5	Email from resident of Heron Gardens dated 17 th August 2018	Objection

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 26th July 2018

Representations & responses relating to Heron Gardens, Rayleigh		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	I am fully supportive of the Heron Gardens Rayleigh restrictions.	Support noted.
2	<p>I am writing to you following the erection of signs on lamp posts around Heron Gardens indicating that you are minded to apply parking restrictions, presumably to discourage all-day parking, to the roads here and inviting comments</p> <p>I have two areas I would like to raise, both of which I believe would improve the scheme as well as make it more practical and workable.</p> <p>Firstly, the restrictions.</p> <p>You show on your plan the areas you intend to apply the restrictions to. I suggest this does not go quite far enough, though it doesn't need to go much further. The restrictions will simply make the drivers park 'round the corner' as it were, further into Heron Gardens. The way to make this more effective is to extend the restrictions to outside numbers 11 and 15, up to the boundary of number 17, on the north side of Heron Gardens. On the south side the restrictions should also be applied to outside number 2 towards number 4's drop kerb. If you then look at the road, there is nowhere to park until round the bend past number 4 and drivers are unlikely to park on a narrow bend.</p> <p>At the same time, the same restrictions should be applied outside number 2, on the western side where it faces number 111. There is otherwise a nice car-sized space right on the junction, potentially causing danger if a vehicle parks there. Apart from the fact that this space would be right on the junction, this junction and the bend in question is where every vehicle, car, van and delivery vehicle for the 200+ houses on this estate has to pass. To knowingly allow this potentially dangerous junction to be partially obstructed on a daily basis is also, I'm sure, not the intention. Further south the road is narrow and bendy and routine parking is unlikely to be a problem.</p> <p>None of this will involve much more work nor materials but would make it much more effective. I speak as a resident living with it currently.</p> <p>If you'd like to visit, what I'm suggesting will be perfectly obvious. Or if you'd like to be sent photographs, (or look on Google Streetview, if it's easier) please just ask. It's actually a</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Parking restrictions on estate roads are generally avoided as the parking is usually by the residents themselves. However as in this case the parking issues are caused by non-residents. It is difficult to find a reasonable end point to any of these restrictions, the best option has been proposed to cause the minimum effect on the majority of residents (3 of the 5 affected residents signed the local councillors petition) to a point where visibility is improved.</p> <p>As parking at this location could occur on any day, at any time, and given the presence of the blind bend, a one-hour restriction, for example, would not prevent obstructive parking to large vehicles trying to access the estate outside of the operational time.</p>

	<p>sensible solution. Secondly, the hours of the restrictions. You're behaving a little inconsistently. The road is not a bus route though clearly there has to be emergency access. The problem is only ever Monday to Friday, never weekends. So, I don't understand why you propose 'no waiting at any time', because at weekends there is no problem. This is all the more puzzling as in Kestrel Grove, Kingfisher Crescent, Swallow Close and other roads on the birds estate, one hours' restriction a day, Monday to Friday, seems to solve all problems, more so because in some places it is 10-11 am and others 2-3pm. To apply a total No waiting restriction is inconsistent and would also inconvenience residents dreadfully 24/7, seven days a week. This can't be your intention either, surely. Again, I ask, come and have a look. Anytime. The same logic applies; one hour a day, Monday to Friday is the way to do it. I did sign Cllr Lumley's petition to look at parking restrictions in Heron Gardens, but this was not on the basis of a total No Waiting restriction, that doesn't actually do much except move the problem 20-30 metres anyway. She agreed with this at the time so maybe she hasn't engaged with you in strict accuracy. My solution makes the situation much less attractive for the regular all-day parkers. Can I please ask that this proposal is re-examined? Maybe could I ask for your thoughts? If I can assist in any way, please just ask.</p>	
3	<p>I am sending you this email as I wish to partly support the above.</p> <p>I agree that parking restrictions are necessary for the entrance to the Birds Estate in Rayleigh. I wish you to consider extending the restriction to parking to between No 15 and No 17. Also between No 2 and No4, No 2 and 38 and finally No 111 and 109. The reason for this being that this junction serves as the entrance/exit point for a large part of this estate. The road is narrow and when vehicles are parked in the areas already in your proposal and the additions I have suggested, this blocks the sight line for these two bends. For any vehicle larger than a car, getting around a parked car usually means mounting the kerb which is not safe either.</p> <p>I would also like you to consider any parking restriction being for one hour a day as the rest of the Birds Estate with parking restrictions. I do not see any need for a parking restriction to include parking permits. I do not understand the logic in 'No waiting at any time' in this area of the Birds Estate when you have imposed a one hour restriction in other parts. In my opinion to reduce residents parking to off road is heavy handed and not consistent. I do however support a one hour restriction as per the surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Parking restrictions on estate roads are generally avoided as the parking is usually by the residents themselves. However as in this case the parking issues are caused by non-residents. It is difficult to find a reasonable end point to any of these restrictions, the best option has been proposed to cause the minimum effect on the majority of residents (3 of the 5 affected residents signed the local councillors petition) to a point where visibility is improved.</p>

