Peckham and Nunhead Community Council

Theme: Getting to know you … and setting priorities for the year

Wednesday 29 June 2016
7.00 pm
St Mary Magdalene Church, 17 St Mary’s Road, (Off Queens Road) London, SE15

Membership

Councillor Sunil Chopra (Chair)       Councillor Barrie Hargrove
Councillor Sandra Rhule (Vice-Chair)  Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Evelyn Akoto               Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor Jasmine Ali                 Councillor Jamille Mohammed
Councillor Fiona Colley                Councillor Johnson Situ
Councillor Nick Dolezal                Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Gavin Edwards               Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Renata Hamvas              

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting
Eleanor Kelly
Chief Executive
Date: Tuesday 21 June 2016

Order of Business
1. **INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

   Welcome those present at the meeting (chair).

   Introductions from the new chair and vice chair of Peckham and Nunhead Community Council for the council year 2016/17.

   Chair to thank departing chair and vice chair of this community council.

2. **APOLOGIES**

   To receive any apologies for absence or lateness.

3. **DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

   Members to declare any interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

4. **ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

   The chair to advise whether they have agreed to any item of urgent business being admitted to the agenda.

5. **MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING** (Pages 2 - 11)

   To approve as a correct record the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 21 March 2016.

6. **DEPUTATIONS** (Pages 12 - 13)  

   The community council to consider two deputation requests from residents of Co-operative House and Peckham Planning Network.

7. **COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS**  

   - To receive community announcements or presentations
   - To receive written updates from the Police (if any)
   - Peckham Settlement – re-launch
8. THEME: "GETTING TO KNOW YOU ...."

- Introduction from the chair and vice chair: To talk about their aspirations for the year.
- Introduction from cabinet member for communities and safety: To present his vision.
- Ward workshops to set priorities for the year: 2016/17 that will cover topics on:
  - Intergenerational priorities: Reducing social isolation, improving care of the elderly.
  - Health and wellbeing: Include awareness to tackle obesity in young and older people.
  - Growing prosperity: Encouraging local business, skills development and employment.
  - Peckham and Nunhead: Discuss issues about the environment, air pollution and green spaces.
  - Crime and community safety: Discuss issues about the safer neighbourhood watch, Southwark safer communities and joint working with the police and community safety led projects.
  - Any other items.

BREAK AT 8.15 PM

An opportunity for residents to talk to councillors and officers.

9. FEEDBACK ON WORKSHOPS AND SET PRIORITIES FOR 2016 - 2017

10. CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) STUDIES IN QUEENS ROAD AND PECKHAM ROAD SOUTH (Pages 14 - 24)

- The commencement of controlled parking zone (CPZ) studies in the Queens Road and Peckham Road south areas.

11. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

This is an opportunity for public questions to be addressed to the chair.

Residents or persons working in the borough may ask questions on any matter in relation to which the council has powers or duties.

Responses may be supplied in writing following the meeting.
Each community council may submit one question to a council assembly meeting that has previously been considered and noted by the community council.

Any question to be submitted from a community council to council assembly should first be the subject of discussion at a community council meeting. The subject matter and question should be clearly noted in the community council’s minutes and thereafter the agreed question can be referred to the constitutional team.

The community council is invited to consider if it wishes to submit a question to the ordinary meeting of council assembly on 13 July 2016.

Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

Members to consider the recommendations in the report.

Date: Tuesday 21 June 2016
INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

CONTACT: Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer, Tel: 020 7525 7234 or email: beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk
Website: www.southwark.gov.uk

ACCESS TO INFORMATION
On request, agendas and reports will be supplied to members of the public, except if they contain confidential or exempted information.

ACCESSIBLE MEETINGS
The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. For further details on building access, translation and interpreting services, the provision of signers and other access requirements, please contact the Constitutional Officer.

Disabled members of the public, who wish to attend community council meetings and require transport assistance in order to attend, are requested to contact the Constitutional Officer. The Constitutional Officer will try to arrange transport to and from the meeting. There will be no charge to the person requiring transport. Please note that it is necessary to contact us as far in advance as possible, and at least three working days before the meeting.

BABYSITTING/CARERS’ ALLOWANCES
If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children or an elderly or disabled dependant, so that you can attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form from the Constitutional Officer at the meeting.

DEPUTATIONS
Deputations provide the opportunity for a group of people who are resident or working in the borough to make a formal representation of their views at the meeting. Deputations have to be regarding an issue within the direct responsibility of the Council. For further information on deputations, please contact the Constitutional Officer.

