

**MEETING OF THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
SUB COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERING OBJECTIONS AGAINST AN
ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER.**

5 SEPTEMBER 2019
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC CENTRE, CHELMSFORD
CITY COUNCIL
COMMENCING AT 15.00 PM.

AGENDA

1. Welcome by Chairman of the Sub Committee and minutes of the last meeting.
2. Apologies for absence
3. Consideration of objections against Variation 79 Part2 relating to: Warren Close, Chelmsford
4. Consideration of objections against Variation 79 Part2 relating to: Exeter Road and Torrington Close, Chelmsford
5. Consideration of objections against Variation 79 Part2 relating to: Mildmay Road Chelmsford.
6. Consideration of objections against Variation 82 relating to: Abbess Close, Ashford Road, Beeches Road, Benedict Drive, Dane Road, Hawkhurst Close, Nabbott Road, Ravensbourne Drive, St Catherine's Road and St Peters Road, Chelmsford.
7. Any other business

MINUTES

of the

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB-COMMITTEE on 14 February 2019 at 10am

Present:

Councillor Ron Pratt (Chairman)	Maldon District Council
Councillor Jon Cloke	Brentwood Borough Council
Councillor Michael Steptoe	Rochford District Council

In attendance:

Nick Binder	Chelmsford City Council
William Butcher	Chelmsford City Council
Andrew Clay	Chelmsford City Council
Jon Desmond	Rochford District Council
Brian Mayfield	Chelmsford City Council

1. **Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed those present.

2. **Apologies and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Marcus Hotten. Jon Desmond attended as his substitute.

3. **Minutes and Matters Arising**

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

There were no matters of business arising.

4. **The South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce a resident permit parking scheme in Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road, Hockley from Monday to Friday between 10am and 11am.

Forty-two expressions of support and seven objections had been received following advertising of the Order. Two members of the public attended the meeting to speak in favour of the Order.

The Sub-Committee was informed that the Order would not affect the ability of parents to drop off and collect children from the nearby school.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Leamington Road and Cheltenham Road, Hockley be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(10.02 to 10.08am)

5. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce No Waiting Monday to Friday 11am to 12pm on the west side of Plumberow Avenue, and No Waiting Monday to Friday 10am to 11am on the east side of that road, including The Acorns and Wimhurst Close. In addition, it was proposed to introduce No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on the junctions of Wimhurst Close, Plumberow Avenue, Mount Avenue, Orchard Avenue and Appleyard Avenue, Hockley.

Sixteen representations of support, five objections and one “no objection” had been received to the proposal. The Sub-Committee considered the representations and concluded that the Order should be made but modified to take account of the objectors’ concerns.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Wimhurst Close, Plumberow Avenue and The Acorns, Hockley be made as advertised, 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 to Friday 10am to 11am single yellow line scheme to be retained on the south side and the north side amended to operate Monday to Friday 11am to 12pm; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(10.08 to 10.16am)

6. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to replace the existing prohibition of waiting, Monday to Saturday 11am -12pm parking restriction in Queens Road 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.

Four objections and five expressions of support had been received following advertising of the Order. The local ward councillors had also expressed support, a letter of support from a local resident was read out at the meeting, and two local residents attended the meeting to speak in favour of the Order. Whilst initially the officers had recommended that the Order be withdrawn to enable consultation on a permit parking scheme, they, and the Sub-Committee, were now of the view that the Order should proceed as advertised. The possible conflict between vehicles travelling in opposite directions along Queens Road would be monitored to assess whether refuges could or should be implemented to enable safe passing.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Queens Road and Broad Oak Way, Rayleigh be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(10.16 to 10.31am)

7. **South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201***

The Sub-Committee considered representations on the above Order which proposed the variation of the Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Consolidation) Order No. 2008 to introduce No Waiting At Any Time, from a point 10 metres south of its junction with Kestrel Grove southwards then eastwards to a point in line with the boundary between property Nos.9 & 11 Heron Gardens..

Four objections and one expression of support had been received following advertising of the Order. A resident of Heron Gardens attended the meeting to say that, whilst he supported the objective of the Order to deter inconsiderate parking and parking on footways, he did not believe that the location of the proposed restrictions extended far enough and suggested that the restriction extended to a point to include the junction outside property Nos 11 and 15 Heron Gardens. .

The Sub-Committee had some sympathy with that view but felt that the proposed restrictions would have the desired effect of alleviating the parking problems. It asked, however, the officers closely monitor the situation following the introduction of the restrictions.

AGREED that:

1. the South Essex Parking Partnership (Various Roads) (District of Rochford) (Prohibition of Waiting and Parking Places) (Amendment No. 52) Order 201* insofar as it relates to Heron Gardens, Rayleigh be made as advertised; and
2. those who made representations be advised accordingly.

(10.31 to 10.44am)

The meeting closed at 10.44am.

Chairman

**SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
(TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB COMMITTEE**

5 September 2019

AGENDA ITEM 6

Subject	<p>THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL) (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING CONSOLIDATION) (VARIATION NO.82) ORDER 201*</p> <p>Relating to <u>Abbess Close, Ashford Road, Beeches Road, Benedict Drive, Dane Road, Hawkhurst Close, Nabbott Road, Ravensbourne Drive, St Catherine’s Road and St Peters Road, Chelmsford.</u></p>
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 (Chelmsford City Council) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) (Variation No.82) 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.
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.	<p>Background The purpose of this Order is to vary the Borough Council of Chelmsford (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) Order 2009 as set out below: -</p>																																													
1.1	<p>On 13 July 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a Councillor requesting a resident permit parking scheme to deter commuter parking in Benedict Drive and Nabbott Road. The request was supported by 16 residents.</p>																																													
1.2	<p>On 22 August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form the same Councillor requesting a single yellow line parking restriction in Ravensbourne Drive, Dane Road and surrounding roads to deter commuter parking, and provide double yellow lines on the junctions. The request was supported by 20 residents.</p>																																													
1.3	<p>Following receipt of the application forms the SEPP carried out an informal consultation with all residents of the following roads to seek their view on consideration to provide a resident permit parking scheme. The results are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="276 790 1420 1193"> <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>Ravensbourne Dr</td> <td>82</td> <td>55 (67%)</td> <td>49 (89%)</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nabbott Road</td> <td>31</td> <td>22 (71%)</td> <td>20 (90%)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benedict Drive</td> <td>22</td> <td>18 (82%)</td> <td>18 (100%)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St Peter's Road</td> <td>37</td> <td>27 (73%)</td> <td>23 (85%)</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St Catherine's Rd</td> <td>37</td> <td>29 (78%)</td> <td>21 (72%)</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dane Road</td> <td>37</td> <td>24 (65%)</td> <td>19 (79%)</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Abess Close</td> <td>24</td> <td>15 (62%)</td> <td>14 (93%)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Beeches Road</td> <td>126</td> <td>70 (56%)</td> <td>61 (87%)</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour	Ravensbourne Dr	82	55 (67%)	49 (89%)	6	Nabbott Road	31	22 (71%)	20 (90%)	2	Benedict Drive	22	18 (82%)	18 (100%)	0	St Peter's Road	37	27 (73%)	23 (85%)	4	St Catherine's Rd	37	29 (78%)	21 (72%)	8	Dane Road	37	24 (65%)	19 (79%)	5	Abess Close	24	15 (62%)	14 (93%)	1	Beeches Road	126	70 (56%)	61 (87%)	9
Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour																																										
Ravensbourne Dr	82	55 (67%)	49 (89%)	6																																										
Nabbott Road	31	22 (71%)	20 (90%)	2																																										
Benedict Drive	22	18 (82%)	18 (100%)	0																																										
St Peter's Road	37	27 (73%)	23 (85%)	4																																										
St Catherine's Rd	37	29 (78%)	21 (72%)	8																																										
Dane Road	37	24 (65%)	19 (79%)	5																																										
Abess Close	24	15 (62%)	14 (93%)	1																																										
Beeches Road	126	70 (56%)	61 (87%)	9																																										
1.4	<p>The majority opted for a Mon-Fri 10—11am scheme. The results meet the SEPP criteria for progression.</p> <p>It has been agreed with the Lead Councillor and Lead Officer for parking matters for Chelmsford to cost a scheme to propose a resident permit parking scheme, operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 10am to 11am. It is estimated at £8000. This cost will be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Chelmsford, to publish one Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>SEPP Policy – 7.4 Commuter parking in a residential street (preferred parking)</p> <p>* The parking by non-residents must be sufficiently severe to cause serious inconvenience to residents – met in part (not all of the above roads suffer with commuter parking, at this time).</p>																																													

	<p>* The preferred traffic management solution for parking issues in residential areas is the introduction of a residents parking scheme – met.</p> <p>* The majority of residents have no off-street parking facilities available to them – not met.</p> <p>* The majority of residents are in favour of such a scheme – met.</p> <p>* The introduction of a scheme would not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads – may displace parking to nearby roads.</p> <p>* The Partnership is satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement can be maintained – met, there are existing parking restrictions in the area.</p>
1.5	<p>It was agreed with the Lead Councillor and Lead Officer for parking matters for Chelmsford to cost a scheme to prohibit parking at the junctions mentioned above. It is estimated at £8,000. This cost will be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Chelmsford, to publish one Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>A scheme was costed at £8,000. The request was placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee on 8 March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary Traffic Regulation Order.</p>
1.6	<p>The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 28 March 2019, 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>
1.7	<p>When the Order was published on 28 March 2019 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	<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 none of them are of sufficient weight to warrant the Order not being made.</p>
<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 resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 27/03/2019	Objection
2	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 28/03/2019	Support
3	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 28/03/2019	Support
4	Email from resident of Ashford Road dated 28/03/2019	Support
5	Email from resident of St Peter's Road dated 28/03/2019	Support
6	Email from resident of St Catherine's Road dated 28/03/2019	Support
7	Email from resident dated 28/03/2019	Support
8	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 28/03/2019	Support
9	Email from resident of Nabbott Road dated 29/03/2019	Support
10	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 29/03/2019	Support
11	Email from resident of Hawkhurst Close dated 31/03/2019	Support
12	Email from resident of Benedict Drive dated 31/03/2019	Support
13	Email from resident of Benedict Drive dated 31/03/2019	Support
14	Email from resident of St Peter's Road dated 31/03/2019	Objection
15	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 31/03/2019	Support
16	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 01/04/2019	Support
17	Email from resident St Catherine's Road dated 01/04/2019	Support
18	Email from resident of Benedict Drive dated 01/04/2019	Support
19	Email dated 01/04/2019	Support
20	Email from resident of Hawkhurst Close dated 01/04/2019	Support
21	Email from Councillor dated 01/04/2019	Support
22	Letter from resident of St Peter's Road 02/04/2019	Support
23	Email from resident of Benedict Drive dated 02/04/2019	Support
24	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 02/04/2019	Support
25	Email from resident dated 02/04/2019	Objection
26	Email from resident of Benedict Drive dated 03/04/2019	Support
27	Email from resident of St Catherine's Road dated 03/04/2019	Support
28	Email from resident of Hawkhurst Close dated 03/04/2019	Objection
29	Letter from resident of Ravensbourne Drive 04/04/2019	Support
30	Email from resident of Dane Road dated 06/04/2019	Support
31	Email from resident of St Peter's Road dated 06/04/2019	Support
32	Email from resident of Dane Road dated 06/04/2019	Support
33	Email from resident of Dane Road dated 08/04/2019	Support
34	Letter from resident of St Catherine's Road 06/04/2019	Support
35	Letter from resident of St Catherine's Road 06/04/2019	Support
36	Letter from resident of St Catherine's Road 06/04/2019	Support
37	Letter from resident of Ravensbourne Drive 06/04/2019	Support
38	Email from resident of St Peter's Road dated 09/04/2019	Support
39	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 12/04/2019	Support
40	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 12/04/2019	Support
41	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 15/04/2019	Support
42	Email from resident of St Catherine's Road dated 17/04/2019	Support
43	Email from resident of Ravensbourne Drive dated 18/04/2019	Support
44	Letter from resident of Beeches Road dated 18/04/2019	Objection
45	Email from resident of Beeches Road dated 18/04/2019	Support

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 28 March 2019

Representations & responses relating to Beechenlea estate		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
5	<p>Please be kind enough to record my strong support for the proposed parking restrictions on the Beechenlea estate ie Ravensbourne Drive, Beeches Road, St Peters Road etc etc. The commuter parking in Ravensbourne Drive in particular has been very annoying in the past few years and I have had several unpleasant experiences because of it. Some of the residents have difficulty reversing off their own drives.</p> <p>I would much prefer longer parking restrictions imposed as are already in place in Ashford Road and Canuden Road rather than just a one hour restriction. A brief acknowledgement of my support would be very much appreciated.</p>	<p>All new schemes are monitored for the effectiveness. It is possible for restrictions to be amended if ineffective.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
7	<p>I thoroughly support the parking restrictions, as listed, as long as they can be enforced.</p>	<p>Restrictions will be enforced as part of a rota as other roads in Chelmsford currently are.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
14	<p>We do not agree with the proposals set out for improvement of the hazardous parking that has been allowed to escalate on the Beechenlea Estate due to several issues:</p> <p>The provision of temporary housing in Beeches Road which has meant losing numerous possibly upto twelve or more parking spaces for staff that work at Westlands school, Nursery and Adult Education Centre - these staff now park along Ravensbourne Drive and up into St Peters Road where they access the school via the walkway from Canunden/Ashford Road which has parking restrictions from 10-2pm and as a result has pushed all the parking further into the estate. A lot of the time the parking is also very unsafe where there are whole blocks of cars parked nose to tail right at the end of people's driveways and entrances to roads.</p> <p>The Adult Education Centre has increased its number of courses tenfold without making adequate provision for staff and attendees parking.</p>	<p>All new schemes are monitored for the effectiveness. It is possible for restrictions to be amended if ineffective.</p> <p>Objection noted.</p>

	<p>The commuters, Christmas shoppers, Essex County Cricket Attendees and ALL the workers it seems like - that work in the now rapidly expanded City Centre.</p> <p>The pollution levels are very noticeable along with debris which comes indoors from the building work, heavily congested Waterhouse Lane - so much so we have needed to invest in two air purifiers and avoid opening the main windows just the fanlight windows for a minimal amount of time each week.</p> <p>I have lived here since December 1994 - 24 years plus and have experienced such a deterioration in the quality of air, hazardous driving conditions due to my estate being now used as a Public Car Park by ALL - even though much to my dismay there is plenty of official car parks with spaces available at a reasonable day rate for example Meteor Way £4 for the day.</p> <p>We feel that 10-11am a one hour parking restriction for non residents is wholly inadequate and will not meet the outcome of reducing the parking - the yellow lines that are and have been in place for years makes no difference to how drivers are parking or for how long. We feel very much that the whole estate especially Ravensbourne Drive, St Catherine's Road and our road St Peters Road needs and must be restricted the same as Ashford Road and Canunden Road already is 10-2pm as this seems to address the problem.</p> <p>Please give our comments the consideration it rightly deserves.</p>	
19	I hereby email to advise that I fully support the proposed restrictions being implemented.	Support noted.
20	<p>I am in full support of the The South Essex Parking Partnership (Variation no. 82) Order 201</p> <p>I am in full support of a 'Resident Permit Parking Area' in all of the above roads to deter all day non-resident parking.</p> <p>I have concerns that all-day local worker and commuter parking is causing access issues, parking partially across driveways, and taking up on-street parking spaces so that residents, visitors and tradespeople cannot always park.</p>	Support noted.
21	<p>I do recognise the difficulties faced by residents particularly during weekdays.</p> <p>I too fully support the proposed scheme.</p>	Support noted.
22	I fully support the proposed parking restrictions.	Support noted.
25	Whilst I agree to the parking restrictions in principle, I don't agree that residents should have to purchase a parking permit to park outside of their property, I feel that each household should be	The permit cost covers the enforcement and

	allowed at least one parking permit free of charge.	administration of the scheme. Objection noted.
26	PLEASE NOTE I fully support the proposal for parking restrictions in the Beeches Rd area	Support noted.