		As parking at this location could occur on any day and given the presence of the blind bend, a one-hour restriction would not prevent obstructive parking to large vehicles trying to access the estate outside of the operational time.
4	<p>I wish to object to the proposal by the South Essex Parking Partnership, outlined in amendment 52 - To introduce 'No Waiting At Any Time' to Heron Gardens, Rayleigh.</p> <p>The reasons given for imposing these restrictions are:</p> <p><i>Heron Gardens, Rayleigh</i> <i>Concerns have been raised by a local Councillor and residents of Heron Gardens that all day non-resident parking is causing access issues for larger vehicles entering the estate and vehicles parking partially across driveways. The proposal seeks to prevent all day non-resident parking by extending the existing No Waiting At Any Time Parking restrictions at the junction with Kestrel Grove, south and eastwards to a point in line with the boundary between property Nos. 9 & 11 (to include the sharp, blind bend) which will improve the amenity of the area through which the road runs and the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises and the remainder of the housing estate.</i></p> <p>While it is correct that the road has some all day non-resident parking Monday to Friday from commuters using the local station, it is not accurate to say that vehicles park partially across driveways or that access for large vehicles is restricted. I have commuter parking outside my own property on most days, I have found commuters to be generally considerate with their vehicle positioning and have not witnessed any access issues described when working from home.</p> <p>In my opinion imposing these restrictions will do two things:</p> <p>1) Restrict the flexibility of local residents with respect to the parking of visitors, carers and trades people, especially at the weekend when there is generally little or no commuter parking.</p> <p>2) Force commuter parking to move to other local roads, thereby moving the problem somewhere else, which if followed to a logical conclusion will have large parts of Rayleigh</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Parking restrictions on estate roads are generally avoided as the parking is usually by the residents themselves. However as in this case the parking issues are caused by non-residents. It is difficult to find a reasonable end point to any of these restrictions, the best option has been proposed to cause the minimum effect on the majority of residents (3 of the 5 affected residents signed the local councillors petition) to a point where visibility is improved.</p> <p>As parking at this location could occur on any day and given the presence of the blind bend, the proposed scheme would ensure access for large vehicles to the estate at all times.</p> <p>Parking would be available for visitors further into Heron Gardens or on adjacent roads outside of the one-hour restriction times.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the imposition of any parking restrictions will displace</p>

	<p>covered by severe parking restrictions.</p> <p>If these commuters are forced to pay the excessive amount of £7 per day (£31 per week) on top of large train fares, then this money will not be spent in local shops, bars and restaurants removing money from the local economy and placing it with shareholders of NCP and Greater Anglia who do not seem to offer Rayleigh good value for money at present.</p> <p>If the council believes the removal of commuter parking is a benefit to local residents, then will they consider an extension of the No Waiting between 10am-11am currently in force in Kestrel Grove to provide some flexibility.</p>	<p>vehicles elsewhere.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>I have reviewed the proposed restrictions to make the entrance to our road no waiting at any time. I did write to Russell Panter on 6 September 2017 regarding the safety issues of the commuter parking and he urged I contact June Lumley (our councillor) which I did subsequently.</p> <p>The double yellow lines will undoubtedly stop the commuter parking in that discrete area.</p> <p>I however believe this is not a complete solution as it does not solve the issue of the cars parking opposite the junctions both in Kestrel Grove (a car is permanently parked here apart from the time of day Kestrel's restrictions are in force for) and causes cars to pull out to the other side of the road at the junction and this is therefore a safety issue.</p> <p>There will also not be double lines opposite the junction outside number 11 and as it stops short no doubt people will park here and this will also cause a safety issue. I therefore suggest the double yellow lines are extended to this junction.</p> <p>Several residents including me have complained in the past to the councillor that the real issue is that the majority other roads in the Bird's estate and nearby the station have parking restrictions for an hour a day to stop commuters and for some reason this was not actioned for our road. These proposed restrictions will therefore only move the problem to the rest of the Heron Gardens and Heron Close and are therefore not a long term solution. I see the solution as to being single yellow lines for a restriction with one side of the road with no parking for 1 hour say 10-11 and the other side say 2-3 as in other nearby roads. This will mean commuters cannot park by residents can.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Parking restrictions on estate roads are generally avoided as the parking is usually by the residents themselves. However as in this case the parking issues are caused by non-residents. It is difficult to find a reasonable end point to any of these restrictions, the best option has been proposed to cause the minimum effect on the majority of residents (3 of the 5 affected residents signed the local councillors petition) to a point where visibility is improved.</p> <p>As parking at this location could occur on any day and given the presence of the blind bend, the proposed scheme would ensure access for large vehicles to the estate at all times.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the imposition of any parking restrictions will displace vehicles elsewhere.</p>

I attach photos of the dangerous commuter parking in our road including opposite the junction where I am asking the parking restrictions are extended to.



I look forward to a resolution to the issue.

SEPP has not received an application for an amendment to parking restrictions from residents of Kestrel Grove.