For a large print copy of this pack, please telephone 020 7525 7234.
Peckham and Nunhead Community Council

MINUTES of the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council held on Monday 21 March 2016 at 7.00 pm at Harris Academy Peckham, 112 Peckham Road, London SE15 5DZ

PRESENT:
Councillor Johnson Situ (Chair)
Councillor Cleo Soanes (Vice Chair)
Councillor Evelyn Akoto
Councillor Fiona Colley
Councillor Sunil Chopra
Councillor Nick Dolezal
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor Renata Hamvas
Councillor Richard Livingstone
Councillor Jamille Mohammed
Councillor Sandra Rhule

OTHER MEMBERS
PRESENT:
Councillor Mark Williams, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and New Homes
Councillor Darren Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm

OFFICER SUPPORT:
Ian Ransom, Group Manager, Highways
Gill Kelly, Community Council Development Officer
Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The chair introduced himself, and welcomed councillors, members of the public and officers to the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Jasmine Ali, Michael Situ and Victoria Mills. Councillors Evelyn Akoto, Gavin Edwards and Renata Hamvas submitted their apologies for lateness.

Agenda Item 5
3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

The following member declared an interest in the agenda item listed below:

Councillor Sunil Chopra, non pecuniary interest, in relation to item 11, as he is a member of Link Age Southwark and the Southwark Hindu Centre.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

The chair agreed to accept the following items as urgent business:

- Supplemental agenda no.1: Item 14 – Secure Cycle Parking (Bike Hangar).
- Supplemental agenda no. 2: Item 6 – Deputation request, Peckham CoDesign consultation.
- Supplemental agenda no. 3: Item 15 – Ivydale Traffic Calming Review.

5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2016 be agreed as an accurate record, and signed by the chair.

6. DEPUTATION

The community council received a deputation request from residents who live in the Peckham area.

Michelle Mare, the spokesperson for the deputation outlined the following:

Michelle explained that codesign was a relatively new council policy that was established for Peckham in 2014. This brought local constituents, the council and architects together to work towards a general consensus and agreed design of the public realm that would help develop a smooth path towards planning consent, without it affecting rights to full public consultation.

The deputation said they supported the aims of the codesign but there appeared to be sparse information and regulation concerning the governance and parameters of its application. This could lead to concern as to whether all projects would be treated consistently and equally. She said the residents would like to work further with the council so they could understand the process to develop a robust codesign that would be well received and benefit all concerned.

Michelle explained that they presented a deputation at the cabinet meeting on the 9 February 2016 where they asked for a review of the process. Their request was that they wanted the council to bring forward a meeting to take into account public feedback and further views in order to publish the guidance on the codesign.
Members agreed that there was room for improvement and that the process could be done differently which would take on board the wide range of views.

The chair thanked the deputation for their presentation.

7. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Bellenden Traffic Review

Ian Ransom, group manager from the Highways team gave an update on the Bellenden traffic review.

He explained that following the deputation presentation at the last community council meeting in February 2016, officers met with local residents, Living Streets, Southwark cyclists, cabinet and ward members regarding the council's proposal to remove the Bellenden gyratory system as part of the Bellenden, Lyndhurst Way, Highshore Road walking and cycling scheme.

Ian confirmed that the northern part of Bellenden Road gyratory system would not close. He confirmed the council's plans to install raised pavements and provide a new zebra crossing on the exit of Bellenden Road. Ian explained that there was overwhelming support for this proposal. Ian also referred to the Southwark spine cycle route (the cycle network in Southwark) outlining that the council would speak to residents about the cycling proposals for this. It was noted that any recommendations for the Bellenden traffic review would be presented to the cabinet member for environment and the public realm.

Southwark Civic Awards

The chair announced that the nomination forms for the Southwark Civic Awards 2016 were available on the council’s website. The closing date for receipt of nominations was 29 March 2016. People were encouraged to visit the website www.southwark.gov.uk/civicawards.

For more information contact the awards enquiry line 020 7525 7303 or email mayors.office@southwark.gov.uk

Peckham Coal Line

Kristy from Peckham Coal Line thanked the community council for their support and briefly spoke about the project.

The Peckham Coal Line is an elevated urban park built on disused railway coal sidings to form a physical and social link between two high streets (Peckham Rye down to Lyndhurst Way).