Representations & responses relating to Ashford Road

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
4	<p>I received a letter through the post with the above reference, I tried to look on the enquirer website and the quoted Chelmsford government website for details of the amendments to parking in Ashford Road but no information was on either of these sites.</p> <p>I do wish there to be parking restrictions on Ashford Road - I live at Ashford Road - the current parking permit system only stops commuters abandoning their cars on Ashford Road and pushes them onto the main thorough fare causing traffic congestion and unsafe distances without a clear view of oncoming traffic when it is down to single file due to parked cars.</p> <p>I would like it if there was no parking or no stopping at all on all the roads in this area between 8:30am to 6pm other than offloading eg 10 minutes. When the school is starting or finishing the parking is absolutely ridiculous and the parents leave cars irresponsibly and illegally parked (ie in front of and on junctions) for substantial periods of time - they seem to arrive a good half hour before they need to in order to obtain a parking spot which basically means I cannot access the area in my own car around these times.</p> <p>I don't object to the parking restrictions - I support them! I just wish they were more encompassing - I have now seen Ashford Road is restricted to 10 - 11am residents parking - that is better than nothing but I would like it from 8:30 to end of day. Please register my support not objection - it would be awful with no restrictions.</p>	<p>All new schemes are monitored for the effectiveness. It is possible for restrictions to be amended if ineffective.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

Representations & responses relating to Beeches Road

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
3	I confirm I am in complete agreement with the proposed parking restrictions	Support noted.
10	We would like to register our support for the proposed parking restrictions for variation no 82 Order 201 which includes Beeches Road Chelmsford. We have no objections.	Support noted.
39	<p>I write with regard to the parking proposals outlined for the Westlands Estate as detailed in your letter of 22 March.</p> <p>I am in full agreement with this. Moving through the estate is becoming more and more difficult with the number of cars left during the day at the kerbsides while the owners commute to work. It is</p>	Restrictions will be enforced as part of a rota as other roads in Chelmsford currently are.

	<p>exacerbated in term time with "mum run" delivery and collection at Westlands Primary School. This will of course only be of value if it is rigorously enforced.</p> <p>It would also be of considerable help for traffic calming of some kind to be installed in Beeches Road between Forest Drive and the entrance to the park at the bottom of the hill. I am aware this has been raised in the past and I understand it was then refused as the road is a bus route. That argument is surely invalid as there are other roads in Chelmsford suitably "calmed". Lawn Lane is a case in point.</p>	<p>Request for traffic calming should be directed to Essex County Council. The SEPP can only consider on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
40	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed parking restrictions on Beeches Road, Chelmsford. I feel the proposal will massively improve safety by reducing the number of parked cars, the majority of which are commuters, which make the road narrow and sometimes difficult to manoeuvre. I know also buses find the journey along Beeches Road quite difficult.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
41	<p>Thank you for your letter in March regarding the proposed parking restrictions. As residents of Beeches Road, we wholeheartedly support the proposed restrictions on waiting in our road and surrounding streets and the introduction of residential parking permits. We can confirm that Beeches Road is currently used on a daily basis for all day parking by commuters which not only hinders access by residents and their visitors to their properties but causes difficulties for the buses and other road users due to the resulting congestion and severely reduced visibility. Additionally, we routinely witness parking and even driving on the pavements by road users attempting to overcome these issues which naturally places pedestrians and other road users at risk. We look forward to the introduction of these proposed restrictions which we anticipate will tackle the issues, especially close to the primary school at Beeches Close during school opening and closing times. Our only request is that once introduced, please can the Council ensure sufficient enforcement to make these restrictions effective.</p>	<p>Restrictions will be enforced as part of a rota as other roads in Chelmsford currently are.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
44	<p>Please note my views on said parking proposals.</p> <p>1. Beeches Road is a main bus route and living on the sharp bend I note that there is no restriction on parking between houses 79/85 (the inside of this bend. We have often had parking at this point. House 85 has a bus stop in front, the buses on a lot of occasion pass on this bend they mount the curb, back wheels only to pass.</p> <p>Motorists are tempted to park on this bend, some becoming upset when we suggest they don't.</p> <p>2 In my view it's important to place double yellow lines at this point on the road side – the fear is when all proposed restrictions are in place, we are in line for a serious accident.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p>

45	<p>We are in support of parking restrictions and permits for Beeches Road residents. Please could you confirm that it includes the part of the road that is directly outside the property 159 Beeches Road?</p> <p>We are in favour of full-time permits for Beeches Road residents. Will action also be taken to prevent cars mounting the kerb and parking on the remaining grass area that is not enclosed on the junction of Forest Drive and Beeches Road West side?</p>	<p>The proposal does include the area outside of 159 Beeches Road.</p> <p>Longer hours of operation would require an objection to the current proposal and re-advertising.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
-----------	---	--

Representations & responses relating to Benedict Drive

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
12	<p>As a long standing resident of Benedict Drive I wish to express my full support for all the proposals set out in this document.</p> <p>These restrictions are long overdue.</p>	Support noted.
13	<p>As a resident of Benedict Drive I wish to express my full support for all the proposals set out in this document.</p> <p>These restrictions are long overdue.</p>	Support noted.
18	<p>I am writing to extend my full support in the proposed parking restrictions in reference to the above case.</p>	Support noted.
23	<p>I fully support proposed parking restrictions in your letter of 22.03.19 in Benedict Drive.</p>	Support noted.

Representations & responses relating to Dane Road

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
30	<p>Can I confirm my support for the proposed parking restrictions outlined in the (VARIATION NO.82) ORDER 201*</p> <p>The above proposals should deal with the inconsiderate all-day local worker and commuter parking that is increasingly causing access and road user safety issues in this residential area. Such parking has caused problems including emergency service and delivery vehicle access, partial driveway blockage, lack of parking for residents and a detrimental environmental/amenity impact. Many vehicles have</p>	Support noted.

	<p>begun to mount the pavements when confronted with oncoming vehicles on the wrong side of the road - (particularly in Ravensbourne Drive south of Hawkhurst Close where forward visibility is severely restricted by the commuter parking). This has caused a number of near misses to pedestrians and this safety issue is likely to increase and become more serious as the commuter parking increases further into the surrounding street area outlined in the scheme,.</p> <p>I hope therefore that the scheme is fully approved in line with the overwhelming results of the earlier informal consultation carried out with residents.</p> <p>I therefore look forward to the approval and implementation of the scheme at your earliest opportunity.</p>	
32	herby register their support for this proposal	Support noted.
33	<p>I support the proposals as set out in Variation no82 Order 201 although I am Of the opinion that the restrictions in Dane Road, Ravensbourne Drive and Beeches Road should be for longer periods ie 2 hours rather than an hour.</p> <p>Thank you for the message. I support the Order as drafted.</p>	<p>Longer hours of operation would require an objection to the current proposal and re-advertising.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

Representations & responses relating to Hawkhurst Close

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
11	<p>further to receiving your parking restrictions letter dated 22/3/19, I am addressing a number of points I would like to put to you that you may be able to answer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why in your letter you have said that any previous informal consultation (letters) cannot be considered? So the expense of sending out letters in January 2018 to all residence asking for their views on these changes was a total waste of time. I would like to add that in between this time i had received a parking ticket outside my own house which was appealed and rejected, but scores of mums parking up and down my street and others near the school can do so on corners of junctions etc and still do not seem to be fined or moved on by police for dangerous parking. 2. I would also like to point out that the 'notice of proposals' hung on the lamp post is the most confusing piece of literature for anyone and could be set out in a more simple way. 3. To sum up, I would like to have permit parking in my street (hawkhurst close) for the times proposed in your letter (point 7) I think! and please can we get this sorted out ASAP. 	<p>An informal consultation is carried out first to seek residents' views and to gauge if there is enough support to proceed the formal consultation. If there is not enough support, then SEPP would not go through the time consuming and costly legal process of implementing a TRO.</p> <p>The 'Notice of Proposal' is set out in standard format. The</p>

	Preferably not this time next year.	terminology used is that which is widely used for the implementation of parking restrictions. Support and comments noted.
28	I have read the above proposals but must point out that these do not address the parking problem in Hawkhurst Close at school drop off times. As Hawkhurst Close is a narrow road, during these times ie 8.30am to 9.30am and 2.30 to 3.30pm, it is very difficult and sometimes impossible to have access to or egress from number 1 Hawkhurst Close due to cars being parked opposite my driveway. The only answer to this Monday to Friday problem is for the restriction to be in force between these times and for the rules to be patrolled by enforcement officers.	The South Essex Parking Partnership would not consider restrictions, apart from junction protection, that prevent school drop off/pick up as this would put pressure on other nearby areas. It is also difficult to enforce where short term invasions occur. SEPP Policy 7.5. Objection noted.

Representations & responses relating to Nabbott Road

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
9	Regarding the above parking restrictions on Nabbott Road. We would like it noted that we at Nabbott Road are in full support of the restrictions as noted in the above order.	Support noted.

Representations & responses relating to Ravensbourne Drive

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	With reference to your recent letter concerning the above proposed parking restrictions for Ravensbourne Drive I agree to these changes.	Support noted.
2	As a resident at ravensbourne drive I SUPPORT the parking restrictions proposal Variation 82 order 201	Support noted.
8	Dear Sir/Madam, I have just reviewed the variation no. 82 on line and would like to offer my full support for the proposal. The residents of Hawkhurst Close and myself remain concerned that Chelmsford City Council have not resolved the issue of parking by parents at school time in the Close	The South Essex Parking Partnership would not consider restrictions, apart from junction

	<p>opposite residents driveways making it difficult to access/egress their property safely. There is also the pollution problem especially when parents sit in their cars with the engine running whether winter or summer, when you approach them over our concerns we are just met with verbal abuse from the parents which is totally unacceptable. I believe the council owe the residents of Hawkhurst Close a common Law Duty of Care in providing a safe access/egress to their properties.</p> <p>When the full order has been implemented has there been any consideration to the fact that Ravensbourne Drive will become a race track with vehicles speeding once parking restrictions have been put in place and parked cars removed. I raised this many years ago when our children were very young and was told nothing can be done as Ravensbourne Drive was on a bus route, suffice to say I did not respond if that was the level of knowledge expressed by the Council regarding the area.</p> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation Variation no 82 Order 201. I strongly object to the time restriction for parental parking in Hawkhurst Close and would like to see that change to reflect residents having a safe access/egress to their properties, driveways at all times. I also mentioned the issue of pollution from parents vehicles parked with their engines running whilst waiting for their children. With any such scheme it is also important to ensure the correct enforcement is applied to stop illegal parking, just recently I had to leave home in my car at the start of school time and witnessed vehicles parked on double yellow lines, vehicles parked in time restricted zones and three vehicles parked on the zig-zag lines adjacent the pedestrian crossing, whilst there is no continual enforcement parents will take advantage of this to suit their needs and not the safety of the local residents. I do hope that other residents in Hawkhurst Close express their concerns to you as they do me.</p>	<p>protection, that prevent school drop off/pick up as this would put pressure on other nearby areas. It is also difficult to enforce where short term invasions occur. SEPP Policy 7.5.</p> <p>Objection noted.</p>
15	<p>Please treat this email as evidence of support for the proposed traffic variation in ravenbourne Drive and surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
16	<p>I would like to strongly support the proposal to implement parking restrictions in Ravensbourne Drive, which is the road in which live. I have written to local councillors many times pointing out the dangers caused in this road by commuters parking all day whilst going to work. This virtually makes the lower part of the road (Beaches Road to Nabbot Road particularly) a one lane road. This is a very busy road, especially at school times, with parents driving and walking their children to school. On at least three occasions I have witnessed a driver mount the pavement with all four wheels to avoid having to wait. One was a four wheeled drive vehicle, one a white van that must have travelled at least 100 yards (it disappeared from my sight still on the pavement) along the path and most recently a car. This happened when we got were very slowly backing out of our drive because we we doing so blind to traffic coming through. Two cars pulled in to allow another car through coming from the opposite direction and who had right of way, we very slowly started to continue backing out when the second</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

