

**MEETING OF THE SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP
SUB COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS AGAINST
AN ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**



SOUTH ESSEX

8 August 2024
MARCONI ROOM
CIVIC CENTRE, DUKE STREET,
CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL
COMMENCING AT 3.15 PM.

AGENDA

1. Welcome by Chairman of the Sub Committee.
2. Apologies for absence.
3. Consider representations against proposed TRO for Woodlands Avenue
4. Any other business.

SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP SUB COMMITTEE

Marconi Room, Civic Centre, Duke Street, Chelmsford City Council
Thursday 8th August 2024
3.15pm

AGENDA ITEM 3

Subject	The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) And (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.13) Order 202*
	Relating to Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road, Rayleigh
Report by	South Essex Parking Partnership Manager

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

Purpose:
 To report the receipt of representations made on part of The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) And (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.13) Order 202*

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.
3. to agree that the proposed Order be withdrawn in its entirety.

Recommendation(s)

1. The proposed Order should 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.	Background
1.1	The purpose of this Order is to amend The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) and (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) Consolidation Order 2019 as set out below:
1.2	Several application forms and other correspondence were received between May – October 2022 regarding parking on Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close, Rayleigh. One applicant requested ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions (Double Yellow Lines) on the junction and bend of Woodlands Avenue. A list of 36 names were provided in support of the restrictions, from 20 properties in the area. The applicant stated that vehicles park on the junction Woodlands Avenue and Daws Heath Road, obstructing sightlines and causing vehicles to drive on the wrong side of the road to access Woodlands Avenue. Additionally, it was added that parked vehicles also block access to the dropped kerb for pedestrians crossing Woodlands Avenue to walk along Daws Heath Road.
1.4	Another applicant requested double yellow lines on the junctions of Woodlands Avenue/Daws Heath Road and Woodlands Avenue/Woodlands Close. Additionally, a single yellow line/permit parking scheme was requested Monday – Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm in this area. A list of 22 names were provided in support of the restrictions, from 13 properties in the area. The applicant stated that commuters from the nearby Industrial Estate are park on Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close. Therefore, restrictions were requested in order to minimise commuter parking and to maintain access and sightlines for road users.
1.5	During the site visits conducted, up to 30 vehicles were observed parking in Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close. Vehicles were observed parking on the junctions in the area, within 10 metres. During the week, most road space was taken up by parked vehicles on Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close. During the weekend, it was observed that less vehicles were parking on Woodlands Close. Therefore, it is likely that vehicles parking near the junction of Woodlands Avenue/Woodlands Close belong to commuters. It was observed that vehicles park in the turning heads on these roads, however it is likely that these belong to residents not local workers. On most occasions, one vehicle was observed parking on the bend in question. No obstruction or access issues were observed on any of the site visits. It was observed however that there is limited visibility when traveling round the bend.
1.6	Additionally, during the site visits the narrow carriageway in Woodlands Close was noted. In parts, Woodlands Close is approximately 4.7 metres wide. It is good practice to allow 3 metres running lane for vehicles to pass and at least a 1.2 metre gap on the footway for wheelchair/pushchair users. Additionally, turning heads/circles should be kept clear. Therefore, it was felt that Woodlands Close is not suitable for parking due to its narrow carriageway and footway.
1.7	The relevant department at Rochford District Council was also consulted to discover any access issues for waste/recycling collections. It was stated by the department that because the roads are so narrow, especially Woodlands Close, in the past they have had to reverse up the road and have had problems turning around at the end of Woodlands Avenue.
1.8	Following the assessment, several options were discussed with the SEPP Joint Committee Member and Lead Officer for Rochford whereby it was decided that the SEPP should conduct a Parking Review with residents.