Peckham Platform

The chair mentioned that Peckham Platform had done some great work with young people. The Peckham youth platform (ages range from 13 to 19 years old) usually meet in the gallery. They would be involved in activities like media, which was funding from the community council fund (neighbourhood fund).
8. THEME: SHAPING OUR FUTURE - REGENERATION IN PECKHAM AND NUNHEAD

The chair introduced the theme. He urged people to ask questions or use the twitter feed #SE15 community during the theme.

The community council also held project hubs that were based around the theme.

Chloe Young and Peter Davidson who were representatives from Berkeley Homes talked about the development proposals along the Old Kent Road. They explained that the purpose of their attendance at the community council was to engage fully with local people during the consultation process.

Summary:

Berkeley Homes had recently acquired three industrial sites close to the Old Kent Road which were the former Hygrade Meat factory at Bianca Road, Acorn Wharf and Surrey Wharf which would be redeveloped to create a mix of new homes, commercial space and public realm.

Many of these homes would be affordable and would help the council to achieve its target of building 11,000 new council homes by 2043.

The proposals would significantly increase the number of jobs employed on site. During construction, Berkeley said they would recruit local people and expand the apprenticeship scheme. Representatives explained that a public exhibition took place on 20 April and 21 April 2016.

Both representatives were available for questions during the break.

Councillor Darren Merrill, cabinet member for environment and the public realm addressed the meeting concerning environmental issues in the area.

Councillor Merrill addressed some of the issues the council were dealing with especially in regard to bins that were left on the pavements by local businesses which he felt had a negative impact on the street.

Councillor Merrill said the council's multi disciplinary team regularly visited Rye Lane to encourage traders to keep the pavements clear of clutter. As a result of these visits there had been a slight improvement.

He said the council introduced a pilot scheme to manage street clutter along Walworth Road which had been trialled for six months. The idea was that there would be two scheduled collections each day and if traders missed the scheduled slot, they were not allowed to leave the waste collection out on the pavement.

The council are thinking of implementing the same scheme along Rye Lane.

In response to questions, Councillor Merrill spoke about the difficulties with some commercial waste contracts on Rye Lane which were not managed by the council.
During the presentation Peckham Vision asked for people’s views about environment issues in the area. The project thought it would be a good opportunity to receive them at this meeting.

The chair thanked everyone for their presentations.

9. CONTINUE WITH THEME - SHAPING OUR FUTURE - REGENERATION

Councillor Mark Williams, cabinet member for regeneration and new homes addressed the meeting. He spoke about the main developments and schemes that were taking place in the Peckham area.

The following was highlighted:

- The council’s proposal to build new homes on the North Peckham Estate.
- 133 Rye Lane – application to build new housing developments.
- Proposals to re-develop the Bussey building in Peckham.

Councillor Williams said the council would work and be fully engaged with local residents and developers particularly with regard to ensuring there was low cost home ownership.

In response to questions, regarding Southwark’s rough sleepers, it was noted that the council was addressing this issue. The council would target and ensure that the developers comply with the 35% of social and affordable housing.

Following the presentation, the community council took part in a discussion panel which covered topics on the following:

- The Southwark plan, housing and jobs.
- The engagement of young people on issues relating to regeneration in the area.
- Providing more job opportunities and apprenticeship schemes for young people.
- Provide the community with new and improved stores in Rye Lane as it used to be a place where people liked to shop.

Councillor Williams said he would welcome people’s views on regeneration and housing developments in the Peckham and Nunhead area.

10. CLEANER GREENER SAFER FUNDING 2016/17 - PECKHAM RYE WARD

Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

RESOLVED:

That the following projects be allocated funding from the cleaner greener safer funding programme for 2016/17:

Peckham Rye ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mundania gardens project £3,000
Gardens cycle hanging project £12,500
Memorial information on the Corset Factory on Nunhead Lane £4,000
Francesca Cabrini outdoor classroom £4,000
Tools for One Tree Hill £800
Stuart Road allotments £5,835
Brenchley gardens community raised beds £10,000
Limes Walk tree planting project £750
Rye Hill estate renew metal fencing to Boundary walls £3,250

11. NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND AWARDS 2016/17

Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

RESOLVED:

That the allocations from the neighbourhood fund award 2016 – 2017 be awarded to the following projects:

Livesey ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Pride basket ball club</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark neighbourhood watch Association</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Grove community garden</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledbury TRA</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindley estate tenants &amp; residents Association</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional street cleaning</td>
<td>£6,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwall for all Trust</td>
<td>£3,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent research group</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bermondsey choir</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nunhead ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Pride basket ball club</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astbury road area residents association</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayards estate tenants and residents association</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimtonroy tenants and residents association</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal name</td>
<td>Amount awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchan tenants and residents association</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossall tenants and residents association</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy High Street</td>
<td>£2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Nunhead cemetery</td>
<td>£1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Age Southwark</td>
<td>£2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunheads Voice Ltd</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunheads Voice Ltd (Sunshine club)</td>
<td>£4,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead free film festival</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Coal Line</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster house youth club</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peckham ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health wealth</td>
<td>£1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Pride basketball club</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bells gardens wellbeing ambassadors</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo peace fund</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional street cleaning</td>
<td>£1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester grove estate</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of tomorrow</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSAS hearts of love</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent research</td>
<td>£1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham citizens</td>
<td>£900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared intense support service</td>
<td>£3,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark children's brass band</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark travellers action</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Georges pop-in</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner residents association</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teardusk</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peckham Rye ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquarius golf club</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Nunhead cemetery</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Peckham Rye park</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little People’s World</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead free film festival</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster house youth club</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cycle works</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead Voice sunshine club</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Lane ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal name</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Idowu Foundation</td>
<td>£5,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faces in focus</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead American association</td>
<td>£900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Platform</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Vision</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Gallery</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham Pride basket ball club</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belham Primary/Elim House music project</td>
<td>£1,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consort tenants and residents</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association fun day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consort tenants and residents association coach trip</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. SOUTHWARK LEISURE CAR PARKS

Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.

RESOLVED:

That the local traffic and parking amendments set out in the appendix of the report be approved subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:

The introduction of a four-hour maximum stay in the leisure centre car parking area at Peckham Pulse Leisure centre to prevent all day commuter parking congestion and ensure there is turnover in parking spaces for genuine visitors to the leisure centres as well as measures to permit enforcement of obstructive parking or abuse of disabled parking bays.

13. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

There were no community council questions at this meeting.

Members noted that the community council question could be discussed at the meeting in June 2016 and tabled at the council assembly meeting in July 2016.

14. SECURE CYCLE PARKING (BIKE HANGAR)

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.

A local resident expressed some concern about the installation of a cycle hangar in Astbury Road and asked if it could be reviewed in six months time.
RESOLVED:

That the recommendations that are due to be made to the cabinet member for environment and the public realm on the following be agreed:

1. The community council supports the introduction of cycle hangars on the following roads, subject to the necessary statutory procedures:

   - Astbury Road
   - Azenby Road
   - Bird In Bush Road
   - Choumert Road
   - Choumert Road (Bellenden Road)
   - Commercial Way
   - Ferris Road
   - Nutbrook Street
   - Peckham Rye
   - Queens Road
   - Tresco Road
   - Carden Road and
   - Rye Hill Park.

2. That the community council decided not to support the introduction of a cycle hangar on Machell Road because the council received a low response rate during the consultation period.

15. IVYDALE TRAFFIC REVIEW

Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the community council considered and rejected the seven objections received to the proposals for the essential nature of the additional waiting restrictions to ensure the proposals operate safely and effectively.

2. That officers be instructed to proceed with the traffic order and notify the objectors that the traffic scheme would be implemented subject to the necessary statutory procedures.
Meeting ended at 10.00 pm

CHAIR:

DATED:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Classification:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Meeting Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead Community Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report title:**
Deputation Requests – Representatives of Cooperative House
Residents of Cooperative House
Representatives of Peckham Planning Network

**Ward(s) or groups affected:**
Peckham Rye ward

**From:**
Proper constitutional officer

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council consider two deputation requests from residents of Cooperative House, 263 Rye Lane, SE15 4UR and representatives of Peckham Planning Network.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2. The first deputation request has been submitted by representatives of Cooperative House which refers to the lack of transparency and communication with developers in the local area.

3. The first deputation states:

“We feel that we have been unfairly represented by the results of a canvassed survey to the Cooperative House residents with regards to a local development. The developers did not give a fair representation of our views which was used in a survey which was then submitted to the council.”

4. The residents of Cooperative House would like the opportunity to meet with local ward councillors and the developer to ensure that the residents’ views are heard in full and that they are adequately consulted on any of the processes.

5. The second deputation request has been submitted by representatives of Peckham Planning Network about development in the Peckham Town Centre.

6. The second deputation states:

“Peckham Planning Network would like to bring to the attention of the community council the concerns they have regarding the significant adverse cumulative effects of development in the local area particularly with regard to the Peckham Town Centre.”