	<p>car obviously lost patience and pull up on to the pavement and headed straight for us, only turning down our neighbours drop down curb and going off behind us. A quite scary occurrence, particularly for me in the passenger seat. These are the worst cases, but I couldn't say how many time cars have been driven with two wheels on the pavement, it is an every day occurrence. Apart from this there is nowhere for delivery vans to stop and, as I can vouch for, nowhere for ambulances to pull in. Often inconsiderate parking means we have to drive off in the opposite direction to the way we want because the car is parked so close to our drop down that turning is only possible from one way. As I have said, this is a busy road, particularly at school time, and I feel it is only a matter of time before there is an accident. I have been told several times when I have written on this issue, that it is illegal to drive on the pavement! I know that and I'm pretty sure the drivers who do so know that, but it still happens nevertheless as does speeding along here. The only sure way to cure this problem must be to reduce the parking. A simple restriction of 'no parking allowed between 10.00 am and 11.00 am Monday to Friday' would be a great help. I feel it should not just be down to the residents requirements but also to the bigger issue of safety. Hopefully, you will be of the same view, and permit this proposal to go through.</p>	
24	<p>We are pleased something positive is now going to help sort this parking problem out. My end of Ravensbourne drive (lower end) has a BLIND SPOT, it does Not matter weather you are going down or coming up it is a single track road. When I have been walking towards home from the park there has been A lot of vehicles including mums with children driving down the pavement to impatient to wait a few seconds. My only concern is that MORE motorist will Use Ravensbourne Drive as if they are at Brands Hatch. We both support the parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Any speeding issues should be reported to the Police. Support noted.</p>
29	<p>I would be pleased to agree that house holders in Ravensbourne Drive could obtain a Parking Permit, should they wish to do so. I would certainly like to buy one when they are available. With regards to dangerous car parking in my road where up to 25 cars parked nose to tail causing hazardous conditions where traffic coming in either direction cannot see around the bend in the road should be prevented to park there, say between 7 and 5pm or similar. This would cut out the parking and make it safer for children to walk Down the road to their school which is off Beeches Road. The people who park in Ravensbourne Drive can be seen getting out of their cars and walking to the railway station or Chelmsford City businesses. They obviously do not wish to use the City's car parks. My letter was in favour of parking restrictions in Ravensbourne Drive as a guard against indiscriminate parking by individuals who come from outside and use the road as a car park. This makes it highly dangerous for children walking to primary school, ambulances on call, and not forgetting local motorists trying to reach the other end of the road without being stopped by not enough room to</p>	<p>Longer hours of operation would require an objection to the current proposal and re-advertising. Support noted.</p>

	pass these interlopers. Please make sure that my opinion was in favour of parking restrictions etc.	
37	Regarding the proposal for parking restrictions (Variation No 82) Order 201*. I am writing this letter in support of the proposal.	Support noted.
43	<p>As a resident of Ravensbourne Drive I support the parking restriction proposal and indicated so in the previous consultation.</p> <p>I would like to make you aware of some more subtle consequences of the all day parking problem, which the authority could consider if further support proves to be necessary.</p> <p>In common with many other locations in Chelmsford the traffic nuisance has increased very noticeably over the last 20 years.</p> <p>There are two principal elements. The twice a day school run. The nominally twice a day but often more frequent "Rat Running" to avoid congestion in the Waterhouse lane area. I can see that there is little that can be done to mitigate these.</p> <p>However the point I wish to make is that both of the above are exacerbated by all day non residential parking which creates a predominantly single lane route and chicanes that disrupt the traffic flow making it more noisy and more of a nuisance. There are two bends at the North end and these result in motorists driving blind, without due care, at an inappropriate speed, on the wrong side of the road in an attempt to rapidly get round the line of obstructing parked cars.</p> <p>Currently the number of cars parked in the street on a non working day, by residents or visitors, is very much less and not constrictive.</p> <p>I am both a motorist and a frequent cyclist. When cycling I have had several very unpleasant experiences when encountering a fast travelling car(s) on the wrong side of the road as I've entered one of the bends. In most cases the drivers did not slow down when sighting me. This aspect is a real danger to cyclists and in my opinion is the most serious consequential effect.</p> <p>I hope this input is useful and that the proposal can be rapidly expedited.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention.</p>	Support noted.

Representations & responses relating to St Catherine's Road

Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
6	We are both writing in support of this proposal. This is due to the difficulties we presently experience when accessing our road via Ravensbourne Drive. Without this proposal the situation will only worsen.	Support noted.
17	<p>I refer to your letter of 22.03.19 regarding proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>My wife and I are the residents at St Catherines Road, which is one of the roads covered by the</p>	Restrictions will be enforced as part of a rota as other roads in Chelmsford currently are.

	<p>proposals.</p> <p>My wife and I fully support and are in agreement with these proposals as local workers and commuters are taking up on street parking spaces, causing major problems to residents and tradespeople.</p> <p>This issue has been exacerbated in St Catherines Road in the past three weeks as every weekday we now have between 7 and 10 cars used by non residents being parked in our road, particularly the east part. They park on the south side of St Catherines Road and those of us living on the north side have particular problems getting of and on to our driveways. Today there are 11 cars so parked.</p> <p>There is a free for all between 8.00 and 8.30am each weekday morning as they fight for space, leading to parking without any apparent regard for the residents access. Today one such car was parked on the double yellow lines without any apparent regard that they were breaking the law.</p> <p>The drivers appear to all work at the ECL Wellbeing Hub building on the corner of St Catherines Road and Ravensbourne Drive, where I understand the upper floor have recently been converted into office space.</p> <p>As this scheme is designed to protect residents, can you reassure us that workers at the ECL building will not be receiving any special permits or dispensations which would allow them to override the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions need to be firmly reinforced as otherwise we feel that local workers and commuters will just ignore them and take a risk that they may be caught and penalised.</p>	<p>Only residents can obtain permits.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
27	<p>The proposed parking restrictions for St Catherines Road have our approval but I do have one query.</p> <p>There has been an increase in cars parking in St Cathrines Road recently. i understand that this is due to Essex County Council now using the Chelmsford Wellbeing Hub (ECL) in Ravensbourne Drive as offices as well as for its original intended purposes as an adult education centre.</p> <p>Can you confirm whether the people using the offices will be subject to the new parking restrictions or will they have access to permits to allow them to park all day in St Catherines Road without any restrictions?</p>	<p>Only residents can obtain permits.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

34	I support the proposed parking restriction	Support noted.
35	I support the parking restrictions proposed for St Catherines Road	Support noted.
36	I am formally responding supporting the above proposal	Support noted.
42	<p>Further to your letter dated 22nd March I email to agree with the parking restrictions proposed within Variation No.82.</p> <p>I live in St Catherine's Road and when members of the public park on this road, by Ravensbourne Road it can be very difficult to get out of my driveway and I am unable to sometimes have visitors as there is no parking available.</p> <p>I have been advised that the community centre on Ravensbourne Drive now has either Essex County Council or Chelmsford City Council officers working from there, those members of staff now also park on the road around St Catherine's Road and this increases the traffic, this needs to be looked into accordingly.</p>	Support noted.

Representations & responses relating to St Peter's Road		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
31	<p>We have seen the proposal regarding parking restrictions in St.Peters Road, Chelmsford, and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>These look satisfactory to us.</p> <p>We look forward them being implemented .</p>	Support noted.
38	I agree to a parking zones in the Beeches road area.	Support noted.

**SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
(TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB COMMITTEE**

5 September 2019

AGENDA ITEM 4

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL) (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING CONSOLIDATION) (VARIATION NO.79) ORDER 201* Part 2
	Relating to Exeter Road and Torrington Close, Chelmsford
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 (Chelmsford City Council) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) (Variation No.79) Order 201* Part 2

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 but amended by reducing the operational hours of the permit scheme to a 1-hour restriction, in the form of Monday to Friday 11am to Noon; 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	The purpose of this Order is to vary the Borough Council of Chelmsford (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) Order 2009 as set out below: -																					
1.2	The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Exeter Road and Torrington Close, Chelmsford.																					
1.3	On 19 September 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Torrington Close requesting parking restrictions, to deter all-day non-resident parking. The request was supported by residents from Torrington Close and Exeter Road.																					
1.4	<p>In line with the request, an informal consultation was carried out with all residents of Exeter Road and Torrington Close to seek their views.</p> <p>The consultation results were as follows:</p>																					
	<table border="1" data-bbox="276 831 1426 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="276 831 475 992">Road</th> <th data-bbox="475 831 608 992">Number of properties</th> <th data-bbox="608 831 746 992">Number of responses</th> <th data-bbox="746 831 906 992">Number in favour of permit parking</th> <th data-bbox="906 831 1045 992">Number not in favour</th> <th data-bbox="1045 831 1254 992">Number in favour of DYL on junctions</th> <th data-bbox="1254 831 1426 992">Number not in favour of DYL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 992 475 1064">Torrington Close</td> <td data-bbox="475 992 608 1064">23</td> <td data-bbox="608 992 746 1064">19 (89%)</td> <td data-bbox="746 992 906 1064">17 (89%)</td> <td data-bbox="906 992 1045 1064">2 (11%)</td> <td data-bbox="1045 992 1254 1064">18 (95%)</td> <td data-bbox="1254 992 1426 1064">1 (5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 1064 475 1137">Exeter Road</td> <td data-bbox="475 1064 608 1137">13</td> <td data-bbox="608 1064 746 1137">11 (85%)</td> <td data-bbox="746 1064 906 1137">7 (64%)</td> <td data-bbox="906 1064 1045 1137">4 (36%)</td> <td data-bbox="1045 1064 1254 1137">9 (82%)</td> <td data-bbox="1254 1064 1426 1137">2 (18%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour	Number in favour of DYL on junctions	Number not in favour of DYL	Torrington Close	23	19 (89%)	17 (89%)	2 (11%)	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	Exeter Road	13	11 (85%)	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)
Road	Number of properties	Number of responses	Number in favour of permit parking	Number not in favour	Number in favour of DYL on junctions	Number not in favour of DYL																
Torrington Close	23	19 (89%)	17 (89%)	2 (11%)	18 (95%)	1 (5%)																
Exeter Road	13	11 (85%)	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)																
1.5	The above results met the SEPP criteria for progression to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order on both roads. 16 of the 30 total respondents opted for a 9am-5pm scheme, 8 opted for a 10-11am & 2-3pm scheme.																					
1.6	<p>It was agreed with the Lead Councillor and Lead Officer for parking matters for Chelmsford to cost a scheme to propose a resident permit parking scheme operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 9am to 5pm, and double yellow lines on the junctions. It was estimated at £3000. This cost would be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Chelmsford, to publish one Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>The request was placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee on 8th March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order</p>																					
1.7	The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 7 th June 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.																					
1.8	When the Order was published on 7 June 2018 a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced.																					

1.9	<p>A letter was also sent to all residents of Exeter Way and Torrington Close on 25 May 2018, inviting them to comment. Copy provided below:</p> <p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Chelmsford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No.79 Order 201*.</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) will shortly be publishing the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order. The proposal seeks to install 'No Waiting at any time' parking restrictions on the junctions of Springfield Green, Torrington Close, Falmouth Road and Tavistock Road at its junction with Exeter Road and provide a resident permit parking scheme in Exeter Road and Torrington Close which will operate from Monday to Friday between the hours of 9am to 5pm.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer on the 7 June and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can be found on the Council's website from 7 June:</p> <p>https://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/parking-and-travel/parking-restrictions/view-current-and-proposed-parking-restrictions/chelmsford-parking-restrictions/</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day statutory 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 Sub Committee (TRO Objections) 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. Any person that submits a representation during the 21-day statutory period will receive a copy of the report in advance of the meeting and invited to attend, where they will have the opportunity to speak to the Committee members before a decision is made.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments (objection or support) on or after the 7 June you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 29 June.</p> <p><u>This is your opportunity to formally respond to the proposal.</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	The correspondents have made several 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 following these comments, the Order should be made with the amendment of reduced permit parking times to a 1-hour restriction in the form of Monday to Friday 11am to Noon.