2.	Parking Review										
2.1	SEPP Technicians designed two options for residents. Option 1 included Double Yellow Lines on the junctions of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close and the bend. Option 2 included 'Permit Parking Area Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm' with Double Yellow Lines on the junctions, bend, turning head of Woodlands Avenue and all of Woodlands Close.										
2.2	Residents were invited to take part in the Parking Review from 25th November – 23rd December 2022. The results were as follows:										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No. of Properties</th> <th>No. of Responses</th> <th>No. in favour of introducing restrictions</th> <th>No. in favour of Option 1</th> <th>No. in favour of Option 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>54</td> <td>42 (78%)</td> <td>36 (86%)</td> <td>8 (22%)</td> <td>28 (78%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No. of Properties	No. of Responses	No. in favour of introducing restrictions	No. in favour of Option 1	No. in favour of Option 2	54	42 (78%)	36 (86%)	8 (22%)	28 (78%)
No. of Properties	No. of Responses	No. in favour of introducing restrictions	No. in favour of Option 1	No. in favour of Option 2							
54	42 (78%)	36 (86%)	8 (22%)	28 (78%)							
2.3	In consideration of the results and the comments received during the Parking Review, it was decided by the SEPP Joint Committee Member and Lead Officer for Rochford to proceed with Option 2 to introduce a 'Permit Parking Area Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm' with Double Yellow Lines on the junctions, bend, turning head of Woodlands Avenue and all of Woodlands Close.										
2.3	Furthermore, the request for funding was agreed in May 2023 to proceed with the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders. The cost of the scheme was estimated at £5,000. This cost could be reduced if incorporated with other roads in Rochford to publish one Traffic Regulation Order.										
3	Relevant excerpts from SEPP Policy (Version 6 December 2020)										
3.1	<p>SEPP Policy 7.4 - 'The criteria for prioritising requests for restrictions in residential areas is as follows:'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • '<i>The parking by non-residents must be sufficiently severe to cause serious inconvenience to residents.</i>' – Met. Based on the site visits conducted, during the week the majority of road space is taken up by parked vehicles. • '<i>The majority of residents have no off-street parking facilities available to them.</i>' – Not met. The majority of properties do have some form of off-street parking. • '<i>The majority of residents are in favour of such a scheme.</i>' - Met. 78% of properties responded to the Parking Review. Out of those that responded, 86% were in favour of introducing restrictions. Out of those in favour, 78% voted for option 2. • '<i>The introduction of a scheme would not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.</i>' – Met in part – It is acknowledged that vehicles may displace in adjacent roads. Should a new scheme be introduced, its effect can be monitored. • 'The Partnership is satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement can be maintained.' – Met. There are existing restrictions in the area. For example, Wyburns Avenue is subject to a Permit Parking Area Monday to Friday 9am- 										

<p>3.2</p>	<p>11am and 1pm-3pm (excluding Bank Holidays).</p> <p>SEPP Policy – 1.6 It is acknowledged that all requests for a parking restriction will carry some form of merit and may be beneficial to the particular area. The requests will be submitted for a variety of reasons and depending on the circumstance will be considered as a high or low funding priority to the Partnership. As the amount of funding available for new schemes is limited it is the intention of this policy to provide a criteria, which if met, will be considered a high priority scheme for the Partnership and therefore stand a greater chance of receiving the available funding. Schemes that do not meet all the criteria can still be progressed and considered by the Joint Committee, but schemes with a higher priority will take precedence. All schemes will be subject to available funding.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Traffic Regulation Order – Previous Proposal</p>
<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p>In August 2023, the South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) conducted a formal consultation regarding the introduction of a ‘Permit Parking Area Zone L Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm’ on Woodlands Avenue with ‘Double Yellow Lines’ on the junctions, bend, turning heads and all of Woodlands Close. This parking scheme was originally advertised as part of ‘The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) And (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.11) Order 202*’. During the consultation 19 objections were received alongside 15 comments in support.</p> <p>At its meeting on 14th December 2023, the SEPP Sub-Committee considered the representations received during the 21 statutory consultation period. The relevant minutes from that meeting are as follows:</p> <p><i>The Sub-Committee considered representations which proposed the introduction a Permit Parking Area Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm, with Double Yellow Lines on the junctions, bend, turning head of Woodlands Avenue and all of Woodlands Close. During the consultations 19 objections were received and 15 comments were received in support, concerns included not enough spaces for residents and visitors, negative impacts on property values and the proposals being too severe.</i></p> <p><i>The Sub-Committee heard from local residents who expressed concern at the scale of the scheme and the issues it would cause for families living on the street and their visitors. They acknowledged that the permit zones were required but felt that the extent of the double yellow lines was excessive and would lead to problems.</i></p> <p><i>The Sub-Committee considered whether they could replace the extensive double yellow lines with a residents permit zone, but received legal advice that as this had not been consulted on it would not be possible. Therefore, the Sub-Committee decided that the scheme should be withdrawn and redesigned, to incorporate those comments and concerns and be prioritised by officers.</i></p> <p>Therefore, the SEPP decided to re-design the scheme in accordance with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee. The SEPP published a new proposal to introduce a ‘Permit Parking Area Zone L Monday to Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm’ on Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close. ‘Double Yellow Lines’ would also be proposed on the junctions of Daws Heath Road, Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close as well as on the turning heads.</p>