List of Appendices

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 resident of Tavistock dated 7 th June 2018	Objection
2	Email from resident of Exeter Road dated 7 th June 2018	Objection
3	Email from resident of Redruth Close dated 11 th June 2018	Objection
4 -10	Email from residents of Exeter Road dated 12 th June 2018	Objection
11	Email from resident of Torrington Close dated 18 th June 2018	Support
12	Email from parent from Saints pre-school dated 21 st June 2018	Objection
13	Email from parent from Saints pre-school dated 25 th June 2018	Objection
14	Email from Managers of All Saints Pre- School dated 25 th June 2018	Objection
15	Email from parent from Saints pre-school dated 25 th June 2018	Objection
16	Email from local Councillor dated 25 th June 2018	Objection
17	Email from staff member of All saints Church dated 26 th June 2018	Objection
18	Email from resident of Springfield Green dated 25 th June 2018	Support
19	Email from grandparent of attendant of All Saints Pre- School dated 26 th June 2018	Objection
20	Email from Church visitor dated 26 th June 2018	Objection
21	Email from local resident dated 26 th June 2018	Objection
22	Email from Church visitor dated 27 th June 2018	Objection
23	Email from Church visitor dated 27 th June 2018	Objection
24	Email from Church visitor dated 27 th June 2018	Objection
25	Email from Church visitor dated 27 th June 2018	Objection
26	Email from resident of Springfield Place dated 27 th June 2018	Comment
27	Resident of Torrington Close dated 28 th June 2018	Support
28	Email from Church visitor dated 28 th June 2018	Objection
29	Email from Church visitor dated 28 th June 2018	Objection
30	Email from secretary of church dated 28 th June 2018	Objection
31	Email from Church visitor dated 28 th June 2018	Objection
32	Email from Church visitor dated 28 th June 2018	Objection
33	Email from Church visitor dated 29 th June 2018	Objection
34	Email from resident of Tavistock Road dated 29 th June 2018	Objection

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 7 June 2018

Representations & responses relating to Exeter Road area		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	<p>Whilst I recognise that there is a significant problem with commuter parking in Exeter Road I object to this proposal since there has been no apparent consideration of the effect that this scheme will have on surrounding roads. As far as I am aware residents of surrounding roads have not been consulted over this scheme.</p> <p>I am a resident of Tavistock Road and this scheme will lead to displacement of parking into that road with, presumably, the inevitable introduction of a costly and inconvenient permit parking system there. Please confirm that you have received this objection.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding displaced parking.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the introduction of any parking restriction may displace some vehicles elsewhere. However, it is difficult to determine its impact until after a scheme is implemented</p>
2	<p>In general, we (my wife and me) agree with the proposals but have one comment concerning a "<i>Permit Parking Area</i>".</p> <p>This area is in front of our house described as "<i>North west side from a point 10 metres north east of its junction with Torrington Close in a north easterly direction to a point 14 metres south west of its junction with Tavistock Road</i>". Currently we see a great deal of car and pedestrian activity in the mornings when parents and children are going to The Tyrrells Primary School in Tavistock Road and again in the afternoons.</p> <p>We have no objection to the continued use of parents leaving their cars in front of our house during these two times. With the introduction of the "<i>Permit Parking Area</i>" from "<i>9am to 5pm</i>", this school car parking will have to cease in front of our house and therefore they will have to move to other areas not affected by the permit scheme.</p> <p>We do believe this area in front of our house should be part of the permit parking scheme but is it possible to have just this "<i>Permit Parking Area</i>" to be "<i>10-11am and 2-3pm</i>". I know this will only provide a few extra car parking spaces for the school run but it might help? I guess that having one area to police with different times may</p>	<p>Objection to the operational times noted.</p> <p>The results of the informal consultation highlighted a preference for a 9am-5pm scheme by residents.</p>

	cause confusion, therefore this idea could prove to be more trouble than it is worth. If that is thought to be the case then we will accept the blanket Mon-Fri 9 to 5 proposal.	
3	<p>I have read your notices dated 7 June that have been attached to various lamp posts in Exeter Road; I live in one of the bungalows in Redruth Close.</p> <p>As our main route of access is via Springfield Green and Exeter Road, we are used to the problems of turning from the Green at various times of the day. Spotting a clear passage of time to drive past about 12 cars parked opposite the houses is sometimes daunting/frustrating - particularly at school opening and closing times (Tyrrells School).</p> <p>I would make no issue with part 1 of your notice - total banning of parking at various junctions and surrounds; it is just common sense, not always displayed by all at large.</p> <p>My concern is that the "Permit Only" section 2 affecting Exeter Road and Torrington Close will just involve cars parking in the already narrow and congested Tavistock Road, Cambourne Close and, <u>yes, Redruth Close!!!</u> Unless we just learn to put up with a certain amount of waiting to pass, you will gradually be extending out into the further reaches of Springfield until we are all "permit only". Can you tell me how I can follow progress on this issue and meanwhile log my concerns?</p>	<p>Support for DYL noted.</p> <p>Objection noted regarding displaced parking.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the introduction of any parking restriction may displace some vehicles elsewhere. However, it is difficult to determine its impact until after a scheme is implemented.</p> <p>Those that have made comment will be updated via email / letter.</p>
4 - 10	<p>Ref to your letter dated 25th May 18, we are the residents on either side of the Road (from the junction of Falmouth Road and Exeter Road to the junction of Tavistock Road and Exeter Road)</p> <p>** Exeter Road – *****</p> <p>** Exeter Road – *****</p> <p>** Exeter Road – Self (* * *****)</p> <p>** Exeter Road – **** & ***** (**** has already submitted an email raising objection)</p> <p>** Tavistock Road – ***** and *****</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times and DYL at Tavistock Road / Exeter Road.</p>

	<p>** Tavistock Road – ***** and ***** *****</p> <p>** Tavistock Road - **** *****</p> <p>** Tavistock Road – **** *****</p> <p>We all are of the opinion that we do not wish to have the proposed parking [(a)Permit Parking along the Exeter Road from the junction with Falmouth Road till Tavistock Road and (b) No waiting at any time at the junction of Tavistock Road and Exeter Road] restrictions in our section of the Road.</p> <p>Instead we would request for timed parking restrictions along the Exeter Road from the junction with Falmouth Road till Tavistock Road as below – “No Parking between 10-11 am on one side and No Parking between 2-3pm on the other side of the Road”</p> <p>We all are copied on this email to confirm our opinion raising objection to the amendment proposal and suggesting a more conducive and appropriate measure for our part of the road. We hope you will kindly consider our request and accordingly take appropriate measures.</p>	
11	<p>As a resident of Torrington Close we fully support the above proposal. Vehicles are parked along Exeter Road by ‘commuters’ between 9 and 5 Monday to Friday. On a regular basis during this time it has become dangerous to exit Torrington Close either by Car or Bicycle as our view is completely blocked by parked cars on Exeter Road. On numerous occasions I have had to turn out of Torrington Close ‘blind’ and hope that nothing is coming. I have witnessed several times irate drivers in Exeter Road mounting the pavement (both going forward and in reverse) without looking and on one occasion a frantic mother had to pull her child to safety to avoid the irresponsible actions of a car mounting the pavement. Parents with pushchairs/children are regularly having to go on to the road to navigate around the crazy antics of car drivers. A few days ago a lorry had to deliver a ‘skip bag’ to one of the houses in Exeter Road and this resulted in a 15 minute hold up both ways on Exeter Road and surrounding roads because of the parked cars on Exeter Road. These are just a few examples of what has now become a difficult and dangerous environment to live in.</p> <p>In relation to Torrington Close the cars that are parked here during working hours are</p>	Support noted.

	<p>often parked on both sides of the road in a 'chicane type' formation which means cars can get through but – owing to Torrington Close being a particularly narrow road – larger vehicles, delivery lorries etc. cannot get through. More importantly an ambulance or fire engine would not have access which is a serious concern to the residents. Parking in Torrington Close also causes problems when trying to exit our driveways safely.</p> <p>We hope that the above proposal will be approved and implemented before someone is seriously hurt.</p>	
12	<p>I am aware of the proposition for parking restrictions/ permit parking along Exeter Road / Torrington Close.</p> <p>My son attends All Saints pre-school within All Saints Church, Springfield Green. As a direct consequence of implementing permit parking on the above roads, our preschool parking and operations will be severely affected. Whilst all the parents at the pre-school walk our children as often as we can, this is not always possible due to work or collecting of older siblings.</p> <p>The restrictions will struggle to deliver the equipment needed by the school on a daily basis, and these restrictions may deter future parents from sending their children to the preschool.</p> <p>The preschool has been at the church site for over 30 years, and is a small yet vital and important part of our community.</p> <p>My retired mother also volunteers at the preschool, and these changes may prevent her from being able to continue, to both her and the children's detriment.</p> <p>Whilst, as a resident of an area very close to a school, I appreciate the frustrations of congestion and parking due to school drop off, I believe this can be addressed in a way that would not affect our preschool. It is felt that a more suitable alternative of time restrictions / yellow lines should be considered.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted for your consideration</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times affecting parents of All Saints Pre-School</p>

<p>13</p>	<p>I would like to say that I formally object to the proposed parking restriction. Parking is already very limited in this area and will make it very difficult for me to drop off and pick up my children from the preschool which I will need to do by car once my older child starts school. The proposed permit parking restrictions will force more cars to park outside the church.</p> <p>The preschool is a much loved and valuable part of our community and would hate to see it close if parents and staff were unable to park. I hope this is taken into consideration when deciding whether to implement this restriction.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times affecting parents of All Saints Pre-School</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>On behalf of the All Saints' Pre School, Springfield Green, Chelmsford CM1 7HS we wish to formally object to point 5 and 8 in Variation No.79. In particular we wish to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Exeter Road, and Torrington Close.</p> <p>As you will be aware the All Saints Pre School provides invaluable child care for preschool children from the local community. In order for parents and staff to utilise the preschool there is a requirement for long term daily parking for both staff working at the preschool and short term parking for parents dropping off or collecting their children.</p> <p>If the proposed parking restrictions in point 5 of Variation No.79 are adopted the following scenarios are likely to happen. Any vehicle which currently parks in Exeter Close, Torrington Road etc. will be forced to look elsewhere for parking and it is likely they will attempt to utilise the parking bays immediately outside the church/preschool. This will in turn affect the ability for parents to stop safely immediately outside the preschool to drop off or collect their children.</p> <p>They will have to look further afield for a parking space in the wider local area and with the additional parking restrictions in this area it could take them some time to locate and could result in parents being very late to collect their children, causing inconvenience and potential distress to the young children.</p> <p>In addition the proposed plans would have an effect upon the ability of the members of staff at the preschool to find an appropriate daily car parking space. As you will be aware there is no parking available at the church/preschool they can use and therefore they will be unable to find any suitable parking space. This causes each member of</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times affecting parents of All Saints Pre-School & Staff Members</p>

	<p>staff a significant difficulty when they are required to carry additional resources and materials for the preschool in addition to snacks for 28 children which are unable to be stored at the church.</p> <p>In the longer term the impact of these proposed changes may result in parents deciding to move their children away from the preschool as logistically it is inconvenient, and if this happens the preschool may be forced to close.</p> <p>Whilst the preschool can fully understand the issues which the local residents face which has resulted in these proposals, we believe the suggested measures go too far and disrupt the wider community from freely accessing the preschool and church. For example, a better way to deal with the concerns over parking across driveways would be to simply paint double yellow lines across the driveway entrances for the local residents or to impose a one hour parking restriction.</p> <p>As a result we formally object to the proposed Variation No.79 as it pertains to Exeter Road and Torrington Close and request point 5 & 8 of the order is amended as to exclude these roads.</p> <p>In the alternative, if these objections are overridden then in the alternative we believe the staff of both the preschool and church should be added to the persons eligible to apply for a parking permit in the applicable zone 23.</p> <p>This will generate more revenue for the council and allow the staff of both the preschool and church to park close by and allow them to continue to provide the invaluable services to the local community.</p>	
15	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed 'permit parking only' restrictions as it pertains to Exeter Road and Torrington Close and request point 5 and 8 of the order is amended as to exclude these roads. My daughter attends 'All Saints Pre School' and it is such a good Pre School I have been traveling for 2 years from North Springfield by car so she can attend it. It is voluntary run therefore it relies on outside e.g. parents support/funding and parents have been supporting it for 30 years now, through sending their children to it and attending fund raising fetes etc. I have a degree in Early Childhood Studies myself and visited all the Pre School settings in the area, some more</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times affecting parents of All Saints Pre-School & Staff Members</p>

	<p>convenient for me, but decided All Saints offered the child lead nurturing and stimulating setting I wanted for my daughter. The Pre School is currently greatly concerned about the proposed parking restrictions, as for it to run successfully it is essential staff and parents can access parking directly outside the church. The Pre School feel if the 'permit parking' only restrictions go ahead people who were parking in the proposed area, will be forced to park outside the church, therefore using vital spaces needed by the Pre School community. This may in turn lead to less parents sending their children to the Pre School due to the inconvenience, which would mean the Pre School as it is voluntary funded would not survive. The Pre School and parents appreciate the frustration of some of the residents in the Exeter Road/Torrington Close area, but feel 'permit parking only' is not the solution. The Pre School community would like other solutions to be implemented e.g. 1 hour parking restrictions or yellow lines outside resident's drive ways. If these objections are over ridden, it is essential in my opinion both the staff of the Pre School and church should be added to the persons eligible for a parking permit in applicable Zone 23.</p>	
16	<p>I write as the local County member for Springfield on behalf of the various community groups at All Saints Church.</p> <p>I do accept the need for parking restrictions in Exeter Road and Torrington Close to alleviate the problems of all-day parking. However, I do have concerns about some aspects of the proposals in so far as they will impinge on the community activities at the Church.</p> <p>The Church and the adjoining Church Centre is a well-used community facility catering for a range of groups. These include the daily Pre-School group, uniformed youth groups and meetings and activities for self-help groups. Many attending are elderly and have mobility difficulties.</p> <p>The existing parking restriction outside the Church, no waiting for an hour from 12.30pm, with some sixteen spaces meets most needs. Inevitably there will be times when parking is required during this hour, for example when the Pre-School group have lunch time activities. There will also be weekday funerals where mourners may come from some distance and need to park. Also, weekday weddings generate parking demand.</p> <p>The residents permit parking scheme as proposed would make it almost impossible to run some of these activities. In addition, I am concerned that the displaced parking would then move along Springfield Green thereby creating another problem.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding the effect on the Church and Church Centre.</p>

	<p>If I might suggest, as an alternative, limited parking along the north west side of Exeter Road for say one hour just for the short distance from its junction with Springfield Green, would deter the all-day parking. This could be different from the 12:30 -13:30 currently outside the Church.</p> <p>Finally, I do not know if this is possible but if visitor's vouchers could be purchased by the Church to be used where the residents only permits apply, that would assist too. I hope the above points will be considered in the constructive way they are intended.</p>	
17	<p>Please may you reconsider the proposed permit parking restrictions for the following reasons.</p> <p>The parking problem will just be moved to another nearby road.</p> <p>The restricted parking will create a serious lack of parking for those using All Saints Church – weddings, funerals etc, Pre-school drop off and collection, staff and volunteers for all these events.</p> <p>The restricted parking will cause more parents to park where they should not and in even more dangerous places to drop off and collect from Tyrells Primary School causing a further risk to lives.</p> <p>I can understand the local feeling about people parking over driveways etc, my Mum lives right by the school and over many years we adjust the times we go in and out because of the school day times.</p> <p>When people move into the area they know they are moving near a school and a church and with that comes the sad stupidity that some people show with lack of consideration with their parking.</p> <p>The solution:</p> <p>Regular parking wardens to visit the area at school drop off and collection times. Target the area for a few weeks and fine people, the message will slowly start to get across.</p> <p>Continued liaison with the school who are desperately trying to get the parents to be</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding the effect on the Church and Church Centre and displaced vehicles.</p>

	<p>responsible, it is just a few who need to be targeted as they as usual ruin it for the majority.</p> <p>Consideration for a restricted parking time. This is about a community not about how much the council can make from parking permit fees.</p> <p>Should a parking permit be introduced to this area may there be permits granted to staff who work at the All Saints Pre School who use this area to park to free up outside the church for the drop off/pick up of their attendees. This pre school has operated from the church hall some 30 years so needs consideration.</p> <p>To further add to my e-mail. I formally object to the proposed Variation No 79 and request point 5 and 8 of the order is amended to exclude these roads.</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail, I would like to add one further point – to make it clear to many who disregard the Highway Code/rules f the road, double yellow lines on the corner of roads in this area so cars are not parked as close to junctions causing visibility restrictions for on-coming traffic etc. Of course once again 'policing' these parking restrictions. This is the biggest 'ask' – please?</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>I am the resident of ** Springfield Green whose boundary plot runs along a significant stretch of Exeter Road.</p> <p>I am supportive of the proposal to address the all day on street parking along the captioned roads but feel this needs some refinement in order to be sympathetic to the local Pre school and church activities at All Saints Church on Springfield Green.</p> <p>There is no argument that the roads in question suffer from unnecessary congestion caused by all day parking, likely from commuters leaving their car for the day before heading to the rail station. I agree that this needs to be addressed and introducing parking restrictions would appear to be a sensible approach.</p> <p>I understand that the proposal is that parking restrictions are anticipated from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday and that local residents would receive a parking permit.</p>	<p>Support with an amendment noted regarding operational times.</p>

Firstly, I do not think it would be necessary for local residents to receive a parking permit as nearly all houses along these roads have driveway and garage parking. Providing parking permits will likely just encourage residents to park their cars on the road rather than their driveway, allowing for additional cars to be considered and the congestion issue returns.

Secondly and most importantly, the pre-school at All Saints Church provides an invaluable service to the local community. Introducing parking restrictions to Exeter and Torrington would likely see the offending all day parkers move round the corner and use the parking bays outside the church. If cars are parked here from morning till evening it would cause issue for the parents and teachers of the pre-school who use these bays for quick and safe access to the pre-school.

The key here is the safety of the pre-school children which must be paramount in this decision. If parking outside the church is not available, then parents will be faced with parking elsewhere, away from the church thus causing an increased concern to the children's safety. With excitable children rushing to school from all directions, I can foresee potential incidents which can be avoided by having the parents able to use the parking bays directly outside the church.

I am also aware that the teachers working at the pre-school need to park close to the church as they often carry considerable amounts of equipment to the church which will be difficult if they are forced to park elsewhere.

I feel that the required action would be to introduce parking restrictions on Exeter and Torrington but instead of these running from 9am to 5pm each working day, they would be better served running from 12.30pm to 1.30pm each working day.

This would deter the all day parkers who I understand are the group being targeted. The time mentioned would also allow the pre-school to continue operating without impairment and importantly, focus on the safety of the children attending.

As mentioned above, I do not think it is necessary to issue parking permits to local residents for the reasons detailed. I would like these views taken into account.

<p>19</p>	<p>I refer to the proposed parking restrictions/ permit parking along Exeter Road / Torrington Close/ Springfield Green.</p> <p>My Grandson attends All Saints pre-school within All Saints Church, Springfield Green. As a direct consequence of implementing permit parking on the above roads, our preschool parking and operations will be severely affected. Whilst all the parents at the preschool walk their children as often as they can, this is not always possible for those who work or have to drop off and collect older siblings from schools a long way from this preschool.</p> <p>I am a retired Grandmother who frequently looks after my two grandsons. I have to travel from Chelmer Village to Springfield, drop the eldest at school, then drive to preschool to drop the youngest at preschool. Also, I volunteer at preschool on a Thursday morning and need to park for the 3 1/2 hours I am there.</p> <p>The restrictions may deter future parents from sending their children to this preschool which is likely to force them to close. Volunteers would think twice too! The preschool has been at the church site for over 30 years and is a small yet vital and important part of our community.</p> <p>Also, funerals are still held at the church and where would the family's and friends of the deceased park? Would it be fair for them to run around after permits at this difficult time?</p> <p>I appreciate the frustrations of congestion and parking due to preschool drop off and collection, but I believe this must be addressed in a way that would not affect our preschool. The area outside the Church does not have houses coming onto it, therefore I don't see why the current restrictions that apply cannot remain.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted for your consideration.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding the effect on the Church and Church Centre</p>
<p>20</p>	<p>Please find below my objections to Variation No.79</p> <p>- The Exeter Road and Torrington Close proposed Permit Parking restrictions will force more cars to park outside the church. As a result the spaces outside the church will no longer be available for staff and parents.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Pre-School</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a valuable pre-school and forms part of the social community in the local area. It has operated from the church premises for the past 30 years and local parents rely on this business remaining open to provide learning opportunities. - Prospective parents will be discouraged from sending their children to this pre-school due to the inability to regularly use close and suitable parking spaces, which may result in the closure of the preschool. - Staff will struggle to deliver essential materials and resources to the preschool when they have to park further away - A suitable alternative of a proposed 1 hour restriction or yellow lines outside residences driveways should be considered. 	
21	<p>NO WAITING in Exeter Road, Falmouth Road, Tavistock Road, Torrington Close and Springfield Green and PERMIT PARKING in Exeter Road and Torrington Road.</p> <p>I am writing regarding the above proposals for No Waiting and Permit Parking. I live close to these roads and also work in the area. Having lived in Springfield for close to 30 years I feel I can comment on these parking plans.</p> <p>I agree that some parking restrictions need to be put in place for Exeter Road, particularly at the intersection with Springfield Green. Parked cars during the day in Exeter Road cause cars turning into Exeter Road from Springfield Road to have to back up onto the main road and stop traffic flow. However, I do not believe this affects Torrington Close at all. I think restricted hours would be sufficient to reduce parking in Exeter Road. I know people park their cars on Exeter Road who work close by but this is not a problem every day and certainly not all day long. I took a photo at 4pm today of Exeter Road and Torrington Close and they were virtually clear of any cars. I have attached these photos which I wish to be viewed as part of the consideration of my objections to the hours proposed. Therefore the suggestion of parking restrictions until 5pm or No Waiting at all is VERY heavy-handed in my opinion. I believe that restricted parking between 10-3pm would be much more appropriate so as to allow for some parking and especially for parents to drop their children off at the local school.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding the effect on the Church and Church Centre and displaced vehicles.</p>

	<p>One of my main objections to the changes is that the people parking cars in Exeter Road will just move their cars further up and park in Tavistock Road instead. At the moment there is an 'unofficial' one-way system operating whereby parents dropping off children drive in one direction past Tyrrells school as the road is very narrow. If people are driving around from either direction, it would cause even more traffic issues. People from out of area who usually park in Exeter Road who would now be parking in Tavistock Road have no idea of the problems it will cause.</p> <p>My other issue with the intended restrictions is that I live on Penzance Close and I am concerned that making such severe restrictions will just cause the problem to move to our road instead. Our road is very restricted in terms of parking and our drives are incredibly small, unlike Torrington Close and Exeter Road who have plenty of space on their own drives. In addition, parents dropping off children will have fewer places to park and so will be tempted to park in more inappropriate ways. They already park on the zigzag lines outside the school.</p> <p>I think No Waiting and Permit Parking needs to be made in consideration of both the traffic arising from Tyrrells School and to other residents who do not have sufficient drives to park all their cars and must then compete with the parked cars, which will inevitably move up towards Penzance Close, Taunton Road and Tavistock Road. I believe too the restrictions should be less severe and times for permit holders only restricted to 10-3 especially on Torrington Close.</p> <p>I would like to know if any meetings are to be held about these proposals.</p>	<p>Those that have made comment will be updated via email / letter.</p>
<p>22</p>	<p>Please find below my objections to Variation No.79</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Exeter Road and Torrington Close proposed Permit Parking restrictions will force more cars to park outside the church. As a result the spaces outside the church will no longer be available for staff and parents. - This is a valuable pre-school and forms part of the social community in the local area. 	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church and Church Centre.</p>

	<p>It has operated from the church premises for the past 30 years and local parents rely on this business remaining open to provide learning opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prospective parents will be discouraged from sending their children to this pre-school due to the inability to regularly use close and suitable parking spaces, which may result in the closure of the preschool. - Staff will struggle to deliver essential materials and resources to the preschool when they have to park further away - A suitable alternative of a proposed 1 hour restriction or yellow lines outside residences driveways should be considered. <p>I strongly oppose the introduction of the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>I am an elderly grandparent of children that use the pre-school and the proposed restrictions clearly will adversely affect me, and my participation in daily duties.</p>	
23	<p>I object to the park restrictions proposed to the Springfield church road (Exeter road/Torrington road) as it will severely affect the children and baby groups that are run there. Many times I have attended the breastfeeding support group and without driving and parking close by I wouldn't have been able to attend and get the help needed.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church Centre.</p>
24	<p>I wish to formally object to point 5 and 8 in Variation No. 79, in particular objecting to the proposed parking restrictions in Exeter Road/Torrington Close.</p> <p>I attend the NCT Breastfeeding group at All Saints Church, Springfield Green, Chelmsford, CM1 7HS. This is the only class of its type in the area, and as a mother struggling to breastfeed, and with no extended support from midwives or health visitors, this class makes a huge difference to my baby and my own life. It is too far to walk to this class and so driving is required. The parking restrictions would make it very difficult to attend this class, and hence I would like to object to the proposal and voice my opinion that having a 1-2 hour limitation to parking during the day would be a better approach.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church Centre.</p>
25	<p>On behalf of the NCT Breastfeeding Group, All Saints Church, Springfield Green, Chelmsford CM1 7HS we wish to formally object to point 5 and 8 in Variation No.79.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church Centre.</p>

In particular we wish to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Exeter Road, and Torrington Close.

The NCT Breastfeeding Group has been at All Saints Church for over 22 years and runs a 'Drop in' session every Wednesday morning, 52 weeks of the year. Most weeks we have between 5-15 mothers and their babies attend to seek Breastfeeding Support. The group is attended by mothers who travel to the venue and therefore require parking nearby.

For example last Wednesday of the 8 mothers who attended 2 walked and 6 drove. They travelled from South Woodham Ferrers, Melbourne, Beaulieu Park, Hatfield Peveral, Nounsley & Baddow. These mothers attending do not live in the local area as a direct result of the Essex County Council withdrawing the funding for the Infant Feeding Service 2 years ago and now only 4 Breastfeeding Groups remain out of 13 which had been located in many Children Centres within the Mid Essex Area. Mothers need support throughout their feeding journey with their babies and will travel to access it as long as they can access the venue with ease and parking for many is essential.

If the proposed parking restrictions in point 5 of Variation No.79 are adopted any vehicle which currently parks in Exeter Close, Torrington Road etc. will be forced to look elsewhere for parking.

On a Wednesday morning the parking bays immediately outside the church are always full by 9.45am as many people use them – in addition to mothers attending the Breastfeeding Group, Staff from the Priory, mothers attending the Church run Play Group (Children in Church) and people who attend the church service (also held on Wednesday morning) – See photos attached showing the parking at 9.55am this morning, 27th June. People who can't find a parking space outside the church currently park in Exeter Road, Torrington Close without this parking people will have to look further afield for a parking space in the wider local area and with the additional parking restrictions in this area it could take them some time to locate – many first attended the group during the very early days following the birth of their baby (within the first couple of weeks for many) – their mobility is restricted and having to walk further with a baby car seat may prove impossible.

Volunteers who runs the Breastfeeding Group also require parking as they also live too

	<p>far to walk.</p> <p>Whilst the Breastfeeding Group can fully understand the issues which the local residents face which has resulted in these proposals, we believe the suggested measures go too far and disrupt the wider community from freely accessing support which they no longer have in their local area. For example, a better way to deal with the concerns over parking across driveways would be to simply paint double yellow lines across the driveway entrances for the local residents or to impose a one hour parking restriction.</p> <p>As a result we formally object to the proposed Variation No.79 as it pertains to Exeter Road and Torrington Close and request point 5 & 8 of the order is amended as to exclude these roads.</p>	
26	<p>Outside Springfield Place there is space for a car to park – there are always multiple cars parked here often over the drive so I request the no waiting Mon – Fri 8-6 be extended as far as the bus stop. I also request the no waiting 12.30 – 1.30 be extended back to the front of the church. Both of these if enforced will enable the buses to move freely from Lawn Lane to Springfield Green.</p>	<p>Additional parking restrictions cannot be added once the proposal is published. Any consideration to add further parking restriction would need to be considered at a later date via a new application form, or the current proposal withdrawn, re-designed and re-advertised.</p>
27	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed parking restrictions in Torrington Close and Exeter Road. (Your reference SEPP/CCC/VAR79).</p> <p>We fully support the published proposals. Currently the junctions of Springfield Green/Exeter Road and Torrington Close/Exeter Road are very dangerous because of parking in both roads. Drivers attempting to enter and leave Torrington Close are completely blind to vehicles travelling along Exeter Road, especially those travelling from Springfield Green. Parking in Torrington Close also means that drivers are forced to leave the road by travelling on the wrong side. This means that not only are they 20nsighted to dangers in Exeter Road but they are also travelling on the wrong side. In addition to the danger this poses, vehicles trying to enter Torrington Close at the same time as others are trying to leave meet head on at the junction. This necessitates one or other driver reversing back some distance much increasing the hazard especially to pedestrians crossing. There are also then consequential knock on effects as a line of traffic forms in Exeter Road (again on the wrong side) and further congestion forms as</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