5	Traffic Regulation Order – New Proposal
5.1	The new proposal was formally advertised under ‘The Essex County Council (Rochford District) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) And (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.13) Order 202**’.
5.2	The proposed Order was published in the Basildon and Southend Echo on 15 th February 2024. Additionally, public notices were erected on the affected roads. Residents of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close were written to informing them of the new proposal.
5.3	Copies of the draft Order were sent to a number of organisations including Essex Police, Essex County Council (Essex Highways, 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
5.4	When the Order was published on 15 th February 2024, a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced.
6	Comments
6.1	During the consultation, 7 objections were received. 11 comments were also received in support.
6.2	Some of the points raised included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions should also be introduced opposite the Woodlands Avenue junction on Daws Heath Road. • Additional ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions should be introduced on the bend of Woodlands Avenue, or a H-Bar reinstated. • The proposed ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions opposite the Woodlands Close junction will create further inconvenience. • The proposed ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions on the turning heads seem excessive. • The proposal will not solve parking issues at evening and weekends. • The costs associated with a Permit Scheme will inconvenience residents, visitors, and workers. • The re-designed scheme falls short of the purpose of the previous proposal. • The proposal will negatively affect property values.
6.3	The full details of the representations are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report together with the comments of the Technicians.
7	Conclusion
7.1	Some correspondents have made several points which lead them to believe the Order should not be pursued in whole or part. However, the SEPP Joint Committee Member and Lead Officer for Rochford, and SEPP Technicians recommend proposed Order be made as advertised.
List of Appendices	
Appendix 1 – List of people making representations	
Appendix 2 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments	
Appendix 3 – Photos	

APPENDIX 1

Ref.	List of people making representations	Type
1	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 14/02/2024	Support
2	Email from residents of Woodlands Close dated 15/02/2024	Support
3	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 15/02/2024	Support
4	Email from resident of Woodlands Close dated 15/02/2024	Support
5	Email dated 15/02/2024	Support
6	Email from resident of Woodlands Close dated 15/02/2024	Support
7	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 15/02/2024	Objection
8	Email from local resident dated 17/02/2024	Objection
9	Email from local resident dated 17/02/2024	Objection
10	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 19/02/2024	Support
11	Letter from residents of Woodlands Avenue dated 16/02/2024	Support
12	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 21/02/2024	Objection
13	Email from resident of Woodlands Close dated 01/03/2024	Support
14	Email from residents of Woodlands Close dated 04/03/2024	Objection
15	Email from residents of Woodlands Avenue dated 05/03/2024	Support
16	Email from local resident dated 06/03/2024	Support
17	Emails from residents of Woodlands Close dated 07/03/2024-08/03/2024	Objection
18	Email from resident of Woodlands Avenue dated 07/03/2024	Objection

APPENDIX 2

**REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES FOLLOWING FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT –
15th February 2024 – 8th March 2024**