	<p>far back as the Springfield Green junction. It is not uncommon for the Exeter Road/Springfield Green junction to be blocked and tail backs including buses form all around Springfield Green – all because of parking in Torrington Close and Exeter Road. This is made especially bad at the entrance and exits to the NHS clinic and Priory Hospital. We believe that these problems could all be solved by the parking restrictions proposed.</p> <p>We also believe it is worth noting that when the recent extensions to the Priory Hospital were considered for planning permission, the local highways department in its response noted that the (then) existing off road parking provision at the Priory was already “at capacity”. The plans were nevertheless approved. The new extensions are now open and the Priory has undertaken a recruitment of additional staff. This expansion has added to the parking problems in the area.</p>	
28	<p>I would like to formally object to point 5 and 8 in variation no.79. In particular, to the proposed parking restrictions in Exeter Road and Torrington Close.</p> <p>As a parent of a child that uses the All Saints Preschool, I believe the proposed permit parking restrictions will cause more cars to park outside of the church, meaning spaces will no longer be available to staff and parents, and causing huge disruption along that stretch of road.</p> <p>This could result in parents being discouraged to send their children to this outstanding preschool as dropping their children off will be significantly more difficult.</p> <p>All Saints is an essential part of our local community, operating from the church premises for over 30 years.</p> <p>I believe a suitable alternative of a proposed 1 hour restriction or yellow lines outside residences should be considered, or that staff of both the preschool and the church should be allowed to apply for the relevant parking permit</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Pre-School</p>
29	<p>As a parent of a child who attends All Saints Pre School I am objecting to the proposed permit parking restrictions above as they will make more cars park outside the church, resulting in less available space than there is already for parents and staff of the pre school.</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Pre-School</p>

	<p>The pre school is a valuable part of the community which has been operating from these premises for 30 years . The lack of parking will discourage future parents from sending their child to this wonderful pre school and also make it extremely difficult for the employees of the pre school to park near their work place.</p> <p>A far more suitable proposal of 1 hour restrictions should be considered so as not to disadvantage the pre school.</p>	
<p>30</p>	<p>I write as secretary of the Parochial Church Council of All Saints' Church, located in Church Lane, Springfield.</p> <p>We support, in principle, the proposals to introduce parking restrictions in Exeter Road and Torrington Close to alleviate the problems of all-day parking. However, we have real concerns about the details of the proposals in so far as they are likely to severely restrict the community activities at the church.</p> <p>The Church and Church Centre is a community facility and is used extensively throughout the week by various groups ranging from a daily Pre-School group, Brownies, Guides, Boys' Brigade to meetings/activities for self-help groups and senior citizens, many of whom have mobility problems. These groups do not require all-day parking and, for some of the time, the sixteen or so spaces outside the church (with no waiting for an hour from 12.30pm) provides what is needed.</p> <p>However there are times during this no waiting period when parking is required – notably for the leaders of the Pre-School group when they have lunch time activities. There are also occasional weekday funerals where mourners may come from some distance and need to park. As weekday weddings are less expensive than Saturday weddings, there is the occasional need for weekday wedding parking.</p> <p>The provision in Exeter Road and Torrington Close for permit parking only between 9am and 5pm on Mondays to Fridays would make it almost impossible to run some of these activities. We are concerned that the only available parking would be on-road on Springfield Green and this would not help the smooth flow of traffic around the green.</p> <p>We would like to request that consideration be given to making the parking restriction</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church Centre.</p>

	<p>in Torrington Close and Exeter Road a limited period (1 hour) no waiting during weekdays but at a different time to that outside the church. That would allow short-term parking (that car owners enjoy at the moment) in these roads while deterring all-day parking.</p> <p>If the Parking Partnership feels that is not appropriate, we would request that consideration be given changing the proposed restriction on the short stretch of road on the north west side of Exeter Road (between Springfield Green and Torrington Close, where there are no houses) to limited time no waiting rather than permit parking.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you would confirm that, if the Partnership feels unable to meet either of these requests, the church is able to purchase blocks of visitor permits which can be used for limited time in the permit parking area.</p>	
31	<p>Please may you reconsider the proposed permit parking restrictions for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Exeter Road and Torrington Close proposed permit parking restrictions will force more cars to park outside the church. As a result, the spaces outside the church will no longer be available for staff and parents.</p> <p>The preschool at the church is a very valuable one, vital to forming part of the social community in the local area. It has operated for the past 30 years, so this matter needs careful consideration.</p> <p>Prospective parents may be discouraged from sending their children to the preschool, due to the inability to regularly use close, suitable parking. This may result in the closure of the preschool, which would be devastating and a huge loss to our local area.</p> <p>The restricted parking will cause more parents to park where they should not and in even more dangerous places to drop off and collect from Tyrrells Primary School, causing a further risk to lives. A suitable alternative of a proposed 1 hour restriction or yellow lines outside residences driveways should be considered.</p>	Objection noted regarding operational times effecting Church Centre.
32	I am writing to raise an objection to the proposed parking restrictions on Exeter Road.	Objection noted regarding operational

	<p>I am a parent of a child who attends All Saints pre school which runs in All Saints church hall. As a working parent I often rely on family members, who do not live locally, to drop off and collect my child from the pre school. There is limited parking outside the church frontage and if there is any other events taking place at the church then they rely on Exeter road for parking to pick up my child. If these restrictions are put in place then this will no longer be possible and there is no where else to park in the vicinity- we are not allowed use of either the Springfield clinic or Priory hospital car parks . This would leave myself and I believe other parents at the pre school in a position of having to consider sending our children elsewhere where we would be able to park. This would be a tragedy as All Saints is a fantastic pre school and a true asset to the local community. I am very sympathetic to the views of the residents of Exeter road but I believe most church users are parking for very short periods and therefore I would suggest an alternative of a 1 hour parking restriction to deter long term stays as an option to be considered.</p> <p>Furthermore, a member of the church council voiced a concern that if users are unable to park in Exeter Road then they will park alongside Springfield Green itself. As a regular user, with my children, of the Green and the playground opposite, I am very concerned of the potential dangerous hazard this will cause when crossing the road for use of the playground. I believe this should also be taken into consideration. Many thanks for taking the time to consider my objection</p>	<p>times effecting Pre-School</p>
<p>33</p>	<p>We respectfully submit this e mail in objection to the above mentioned case. Our daughter has been attending Trinity preschool for the past 2 years and our second born is due to start in November. Obviously the preschool is held dear to our heart and these proposed parking permit changes will personally cause us in the immediacy a degree of issue and inconvenience; but in the bigger picture it is far more important that the proposal is not granted. This proposal will without question bring in to doubt the continuation of a preschool which has served the local community for some 30 years and no doubt cared for and provided the first steps in education for some of those involved in this consultation/decision making process. The changes will not only cause issue for those parents dropping off children but also for the hardworking and caring staff who work at the preschool and within the church.</p> <p>Also the livelihood of the preschool will again be affected in so far that new parents</p>	<p>Objection noted regarding operational times affecting parents of All Saints Pre-School & Staff Members</p>

	<p>will not consider using the preschool when parking will become so troublesome.</p> <p>While we do understand the issues that local residents face we also feel that the current proposal seems to be a little excessive. We strongly hope that this proposal is refused and advise that an alternative option is sought.</p>	
34	<p>I object to the introduction of a parking permit scheme in the Exeter Road, Torrington Road, Falmouth Road area and greater restrictions on Springfield Green.</p> <p>My reasons are that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will move parked car further into the estate where there are no parking restrictions. • There is a popular primary/junior school in Tavistock Road. The road is already is already busy with pick up and drop off movements. This will exacerbate the tensions already felt along these roads. The school also runs a 3PR campaign and this parking scheme could undermine this campaign. • People may park on the Springfield Green hump backed railway bridge making crossing dangerous on this important desire line to school • The cars parked at the entrance to Exeter Road narrow the road reducing traffic speeds into the residential area with a primary/junior school • Many of the houses fronting the roads where the permit scheme is to be introduced have front gardens which can accommodate at least two cars. Allowing permit parking supports greater car ownership which is contrary to the wider aims and objectives of promoting sustainable transport and managing congestion. • I was unable to easily find the order on the website of either the SEPP, ECC or CCC sites – there was no obvious page which said "consultation", or link in the information posted on street. 	<p>Objections noted regarding operational times affecting school parking, displacement of vehicles, traffic speeds and congestion.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

**SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
(TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB COMMITTEE**

5 September 2019

AGENDA ITEM 5

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL) (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING CONSOLIDATION) (VARIATION NO.79) ORDER 201* Part 2 Relating to Mildmay Road, Chelmsford.
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 (Chelmsford City Council) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) (Variation No.79) Order 201* Part 2

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 withdrawn and redesigned to incorporate additional permit parking and re-advertised.
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	The purpose of this Order is to vary the Borough Council of Chelmsford (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) Order 2009 as set out below: -
1.2	The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of part of Mildmay Road, opposite Gladstone Court.
1.3	On 11 August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Gladstone Court requesting part of the resident permit parking in Mildmay Road, opposite Gladstone Court, is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to assist vehicular access to and from Gladstone Court, particularly for larger vehicles. The request was supported by a 27-signature petition from residents, family members, organisations and local Councillors.
1.4	It is acknowledged that larger vehicles may have difficulty manoeuvring into and out of Gladstone Court; however, this has been like this for many years. The entrance to Gladstone Court is approximately 4 metres in width and serves 11 residential properties and parking to the rear of Mencap Hall. Mildmay Road at this point is 7 metres in width and vehicles park both sides leaving a 3.4 metre gap for vehicles to pass.
	
1.5	For information the permit allocation for Mildmay Road is over-subscribed and removing three permit spaces will put extra pressure on the remaining area
1.6	It was agreed with the Lead Councillor and Lead Officer for parking matters for Chelmsford to cost a scheme to amend the parking restriction. It was estimated at £2500. This cost would be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Chelmsford, to publish one Traffic Regulation Order. The request was placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee on 8 March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.

1.7	The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 7 June 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.
1.8	When the Order was published on 7 June 2018 a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced.
1.9	<p>A letter was also sent to affected residents on 25 May 2018, inviting them to comment. Copy provided below:</p> <p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Chelmsford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No.79 Order 201*</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) will shortly be publishing the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order. The proposal seeks to remove 14.2 metres of permit parking opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court and replace it with a double yellow line, which will prohibit parking at all times.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer on the 7 June and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can be found on the Council's website from 7 June:</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day statutory period whereby any person may write objecting to the proposal or write in support.</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day statutory 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 Sub Committee (TRO Objections) 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. Any person that submits a representation during the 21day statutory period will receive a copy of the report in advance of the meeting and invited to attend, where they will have the opportunity to speak to the Committee members before a decision is made.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments (objection or support) on or after the 7 June, you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 29 June.</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	The Order be withdrawn and redesigned to incorporate additional permit parking and re-advertised.

List of Appendices

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 resident of Mildmay Road dated 12 June 2018	Objection
2	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 12 June 2018	Objection
3	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 12 June 2018	Support
4	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 13 June 2018	Support
5	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 14 June 2018	Objection
6	Email from local shop owner dated 14 June 2018	Objection
7	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 15 June 2018	Objection
8	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 16 June 2018	Objection
9	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 15 June 2018	Support
10	Email from resident of Gladstone Court dated 19 June 2018	Support
11	Email from a visitor to a resident of Gladstone Court dated 20 June 2018	Support
12	Email from managing agents of Gladstone Court dated 20 June 2018	Support
13	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 20 June 2018	Support
14	Email from local business dated 20 June 2018	Support
15	Email from resident of Gladstone Court dated 20 June 2018	Support
16	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 20 June 2018	Support
17	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 20 June 2018	Support
18	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 20 June 2018	Support
19	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 21 June 2018	Support
20	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 21 June 2018	Support
21	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 21 June 2018	Objection
22	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 21 June 2018	Support
23	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 22 June 2018	Support
24	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 25 June 2018	Objection
25	Email from local care company dated 25 June 2018	Support
26	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 25 June 2018	Objection
27	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 25 June 2018	Objection
28	Letter from Gladstone Court visitor dated 28 June 2018	Support
29	Letter from Gladstone Court visitor dated 28 June 2018	Support
30	Letter from resident of Gladstone Court dated 28 June 2018	Support
31	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 28 June 2018	Objection
32	Email from resident of Mildmay Road dated 29 June 2018	Objection
33	Email from Gladstone Court visitor dated 5 July 2018 (After Closing date)	Support

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT – 7 June 2018

Representations & responses relating to Mildmay Road.		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	<p>I was extremely shocked to receive the attached letter suggesting an introduction of double yellow lines onto our road. Parking is at a premium on Mildmay Road as it is and there is never enough spaces for the residents so the I cannot understand why there is a need to restrict what little parking space we do have. Quite a few of the houses on this end of the road have dropped kerbs and driveways, which again limits road space. I'd appreciate an explanation of when there is a need to introduce double yellow lines, when it is already permit parking?</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>On 11th August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Gladstone Court requesting part of the resident permit parking in Mildmay Road, opposite Gladstone Court, is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to assist vehicular access to and from Gladstone Court, particularly for larger vehicles. The request was supported by a 27-signature petition from residents, family members, organisations and local Councillors.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents.</p>
2	<p>I read that there is a plan to potentially introduce additional double yellow lines on a section of Mildmay Road. As a resident of the street I am very much against this as it will cause major issues for current residents in terms of further limiting parking for us. Already, the road is extremely busy not only with current residents with 2 or 3 cars already trying to find a space to park but also people using it to park and visit the town centre. To have the space restricted with this proposition even further will mean we</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>On 11th August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Gladstone Court requesting part of the resident permit parking in Mildmay Road,</p>

	<p>won't be able to park at all and if we do manage to find a space it will be a considerable distance away from our own residence. It is already a 'bun fight' to park at the best of times.</p> <p>There seems to be no valid reason from you as to why this is being proposed so please clarify your rationale? Also, to allow more space on the road that cannot be utilised by residents for parking will further encourage drivers (who don't live on Mildmay Road) to use the street as a cut through / rat run to access the town centre, etc rather than having to use the B1007 or Princes Road. Already, the volume of cars is excessive up and down the road and frankly dangerous, as they speed through where older people and young families are living/using the street. It's a fatality waiting to happen!</p>	<p>opposite Gladstone Court, is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to assist vehicular access to and from Gladstone Court, particularly for larger vehicles. The request was supported by a 27-signature petition from residents, family members, organisations and local Councillors.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents.</p>
3	I am in support of this proposal.	Support noted.
4	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 25/5/2018 regarding the installing of double yellow lines opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court in Mildmay Road.</p> <p>I am totally in favour of this and strongly support it, as a driver I frequently have difficulty seeing as I come out of Gladstone Court into Mildmay Road and this will greatly help this. Also as partly disabled person I often have been grocery shopping and generally the Sainsburys van can't access the road so they have to walk some distance with my shopping. In addition as this is a warden controlled complex often ambulances have difficulty accessing our square. For these reasons I am in total support of this amendment.</p>	Support noted.
5	<p>We are writing to you with regards to the proposed changes to the permit parking on Mildmay Road. As a long-term resident, it is clear that parking is already at a premium down this road, and not being able to access suitable parking down the road you live on is an already stressful situation, coupled with the fact that there is a charge for the permits. Further to this, there are already additional availability problems with large numbers of visitors to the local shopping centre using the road for parking each Sunday due to the lack of restrictions enforced by the council.</p> <p>We have lived at this address for seven years and have only seen an issue with access</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents.</p> <p>On 11th August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident</p>

	<p>on one occasion, which was due to a car being parked illegally overhanging the permitted parking area on the Gladstone Court side of the road, rather than anything to do with the cars parked opposite. In addition to this, the council should have considered the access of emergency vehicles before permitting planning permission at Gladstone Court, and I am surprised that this is not considered when approving planning permission to sites with restricted access, especially in a built up residential area. Can I ask what investigation works are undertaken before the approval of such plans? As surely this is a fault which should have been identified? Is a traffic management plan submitted as part of the planning process? The existing parking structure has worked for many years and it is unclear why this has become an issue now.</p> <p>Changing the parking to further reduce the availability on Mildmay Road will make it a less desirable place to live and have an effect on the surrounding house prices, as well as exacerbating the low availability of parking for all the residents and further reducing access to homes. Is there a plan to offer compensation to the surrounding residents for the inconvenience and lost capital in the event that this is approved?</p> <p>We strongly feel that these changes are not necessary and unfairly punish the residents of Mildmay Road.</p>	<p>of Gladstone Court requesting part of the resident permit parking in Mildmay Road, opposite Gladstone Court, is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to assist vehicular access to and from Gladstone Court, particularly for larger vehicles. The request was supported by a 27-signature petition from residents, family members, organisations and local Councillors</p> <p>Planning permission would have been granted at the time by Chelmsford City Council. Relevant organisations such as Essex Highways and Emergency Services would have had opportunity to comment on the proposed development.</p> <p>There is no plan to offer compensation to residents if the scheme is approved.</p>
6	<p>Removing the parking places outside Gladstone court would be a terrible idea, the area already struggles enough with its parking without the removal of several more places. as Gladstone always has White lines across its entrance I fail to see why removing the cars opposite will have any effect?</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>On 11th August 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Gladstone Court requesting part of the resident permit parking in Mildmay Road, opposite Gladstone Court, is changed to a prohibition of waiting at all times (double yellow line) to assist vehicular access to and from Gladstone Court, particularly for larger vehicles. The request was supported by a 27-signature petition from residents,</p>

		<p>family members, organisations and local Councillors</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p>
7	<p>With regard to the amendment to the permit parking opposite Gladstone Court, on Mildmay Road, I would like to make a request.</p> <p>The amount of on-street parking on Mildmay Road means that there is already very little space for us with houses in the vicinity of the proposed change. We are number xx, and have a dropped kerb for our front drive, however this change will mean that people will park in front of it even more than they do now. Numbers 73 and 75 both have white lines on the road in where their drive is. Please could you arrange for us to have something similar before the proposed amendment comes into place.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p> <p>Residents can apply for a H-Bar where a technician can investigate whether a H-Bar is possible to install.</p>
8	<p>I write in reference to the proposed changes to the proposed parking changes in Mildmay Road Chelmsford.</p> <p>I wish to question the plan to remove 14.2 meters of resident parking spaces opposite Gladstone Court. This is effectively 3 resident spaces lost in a highly congested area for parking. I fully understand the need for emergency access to all parts of the residential area but do question the timing?</p> <p>I have lived in this area for over 20 years (18 at xx Mildmay Road) and at no stage has this been a problem. There is already a no parking zone at the entrance to this courtyard.</p> <p>During this time parking in the residents permit bays has become harder and harder and has become all but impossible at some times. This I suspect is a combination of an increased rental population (with multiple cars) acceptance of dropped kerbs to some</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p>

	<p>properties and development of a number of plots with insufficient parking as part of the planning.</p> <p>This has left me at some stages no other option other than to park at the rear of my property in a non-designated space and on a few occasions have incurred a penalty charge from your wardens when I had nowhere to actually park.</p> <p>I notice with interest that there is a planning application under consideration for an 11 property development on land adjacent to 42 Mildmay Road which only has 11 parking spaces as part of the plan. I think it would be obtuse to think that these proposed residents will only have 11 cars and this will put even more pressure on a scarce resource.</p> <p>My thoughts are that if the Emergency Services feel that access to Gladstone Court is a problem (I notice that it is the residents who have raised concerns not necessarily the Emergency Services) Then in order to facilitate this removal Chelmsford City Council must look at replacing these lost spaces with other new ones.</p> <p>I would advise looking at Goldlay Road at the intersection to Mildmay Road; there could be 2 new spaces here in addition to the single one that is there now. You could also look at incorporation a couple of spaces on the stretch of road from the corner of Mildmay to Hall Street? Another possibility is to somehow utilise the space at the front of Mildmay Court Flats? Either way we can't just remove spaces without planning for this loss.</p>	
9	I am in full support of 14.2 metres of double yellow lines opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court, prohibiting parking at all times.	Support noted.
10	From Mrs ***** ** Gladstone Court Mildmay Road Chelmsford. May I add my full support for the yellow lines application.	Support noted.
11	I am writing in support of the proposed parking restriction in Mildmay Road, opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court. My elderly mother is a resident of Gladstone Court and, since she is housebound, I, other members of the family, and friends, have to visit her regularly by car. It is usually quite difficult to gain entrance to the access road leading to her property but, more importantly, it is treacherous trying the exit onto Mildmay Road. It is nigh-on impossible to see clearly the oncoming traffic due to the	Support noted.

	high density of cars parked on both sides of Mildmay Road, immediately adjacent to the access road, thereby causing drivers to edge out in the hope that nothing is coming. I don't know if there have been any accidents or incidents relating to this but I would be very surprised if there hadn't. Therefore, I would strongly support any proposal to improve the current situation.	
12	As managing agents of this development we wish to support the proposal of double yellow lines in Mildmay Road allowing easier access into Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
13	I am very much in favour of the traffic regulation order being proposed for restrictions to parking opposite entrance to Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
14	We would like to endorse and thank you for the proposed parking changes in Mildmay Road Chelmsford as this will significantly improve the accessibility for residents and emergency vehicles. Thank you very much for your attention.	Support noted.
15	I wish to support the proposed yellow lines opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
16	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed parking restriction in Mildmay Road, opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court.</p> <p>My grandmother lives at one of the Gladstone Court properties and I regularly go to visit her as she is unable to leave the house. As a young driver myself, I find it extremely difficult to get in or out of the turning due to the number of cars parked either side of the entrance. It is very difficult to see if any cars are coming and by putting in yellow lines this would help increase visibility and avoid any accidents.</p> <p>I hope that you take my message on board and that the proposed restrictions can go ahead to improve this situation.</p>	Support noted.
17	Yes, we need yellow double lines here	Support noted.
18	I wish to support the proposed yellow lines opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
19	I wish to support the proposed yellow lines opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
20	I fully support the proposal for 14.2 metres of double yellow lines to be introduced opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court on Mildmay Road Chelmsford, prohibiting parking at all times.	Support noted.
21	I have read your proposed THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL) (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING CONSOLIDATION) (VARIATION NO.79) ORDER 201* to remove 14.5m of permit	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra</p>

<p>parking opposite Gladstone Court and wish to object to its implementation.</p> <p>As residents of Mildmay Road we often find parking in the area difficult due to the already limited number of parking spaces. This situation is exacerbated on Sundays when restrictions are lifted and the parking area is open to shoppers and non-residents.</p> <p>I would like to point out that the plan submitted showing current permit parking zones is misleading; there are several houses in this area that have driveways with dropped kerbs and white lines which are not available parking spaces, therefore the number of actual available spaces is fewer than it appears.</p> <p>In addition, the Mencap Centre situated next to Gladstone Court has no allocated parking space of its own and the parents and carers of those attending the facility have to park in the street in order to drop off and collect their charges. Reducing the available parking space in this area will cause more congestion and may lead to cars being parked in unauthorised areas, therefore reducing visibility for oncoming vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>I note that the reason for the request for the removal of the parking spaces opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court is to allow easier access to large delivery vehicles and the emergency services. In fact, several streets in this area with permit parking are very narrow, including the centre section of Mildmay Road, Roman Road, Upper Roman Road and Hamlet Road. Large vehicles, including the waste collection vehicles in this area either have to park in the road and block it off or park away from the address and manhandle the goods to their destination. In the event of the road being blocked off by emergency or delivery vehicles, there are sufficient side roads to facilitate a detour for other drivers. Despite this situation being far from ideal, this is one of the concessions of living in an inner city area and there is no reason why this arrangement needs to differ for Gladstone Court, the residents of which, it should be pointed out, currently enjoy their own off road permit-free parking space.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that the removal of 14.5m of the current available space will have a significant impact on the already difficult parking situation, resulting in</p>	<p>spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p>
---	--

	additional congestion of an already busy road and in all likelihood having a serious impact on safety in this area. Therefore for the reasons stated above, I reiterate my objection to its implementation.	
22	I wish to support the proposed yellow lines on Mildmay Road opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court.	Support noted.
23	I am in full support of 14.2 metres of double yellow lines opposite the entrance of Gladstone Court prohibiting parking at all times.	Support noted.
24	With reference to the above subject we would like to register our objection to the proposed sighting of double yellow lines opposite Gladstone Court. As this would make an already parking problem in Mildmay Road worse. We do realise there is a problem with access to Gladstone Court but this is on a much less often occurrence than the problem of parking on the road in this vicinity. Which is a daily ongoing problem.	Objection noted. It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents
25	I wish to confirm that I am in full agreement with the parking restrictions order that applies to the area opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court. The area is an accident waiting to happen.	Support noted.
26	I'm writing regarding the proposed removal of a stretch of permit parking opposite Gladstone Court, in Mildmay Road. Whilst I understand the proposal and access requirements to Gladstone Court for vehicles, I can't see that this has fully considered the impacts to residents and visitors to Mildmay Road and I do not agree with the proposal. My points/questions are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gladstone Court was built, presumably, with planning permission. What were the requirements for access at the time and why are these considered to not now be adequate? • Has any consideration been given to allocating more parking to residents of Mildmay Road? Particularly towards the bottom nearer the Mildmay Court flats where for 	Objection Noted. Planning permission would have been granted at the time by Chelmsford City Council. Relevant organisations such as Essex Highways and Emergency Services would have had opportunity to comment on the proposed development. It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents

	<p>unknown reasons the stretch is all double yellow lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many visitors to the Mencap centre, next to the entrance of Gladstone Court, both in the day in evenings who cause numerous parking issues for the residents of Mildmay Road at the current time, removing the stretch of 14 meters will exacerbate this problem. • On a Sunday, when the permit is not in force, parking in Mildmay Road is mayhem. Many people use our road as an alternative to paying and parking in the town centre and again the removal of parking will make this problem worse. <p>My final point would be from a conversation I had 18 months ago with a gentlemen from the fire department. I saw him measuring the access/entrance to Gladstone Court and can only assume part of this proposal has come from that survey.</p> <p>We spoke about the access, and the parking, he confirmed to me that even if parking was removed none of his units would be successfully able to make a turn into Gladstone Court and even if they could the space between my house and Mencap is too narrow for the units to navigate up the road whilst also being used to tackle a fire. Hoses on fire engines are efficient/long enough to tackle fires at the end of Gladstone Court whilst the unit is still parked in the road.</p> <p>In relation to emergency vehicles, at the current time, and even yesterday evening as I witnessed, ambulances/paramedics and food delivery vans (Tesco/Ocado/Sainsbury's) are able to turn successfully into and out of the road.</p> <p>I urge you to not implement this removal of parking as it will detriment all residents, not just those parking outside the houses where the removal is proposed. I have lived at the below address for four years, I have not known of any issues with access to Gladstone Court that warrants this action.</p>	
<p>27</p>	<p>I have seen the proposed parking changes in Mildmay Road with the removal of approx. 14.5m of permit parking and would like to object to this change from the variation no79, order 201.</p>	<p>Objection Noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra</p>

	<p>As residents of Mildmay Road we often find parking in the area very difficult due to the already limited number of resident parking spaces and are often unable to park near to our house. The removal of move parking spaces will only add to this and potentially cause safety issues with people parking in restricted areas - such a over yellow lines and blocking cars in by parking close.</p> <p>It is not clear from the diagrams how many spaces would be lost but surely the correct action is not to remove spaces opposite the turning but to reduce the size of a space on the Gladstone court side. As far as I'm concerned, I do not see this being an issue with turning into and out of Gladstone court but another action would be to limit the speed vehicles can travel down Mildmay road by imposing 20mph limits.</p> <p>In summary I wish to reject the application to remove spaces in an already restricted parking area.</p>	<p>spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p> <p>Queries regarding changed in speed limit should be directed to the local councillor for that area.</p>
<p>28</p>	<p>Further to your letter dated 25 May 2018 regarding the above addressed to my grandmother's address at 4 Gladstone Court off Mildmay Road Chelmsford I am writing in support of this amendment.</p> <p>I am quite often unable to turn into the access road to Gladstone Court due to parked cars either side and opposite. I have an Audi car and emergency services would not be able to access the 11 retirement bungalows there. There is rarely availability to even park nearby in Mildmay Road.</p> <p>I often witness very stressed relatives and residents in times of need because of this and am sure this amendment would help to relieve the situation.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>29</p>	<p>Further to your letter dated 25 May 2018 regarding the above addressed to my grandmother's address at 4 Gladstone Court off Mildmay Road Chelmsford I am writing in support of this amendment.</p> <p>There is often difficulty with access to the 11 retirement bungalows at Gladstone Court due to the parking opposite the driveway not allowing larger vehicles to turn into the access road. This proves to be a very serious concern for all the residents when emergency vehicles particularly ambulance and fire are unable to gain entry. This obviously causes great stress for all families and residents concerned.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>