Representations & responses relating to Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road, Rayleigh		
Ref	Representation -	Technician response -
1	We are happy with the below changes.	Support noted.
2	Regarding this revised scheme, we are writing to let you know that we are in favour of these new proposals and are grateful that our previous concerns have now been addressed.	Support noted.
3	Firstly may I thank you all for your efforts so far to resolve the parking issues in Woodlands Avenue. I would like to formally agree to the latest proposal which has the full backing of my family at no [REDACTED]	Support noted.
4	I am very much in favour of the revised parking scheme.	Support noted.
5	It's a good alternative thank you	Support noted.
6	Thank you for your proposed restrictions. I welcome them. Hopefully I might be able to get off my drive in the mornings. Thank you so much for your efforts in sorting out this problem.	Support noted.
7	Email 1 Thank you for your revised plan of the parking / safety around Woodlands ave, Daws Heath rd and Woodlands Close. In the main I agree with the new proposal but the two safety factors that were the whole cause to prompt the parking situation have now been scrapped? There needs to be a short section of DYL on Daws Heath Road	Objection noted. The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road. If a Permit Area is introduced, Permit Holders will be subject to terms and conditions of a residents parking scheme. For

opposite the junction with Woodlands Ave. There are frequently vehicles parked there and you simply cannot see into Woodlands Ave when wanting to turn right. In the darker months this is particularly dangerous as it means reversing up hill onto oncoming traffic in Daws Heath Rd. Even with DYL on the entrance of Woodlands ave it still makes it dangerous and very awkward.

Secondly the bend by the alley way to sidar Rd also presents another danger. There is currently a faded white single line denoting an advisory not to park there but people frequently do. This is dangerous and there have been plenty of near miss head-on colisions, because you cannot see round the bend. A DYL needs to be placed from the boundary of number 12 along to the boundary of number 14 and repeated the opposite side 11 - 13.

The parking scheme started off because of issues around safety foremost because of excessive use by the industrial estate workers making it dangerous and obstructive. I feel the proposal as it stands doesn't take the factors of safety into consideration. That should come before concerns of whether 'my visitors won't be able to park.' Having 'personal' street parking isn't a given, there are 16 houses within the two turning circles alone that don't. A compromise needs to be made that makes the road safe and accessible to the emergency services and refuse vehicles.

Email 2

Thank you for your email. Is there a way that we can all move forward and get this resolved. It took a long time to get to where we were in Dec then the whole process has started again.

Obviously what ever is agreed isn't going to be favourable for everyone but compromise is needed. Is there an opportunity to hash this out at the meeting where we all come to a best scenario plan. I can imagine I'm not the only one having concerns around the bend and entrance and it would be a shame to scrap everything when the current proposal may be at least better than what we currently have? I welcome your thoughts

example, residents must not park in a manner that affects the safety of other pedestrians or vehicles, in a manner that blocks any side roads or adjacent properties or too close to a junction. It is possible for Permit Holders to have their Permit withdrawn if they persisted in these practices.

When the committee meet, they will decide if the proposal is to be implemented and the Order made, amended with a lesser restriction, or withdrawn in its entirety. Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.

The remnants of a H-Bar Marking (Diagram 1026.1) can be located on the outside of the bend of Woodlands Avenue. Google Maps shows that this marking was installed in or before 2009 which pre-dates the SEPP. It should be noted that Diagram 1026.1 is a prescribed, advisory marking designed to prevent vehicles from parking either outside an entrance to off-street premises, or where the kerb is dropped to provide a convenient crossing place for pedestrians. Therefore, a H-Bar marking on the bend Woodlands Avenue is not fit for purpose to prevent parking.

If the proposal is introduced, as with any new parking scheme, its impact would be monitored. Additional restrictions could therefore be introduced later if required.