30	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 25 May 2018 regarding the above. I am writing in support of this as I am 90 years old and have experienced difficulties with ambulances, taxis and relatives being unable to access the parking area to my home. This obviously makes me feel unsafe and at risk. The amendment would help to resolve this issue.</p>	Support Noted
31	<p>We wish to object to this ridiculous proposal to remove approximately 3 cars length of residents parking in Mildmay Road opposite Gladstone Court.</p> <p>We have to pay for our residents parking and in this area parking is at a premium and is due to get worse if the proposed properties get the go ahead on the site of the auctions.</p> <p>More often than not if you come home later than 18.00 you have difficulty parking so take away three spaces and it will get worse.</p> <p>The reason given for this proposal is to allow access for larger vehicles. The site of the retirement properties was formerly an abattoir, the vehicles that used to access the site were rigids up to about 24 tonnes in weight. They managed to get in and out of the site without too much problem.</p> <p>Our residents parking is valid from 08.00hours to 23.00hours because of proximity to Moulsham Street. However, non-residents also park here especially after 20.00hours as wardens don't tend to 'police' it after this time. Removing three spaces will be utter madness and cause lots of problems for us residents.</p>	<p>Objection Noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p>
32	<p>I would like to express my objection to this proposal to reduce parking in what is an extremely congested area for parking. It is already difficult enough to park compounded by a number of residents with drive ways and Mencap vehicles x 2.</p> <p>What will the SEPP do to help alleviate this limited parking issue, or will there be the removal of residents drive ways to compensate for the proposed removal by Gladstone court?</p> <p>On a second though unrelated point I'm also very concerned about the speed of traffic down Mildmay Road which is regularly used as a cut through by large lorries/commercial vehicles travelling at inappropriate speeds. It can be very</p>	<p>Objection Noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Mildmay Road is already oversubscribed. Removing 3 extra spaces will make parking more difficult for residents</p> <p>Queries regarding changed in speed limit/traffic calming should be directed to the local councillor for that area.</p>

	<p>dangerous to get in and out of the car. I would strongly recommend traffic calming, speed restrictions are put in place before a serious accident occurs!</p> <p>Thanks you for considering my comments.</p>	
<p>33</p>	<p><u>After the closing date</u></p> <p>I am writing in support of the proposed parking restriction in Mildmay Road, opposite the entrance to Gladstone Court. My elderly Aunt is a resident of Gladstone Court and, since she is housebound, I, other members of the family, and friends, have to visit her regularly by car. It is usually quite difficult to gain entrance to the access road leading to her property but, more importantly, it is treacherous trying the exit onto Mildmay Road. It is nearly impossible to see clearly the oncoming traffic due to the high density of cars parked on both sides of Mildmay Road, immediately adjacent to the access road, this causes drivers to edge out in the hope that nothing is coming. I don't know if there have been any accidents or incidents relating to this but I would be very surprised if there hadn't. Therefore, I would strongly support any proposal to improve the current situation.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles [in particular Ambulances who visit the elderly residents on a regular basis] are concerned because their vehicles cannot access patients in such a tight location, when time is of the essence and peoples lives are at risk my view is that parking should be of secondary importance.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>

**SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
(TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB COMMITTEE**

5 September 2019

AGENDA ITEM 3

Subject	THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP (CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL) (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING CONSOLIDATION) (VARIATION NO.79) ORDER 201* Part 2 Relating to Warren Close, Broomfield, Chelmsford
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 (Chelmsford City Council) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) (Variation No.79) Order 201* Part 2

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.	Background								
1.1	The purpose of this Order is to vary the Borough Council of Chelmsford (Waiting, Loading and Parking Consolidation) Order 2009 as set out below: -								
1.2	The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) propose to make the above named Order following a parking review of Warren Close.								
1.3	On 21 July 2017, the SEPP received a completed application form from a resident of Warren Close requesting the existing prohibition of waiting (Mon-Fri 10-11am on the north side & 2-3pm on the south side) is changed to a resident permit parking area from 9am to 5pm, to deter hospital visitors and workers. This is similar request where nearby Gernon Close was changed last year. The request had supporting signatures from 8 of the 11 properties.								
1.4	<p>In line with the request, an informal consultation was carried out with all residents of Warren Close to seek their views on consideration to provide a permit scheme Monday to Friday 9am-5pm.</p> <p>The consultation results were as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="292 936 1394 1115"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="292 936 568 1010">No. of Properties Consulted</th> <th data-bbox="568 936 844 1010">No. of Responses</th> <th data-bbox="844 936 1120 1010">No. in favour of Permit Scheme</th> <th data-bbox="1120 936 1394 1010">No. not in favour of Permit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 1010 568 1115">11</td> <td data-bbox="568 1010 844 1115">8 (72%)</td> <td data-bbox="844 1010 1120 1115">7 (87%)</td> <td data-bbox="1120 1010 1394 1115">1 (13%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No. of Properties Consulted	No. of Responses	No. in favour of Permit Scheme	No. not in favour of Permit	11	8 (72%)	7 (87%)	1 (13%)
No. of Properties Consulted	No. of Responses	No. in favour of Permit Scheme	No. not in favour of Permit						
11	8 (72%)	7 (87%)	1 (13%)						
1.5	<p>The above results met the SEPP criteria for progression to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order</p> <p>It was agreed with the Lead Councillor and Lead Officer for parking matters for Chelmsford to cost a scheme to change the current parking restriction to a resident permit parking scheme. It was estimated at £2500. This cost would be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Chelmsford, to publish one Traffic Regulation Order.</p>								
1.6	The request was placed before the South Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee on 8 March 2018 for funding. It was agreed at the meeting to proceed with the necessary traffic regulation order.								
1.7	The Order was originally published in the Enquirer and on site on 7 June 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.								
1.8	When the Order was published on 7 June 2018 a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced.								

1.9	<p><u>Re: The South Essex Parking Partnership (Chelmsford District) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Amendment No.79 Order 201* Part 2.</u></p> <p>The South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) will shortly be publishing the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order. The proposal seeks to change the current single yellow line in Warren Close which prohibits parking and replace with a resident permit parking scheme operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 9am to 5pm.</p> <p>The proposal will be published in The Enquirer on the 7 June and site notices will also be placed. Further information on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order can be found on the Council’s website from 7 June:</p> <p>When the proposal is published it will commence a 21-day statutory period whereby any person may write objecting to the proposal or write in support. If there are unresolved objections the matter will be reported to the South Essex Parking Partnership Sub Committee (TRO Objections) for a decision.</p> <p>The Committee can agree to proceed as published and bring the Order into effect, amend the proposal or withdraw it in its entirety. Any person that submits a representation during the 21-day statutory period will receive a copy of the report in advance of the meeting and invited to attend, where they will have the opportunity to speak to the Committee members before a decision is made.</p> <p>If you wish to make any comments (objection or support) on or after the 7 June, you can email or write to the above. All comments must be received by 29 June.</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.
<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 resident of Warren Close dated 8 June 2018	Objection
2	Email from resident of Warren Close dated 10 June 2018	Objection
3	Email from resident of Warren Close dated 13 June 2018 (same household as Ref 1 above)	Objection

APPENDIX 2

REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT –

7 June 2018

Representations & responses relating to Warren Close		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	<p>Re. SEPP Proposed Traffic Regulation Order to change current single yellow line in Warren Close.... to replace with resident permit parking scheme Amendment No.79 Order 201* We oppose the changes for the following reasons 1. Have never had trouble parking in Warren Close 2. We have several regular week day groups of visitors which would cost us inconvenience and expense 3. The only problem we have is people parking on the Mandeville Way/Warren Close junction both on Mandeville Way opposite Warren Close and on the Warren Close side of Mandeville on the corners into Warren. This obscures our view when driving into and out of Warren Close</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the parking restriction has been requested by the majority of residents. The request is similar to nearby Gernon Close where the prohibition on waiting (single yellow line) was changed to a permit parking scheme.</p> <p>The current restriction prohibits parking from 10am to 11am on one side of the road and from 2pm to 3pm on the other side; therefore, residents cannot have visitors parking all day without the inconvenience of moving their vehicle. A parking permit zone gives residents and their visitors the flexibility of parking on the street at any time with a valid permit.</p> <p>It is acknowledged there is a cost implication to residents for a permit scheme, however there are many nearby roads which retain the single yellow line and visitors can park in those roads if they wish to do so, without charge.</p>

		DYL are proposed for 7 metres on Warren Close with its junction with Mandeville.
2	<p>We are writing to formally object to the changes to the proposed parking restrictions for Warren Close which form part of Amendment 79 order 201.</p> <p>The reasoning given for the changes in Warren Close to provide residents and their visitors greater flexibility would be untrue, permit parking is not designed to provide flexibility. This is not, it is designed to provide restrictions, even greater than those already present by forcing a payment to park.</p> <p>Generally parking in Warren Close is not an issue there is typically one, and maybe two non-resident cars parked and then only for normally short periods of time. I monitored the parking for a number of days and there is between none and two cars parked on the road in Warren Close for between one and two hours. Mandeville Way has significantly more cars parked, varying between two and fourteen cars parked. We would therefore conclude the existing parking restrictions in Warren Close are working as intended.</p> <p>Resident parking schemes can bring about a feeling of entitlement for residents, whereby if you have paid for a permit you use it, therefore when these parking schemes are introduced they can have the opposite effect of intended in that there are now more cars parked on the roads than prior.</p> <p>There is no issue to solve by introducing these further restrictions and as you can see from the above there is significant reasoning why this proposal will have an adverse effect on residents.</p> <p>Also, please be aware the current proposal as published should not be approved in its current form. The area plan for Warren Close is not attached to the official notice on the website and therefore not all information is available to inform residents or the committee making the decision.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal is a result of an application form we received from a resident on 21st June 2017, with a petition signed by 8 residents. The application form was to change the current parking restriction to a resident permit parking scheme operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 9am to 5pm.</p> <p>Following receipt of the application the South Essex Parking Partnership carried out an informal consultation with all residents of Warren Close to seek their views. The results show that 8 of the 11 properties responded (72% response rate) of which 7 of the 8 were in favour of the change (87% of respondents). This met our criteria for progression to the statutory process.</p> <p>The current restriction prohibits parking from 10am to 11am on one side of the road and from 2pm to 3pm on the other side; therefore, residents cannot have visitors parking all day without the inconvenience of moving their vehicle. A parking permit zone gives residents and their visitors the flexibility of parking on the street at any time with a valid permit.</p>

		<p>There is no obligation to purchase a permit if the resident had ample off-road parking and does not intend to park on the road during the operational times of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The missing plan rectified immediately on the Chelmsford City Council website. Chelmsford Traffic Regulation Orders are text based and plans are not legally required. Plans are provided for illustration purposes and are also attached to the on-street site notices.</p>
3	<p>I do not feel that a Permit Parking Zone in Warren Close Broomfield is required, especially when there are other, less restrictive, viable solutions. The first picture attached shows that even when there is parking in the close, it is not restrictive. I have never witnessed a situation where an emergency or utility vehicle has not been able to access the close unlike Mandeville Way, even though for most of the day parking is permitted on both sides. Anyway, most of the properties have off street parking for 4 cars (only 4 of the 11 properties have less). Attached picture 2 shows the problem I regularly experience - parking on the corner of the junction between Warren Close and Mandeville Way and opposite the junction in Mandeville way - a number of close calls experienced where through traffic arrives from a blind spot. The last picture shows that, even if double yellow lines are placed at the corner where shown in the proposal, these do not include where they are required in Mandeville Way, i.e. from and opposite the junction with Warren Close. We do need these no waiting restrictions anyway but to respect those who believe Permit Parking is the solution against opposite parking, surely this could simply be achieved by lengthening the restricted parking times, e.g. 10-11 to 8:30 to 12:00 and 14-15 to 13:00 to 17:00. This would have the following advantages over the proposed amendment: 1). There would be the ability to park on one side at least during the day with little chance of restrictive parking on both sides. 2). Residents would not have to pay to park outside their own</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal is a result of an application form we received from a resident on 21st June 2017, with a petition signed by 8 residents. The application form was to change the current parking restriction to a resident permit parking scheme operating from Monday to Friday between the hours of 9am to 5pm.</p> <p>Following receipt of the application the South Essex Parking Partnership carried out an informal consultation with all residents of Warren Close to seek their views. The results show that 8 of the 11 properties responded (72% response rate) of which 7 of the 8 were in favour of the change (87% of respondents).</p>

house - 6 of the 11 properties are occupied by those under age for a free permit. 3). The permit system, even with one free 4 hour pass, does not cope with those who host group meetings during the day (say typically, 4 on the drive plus an extra 4 cars) except at an unwarranted cost. 4). Similarly, trades too may require roadside parking. In Summary: I have not witnessed excessive parking; the proposal does not anyway solve the major problem of cars parked on the corner / junction of Warren Close and Mandeville way; and a Special Parking area involves residents in unwarranted costs



This met our criteria for progression to the statutory process.

DYL are proposed for 7 metres on Warren Close with its junction with Mandeville only.

The current restriction prohibits residents and their visitors parking all day. A parking permit zone gives residents and their visitors the flexibility of parking on the street at any time with a valid permit.

There is no obligation to purchase a permit if the resident had ample off-road parking and does not intend to park on the road during the operational times of the proposed scheme.