<p>8</p>	<p>Further to the receipt of your letter outlining the amended proposal for woodlands avenue, I would offer the following comments.</p> <p>It's understood the main reason for these proposals is to alleviate the nuisance parking by employees of various factories and offices in the nearby Brook Rd Trading Est., making parking during working hrs difficult for residence visitors and guests and services, the changing to Permit parking in all the major areas is therefore a welcomed logical upgrade. However, there are a few issues that would benefit further consideration.</p> <p>The DYLS opposite woodland close outside 5,7 would serve no real advantage to those residents, [REDACTED] and just create further inconvenience by pushing any visitors to those properties further around the neighbourhood.</p> <p>If perchance there is mitigation on behalf of the Local authority waste collection service in this instance, then having Permit parking here would be equally as effective, but far more convenient to the neighbourhood residents, as it was the nuisance parking that caused the issue with Waste services access etc, not the residents.</p> <p>Secondly, I find it totally illogical and ill-thought-out scheme whereby DYLS are placed opposite a junction in a residential dead end, but fail to Plan DYLS opposite the entrance to woodlands avenue, on Dawes Heath road, which is a main throughfare and heavily used as a "Rat Run" from Rayleigh Weir via Glassys Lane to cut out Rayleigh one way system. The parking opposite Woodlands Ave will only increase throughout the area, as these nuisance parkers find alternatives to Woodlands Ave once any measures are implemented, as it will throughout Dawes Heath road and over the brow of the hill making this area a particularly "Dangerous" Traffic hazard, and would urge further considered thought in this matter before any measures are implemented.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions have been proposed on the junctions of the roads to which Permit Parking is also proposed. This is in line with rule 243 of the Highway Code which states: 'DO NOT stop or park.... opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space.'</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p> <p>If the proposal is introduced, as with any new parking scheme, its impact would be monitored. Additional restrictions could therefore be introduced later if required.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>After receiving your letter about street parking and restrictions in Daws Heath Road, Woodlands Ave and Woodlands Close, Rayleigh. I am pleased with the restrictions ect but would ask if it is possible to put yellow lines on the bend opposite number 11 and 13 Woodlands</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in</p>

	<p>Ave, it does cause problems cars park half up on the pavement which means people with prams or wheelchairs have to go into the road. It makes it very difficult and dangerous get on and off of our driveways and dangerous when two vehicles arrive at the corner from opposite directions,</p>	<p>consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>If a Permit Area is introduced, Permit Holders will be subject to terms and conditions of a residents parking scheme. For example, residents must not park in a manner that affects the safety of other pedestrians or vehicles, in a manner that blocks any side roads or adjacent properties or too close to a junction. It is possible for Permit Holders to have their Permit withdrawn if they persisted in these practices.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p> <p>If the proposal is introduced, as with any new parking scheme, its impact would be monitored. Additional restrictions could therefore be introduced later if required.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Email 1</p> <p>I fully support the proposed amendment no. 13</p> <p>However what seems to have been forgotten is the section of road between number 12 and 14 which is currently a white line (which has almost worn away)</p> <p>This would be great if this was added to be double yellow lines as its a blind bend and cars still park there ignoring the white line (probably not knowing a white line is no stopping): I have campaigned for this to be done for the last 20 years.</p> <p>Email 2</p> <p>I stated I fully support the proposal however what is going to happed the faded white line on the bend</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>If a Permit Area is introduced, Permit Holders will be subject to terms and conditions of a residents parking scheme. For example, residents must not park in a manner that affects the safety of other pedestrians or vehicles, in a manner that blocks any side roads or adjacent properties or too close to a junction. It is possible for Permit Holders to have their Permit withdrawn if they persisted in these practices.</p>

	<p>between no. 12 and 14 ?</p> <p>please use some common sense.</p> <p>Its a dangerous bend and blind</p>	<p>The remnants of a H-Bar Marking (Diagram 1026.1) can be located on the outside of the bend of Woodlands Avenue. Google Maps shows that this marking was installed in or before 2009 which pre-dates the SEPP. It should be noted that Diagram 1026.1 is a prescribed, advisory marking designed to prevent vehicles from parking either outside an entrance to off-street premises, or where the kerb is dropped to provide a convenient crossing place for pedestrians. Therefore, a H-Bar marking on the bend Woodlands Avenue is not fit for purpose to prevent parking.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p> <p>If the proposal is introduced, as with any new parking scheme, its impact would be monitored. Additional restrictions could therefore be introduced later if required.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>We are in agreement to yellow lines and permit holders in Woodlands Ave. The reasons are:-</p> <p>The parking in the road is horrendous, we have lived here for 47 years and it has never been as dangerous as it is now. Double parking, cars and vans over driveways, parking on pavements.</p> <p>The parking is making the road dangerous especially for the elderly, disabled and prams. Crossing the road at the junction of Daws Heath Road is dangerous due to people living on Daws Heath Rd parking right up to the junction and impeding your vision to see cars in both direction.</p> <p>Cars are left all day in the road by workers from the industrial units. We also have parking for the gym and dog walkers who park on the pavement on the corner, pedestrians have to walk in the road.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

	<p>We had to have an emergency ambulance, the paramedic was first on scene, he could not park, my neighbour allowed him to park on her driveway. When the ambulance came minutes were lost as they had difficulty at the top of the road and parking on the roundabout. In the end they parked up the road, blocking the road due to parking. Peoples lives are in danger, a fire engine would never get down the road.</p> <p>It is time to have parking restrictions to make the road safe.</p>	
12	<p>I refer to the above proposed scheme and write to state that I continue to object to the plans. As previously stated I believe the proposal to be heavy handed.</p> <p>The yellow lines at the top of Woodlands Avenue, Daws Heath Road and corner of Woodlands Close are necessary but I believe that putting them round both Turning circles is excessive. There are many other narrow roads in Rayleigh where traffic manages to navigate without resorting to yellow lines.</p> <p>I believe that some restriction - yellow lines or the current faded white lines reinstated - is necessary on the bend in Woodlands Avenue (by the field and alley way).Cars parked or waiting here cause a dangerous obstruction to the motorist's view around the bend . I believe that removing them from the proposal is a wrong decision.</p> <p>I still believe that introducing residents parking permits between certain hours in a bid to reduce commuter /gym traffic is a heavy handed step . It doesn't actually resolve the issues with afternoon / evening and weekend parking yet still involves cost and inconvenience for the residents and their visitors, workmen etc quite possibly having an impact on property values and sales.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions on the turning heads will help to ensure that vehicles are able to turn around in the roads effectively, especially larger vehicles.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Highway is intended for the purposes of passing and re-passing and that no right of parking exists. Parking provision is therefore a concession and, however desirable, should not be at the expense of the purpose of the highway. Where it is safe and desirable parking can be allowed. Therefore, it is the aim of SEPP to try and balance the needs of road users.</p> <p>The remnants of a H-Bar Marking (Diagram 1026.1) can be located on the outside of the bend of Woodlands Avenue. Google Maps shows that this marking was installed in or before 2009 which pre-dates the SEPP. It should be noted that Diagram 1026.1 is a prescribed, advisory marking designed to prevent vehicles from parking either outside an entrance to</p>

		<p>off-street premises, or where the kerb is dropped to provide a convenient crossing place for pedestrians. Therefore, a H-Bar marking on the bend Woodlands Avenue is not fit for purpose to prevent parking.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p> <p>If the proposal is introduced, as with any new parking scheme, its impact would be monitored. Additional restrictions could therefore be introduced later if required.</p> <p>Residents and their visitors only need to purchase a Permit if they wish to park on the road within the operational hours of the Permit Scheme. The Partnership is required to ensure that the cost of running the scheme is self-financing. Charges for permits have been calculated at the minimum level possible and compare very favourably with neighbouring areas.</p> <p>The SEPP are not able to comment on how proposed parking schemes affect property valuations.</p>
13	<p>I am disappointed to learn that the original scheme has been withdrawn as it seemed to answer all my concerns, as far as i can see the re designed scheme falls well short of the original schemes intentions.</p> <p>The re designed scheme seems like second best for at times NON RESIDENT parking can still take place. It is still my view that a scheme is needed that prevents NON RESIDENT parking from clogging up all of Woodlands Close AT ALL TIMES.</p> <p>I doubt that the re designed scheme will be anywhere near as effective as the original scheme promised to be for Woodlands close.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p>

	<p>Overview, I regard the re designed scheme as second best, however it is better than ignoring the residents present situation entirely and doing nothing at all which, I guess could be a possibility, so on that basis, even though I see it as second best I reluctantly support the redesigned scheme.</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the parking issues within the Woodlands Close area.</p> <p>I do appreciate how difficult it must be to meet everyone’s needs and expectations.</p> <p>I would like for it to be formally noted that I object to the Double Yellow Line Proposal located at the turning point (top of) Woodlands Close. All other areas highlighted in the latest proposal I agree with, those being the permit area and double yellow lines at the junction of Woodlands Close and Woodlands Avenue.</p> <p><u>Objections to double yellow Lines proposal in turning point of Woodlands Close (Top of)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the introduction of the proposed yellow lines at the top of Woodlands Close, they would not resolve the current issue. It would continue to restrict the amount of vehicles that are able to park in Woodlands Close. Allowing a permit area in the Turing point also will help assist with the ongoing parking issues for residents. In the previous letter from yourselves facts that have already been cited <i>“9 objections were received and 15 comments were received in support, concerns included not enough spaces for residents and visitors, negative impacts on property values and the proposals being too severe”</i>. With the permits introduced this would allow some control of who parks there and those that are in the road (living or visiting) should be able to park without issue. • The double yellow lines will have a negative impact on the 	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>It should be remembered that the highway is intended for the purposes of passing and re-passing and that no right of parking exists. Parking provision is therefore a concession and, however desirable, should not be at the expense of the purpose of the highway. Where it is safe and desirable parking can be allowed.</p> <p>Permit Parking has been proposed on the majority of Woodlands Close to allow residents to park if needed. It should be noted however, that most residents have some form of off-street parking.</p> <p>‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions have been proposed on the turning heads of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close to better facilitate the passage of traffic and assist vehicles in turning.</p> <p>The SEPP are not able to comment on how proposed parking schemes affect property valuations.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend proposed ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions to ‘Permit Parking’ without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p>

value of my property and those within the turning point And those at the top of the close. Yet other residents in the same street will not have this negative impact on their property because they wouldn't have a double yellow line outside of their property.

- With the double yellow lines imposed at the turning point - There will not be enough space for residents and visitors even with the current permit holders area. This is because of the knock on effect. Those wishing to park in the turning point would have to park in the permit area. Those in the permit area would become frustrated because the people with the yellow lines are always parking in their permit area. Solution give the double yellow line area a permit at the top of Woodlands Close.
- Simply is not fair, how is it reasonable and justifiable that persons are allowed to have permits in the same road and I have to suffer the inconvenience of double yellow lines ?
- Previously it was cited by yourselves that the road was too narrow to allow permit parking - the top part of Woodlands Close is in fact the widest part of the road and even more reason to allow permit parking.
- A justifiable reason for implementation of double yellow lines would be to help or alleviate traffic congestion. This is simply not an issue at the top of Woodlands Close, there is no traffic.
- A justifiable reason for implementation of double yellow lines could be to prevent obstructions in the road. Again not an issue, there is not an obstruction if cars park in the road (if permits were issued) vehicles will still be able to turn easily if cars are parked in the road.

- A justifiable reason for implementation of double yellow lines would be to make a road safer for vehicles and pedestrians. Not an issue, the location is not a junction, it is the widest part of the Close. There is not issue of “not being able to see” because of the vast space and opportunity to be able to see around cars. There is already limited opportunity to park - due to drop kerbs being in place. Thus allowing good visibility even when cars are parked there.
- A justifiable reason for implementation of double yellow lines could be to provide kerb side loading facilities. Not justifiable, given the fact that all properties have drop kerbs. Factual that if properties have large deliveries they are able to park within the drop kerb area to facilitate the delivery of goods - please note that this is a rare occasion as there are not large businesses operating in the area with daily delivery of goods.
- A justifiable reason for implementation of double yellow lines would be if there was an issue with emergency vehicles unable to gain access through to or to a property. This would not be an issue at all. As described above, all properties have dropped kerbs. If vehicles were parked with permits emergency vehicles would still be able to have access to all the properties.

Proposal

My proposal and I foresee no reason why the proposal can't be put in place given that the justifiable measures for double yellow lines are not met. Extend the parking permits to the whole of Woodlands Close as I foresee that this would satisfy all those concerned living in the area.

The issue that all (residents) wanted to be addressed in the first instance was to stop those parking in Woodlands Close dangerously and inconsiderately. The simplest and most convenient solution

	would be to introduce permit parking for the whole of Woodlands Close, with the exception of the double yellow line implementation at the junction of Woodlands Close and Woodlands Avenue - where there is the biggest concern for safety.	
15	<p>We are in receipt of your letter with regards to publishing the above proposal.</p> <p>We are 100% in favour of the No Waiting at any time proposed for the junction of Woodlands Avenue and Daws Heath Rd. Cars and vans continually park right on the corner on the left hand side of the road making it impossible to see into Woodlands Avenue when you are turning left into the street and having to utilise the opposite side of the road. There has also been an increasing number of vehicles parking directly opposite the junction recently, again making entry onto and exiting from the street difficult and increasing the need to utilise the wrong side of the road to do so.</p> <p>The significant number of cars parked at the top of the road also make it very difficult to observe oncoming traffic when exiting our driveway or for road users to see us. We live at No. █ Woodlands Avenue.</p>	Support noted.
16	In regards to the below proposal, I fully support the proposed plan.	Support noted.
17	<p>Email 1 Thank you for your email regarding the Revised Parking Scheme.</p> <p>We strongly object to the double yellow lines proposal at the top of Woodlands Close. All other areas highlighted in the latest proposal we agree with.</p> <p>The reason for the objection is because we feel that this is not very fair on the residents living around the hammer head (this includes us having lived here for over 49 years). It restricts parking for friends and families visiting where would they be able park. Although there is permit parking down the down we don't feel it would resolve the current issue. It would continue to restrict the amount of parking</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>It should be remembered that the highway is intended for the purposes of passing and re-passing and that no right of parking exists. Parking provision is therefore a concession and, however desirable, should not be at the expense of the purpose of the</p>

	<p>available in Woodlands Close.</p> <p>So, could we have permit parking at the top of Woodlands Close (turning area) as well, as this would assist with the ongoing parking issues for residents.</p> <p>Finally we feel that double yellow lines around the turning area is simply not fair on the residents living there. It seems to be very unreasonable that residents down the road are allowed permits and we have to suffer the inconvenience of double yellow lines.</p> <p>Email 2 Further to my email 7 March 2024. We have 16 properties in Woodlands Close, with your proposals for double yellow lines around the turning area which start outside No. 5 and ends outside No. 12 which takes up 8 of the properties. This only leaves 8 properties trying to share parking for the 16 properties in the close.</p>	<p>highway. Where it is safe and desirable parking can be allowed.</p> <p>Permit Parking has been proposed on the majority of Woodlands Close to allow residents to park if needed. It should be noted however, that most residents have some form of off-street parking.</p> <p>'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions have been proposed on the turning heads of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close to better facilitate the passage of traffic and assist vehicles in turning.</p> <p>Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions to 'Permit Parking' without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>After some consideration I feel that the seriousness of parking on the bend of Woodlands Avenue, which was the original complaint has been totally overlooked in this new proposal. Allowing permit parking on the bend goes against The Highway Code Rule 243 which states we must not stop or park on a bend unless forced to do so by stationary traffic. Permit parking along the bend would also block access to council staff who maintain the park.</p> <p>I am also concerned that double yellow lines on Daws Heath Road opposite Woodlands Avenue has not been considered.</p> <p>Whilst I am emailing, could I please have confirmation as to whether or not non residents of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close can apply for a parking permit?</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed in line with the recommendations made by the SEPP Sub Committee in consideration of the representations received during the previous formal consultation for Woodlands Avenue, Woodlands Close and Daws Heath Road.</p> <p>If a Permit Area is introduced, Permit Holders will be subject to terms and conditions of a residents parking scheme. For example, residents must not park in a manner that affects the safety of other pedestrians or vehicles, in a manner that blocks any side roads or adjacent properties or too close to a junction. It is possible for Permit Holders to have their Permit withdrawn if they persisted in these practices.</p> <p>When the committee meet, they will decide if the proposal is to be implemented and the Order made, amended with a lesser</p>

		<p>restriction, or withdrawn in its entirety. Current legislation does not allow the SEPP to amend the proposal to include additional 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions without re-designing the proposal and undergoing another 21-day formal consultation.</p> <p>All residents of Woodlands Avenue and Woodlands Close would be eligible to purchase permits. In the Rochford District, residents are allocated a maximum of two permits per individual property. The aim of a permit parking scheme is not to penalise local residents. Therefore, other nearby properties on adjacent roads without adequate off-street parking would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>
--	--	---

APPENDIX 3
Photos

Image of Woodlands Close, Rayleigh – Taken by local resident



Images of Woodlands Avenue taken during site visits by SEPP Technicians in 2022