7. A deputation can be submitted by a person of any age who lives, works or studies in Southwark. Deputations must relate to matters which the council has powers or duties or which affects Southwark.

8. At the meeting, the spokesperson for the deputation will be invited to speak up to five minutes on the subject matter. The community council will debate the deputation and at the conclusion of the deputation the chair will seek the consent of councillors to debate the subject. Councillors may move motions and amendments without prior notice if the subject does not relate to a report
on the agenda. The meeting can decide to note the deputation or provide support if requested to do so. The community council shall not take any formal decision(s) on the subject raised unless a report is on the agenda.

9. Any relevant resource or community impact issues will be contained in the comments of the strategic director.

**KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

10. The deputation shall consist of no more than six persons, including the spokesperson.

11. Only one member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting, her or his speech being limited to five minutes.

12. Councillors may ask questions of the deputation, which shall be answered by their spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by her or him for up to five minutes at the conclusion of the spokesperson’s address.

13. If more than one deputation is to be heard in respect of one subject there shall be no debate until each deputation has been presented. The monitoring officer shall, in writing, formally communicate the decision of the meeting to the person who submitted the request for the deputation to be received.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OFFICERS**

Director of Regeneration

14. To follow.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Held At</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence from representatives of the deputation</td>
<td>160 Tooley Street, London SE1P 5LX</td>
<td>Beverley Olamijulo 020 7525 7234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUDIT TRAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Chidi Agada, Principal Constitutional Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Author</td>
<td>Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated</td>
<td>20 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Decision?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Title</th>
<th>Comments Sought</th>
<th>Comments included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Law and Democracy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Director of Finance and Governance</td>
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RECOMMENDATION

1. That the community council comment upon the proposed consultation boundary and methods to review parking arrangements:

- within a network of streets to the south of Peckham Road between the existing ‘B’, ‘L’ and ‘LG’ CPZs and to the north of the railway line; and

- within a network of streets around Queen’s Road, bounded by Meeting House Lane and Clifton Crescent to the north, Brayards Road to the south, Pomeroy Street and Lausanne Road to the east and the existing Zone ‘B’ CPZ to the west.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Part 3H of the council’s constitution provides that community councils should be consulted on strategic traffic management matters such as whether to change the times of operation of a parking zone and the related method of consultation.

Peckham Road South area

3. The last parking zone consultation in this area took place in 2012. A new CPZ was rejected at this time. However, the project did result in the implementation of double yellow lines on all road junctions in the study area.

4. Requests for a new CPZ have been raised via local members and directly from residents. Since 2012, we have received 55 individual requests, this includes 27 which have been received between January 2016 – June 2016. There is a social media campaign, via twitter, calling for the introduction of a new CPZ and a petition has been submitted to the council.

5. It should be noted that the study area covers both Camberwell and Peckham and Nunhead community council areas.

6. Further information regarding the proposed Peckham Road south consultation can be found in Appendix 1.

Queen’s Road area

7. The area around Queen’s Road is regularly visited by the council to implement yellow line restrictions to prevent obstructive, inconsiderate and dangerous parking,
particularly close to road junctions; this indicates a high level of parking demand. For example, additional parking restrictions have been introduced in recent years into Astbury Road, Kings Grove and Wood Road.

8. The area as a whole was last consulted in 2002, with no resulting CPZ being implemented. A smaller section of streets within the area were consulted more recently in 2010, which resulted in the extension of the existing Zone B CPZ to Gordon’s Road and Harders Road. This has caused some parking displacement to streets to the east of the zone.

Further information regarding the proposed Queen’s Road CPZ consultation can be found in Appendix 2.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

9. The consultation methods for the CPZ studies are detailed in Appendix 1 for the Peckham Road south area and in Appendix 2 for the Queen’s Road area. Each appendix includes a plan showing proposed the study boundary.

10. Before a final decision is taken, the community council will again be consulted. The procedure is summarised in the table below and full details on the process are contained within Appendix 3.

11. It is intended to stagger the consultations to enable the parking design team to resource and deliver the projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Expected dates Peckham Road</th>
<th>Expected dates Queens Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey &amp; consultation</td>
<td>Autumn 2016</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy implications

12. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the polices of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly

Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction;
Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy; and
Policy 8.1 – seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets

Community impact statement

13. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report and have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.

14. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals
are made.

15. The introduction or amendment of a parking zone contributes to an improved environment through the elimination of on-street commuter parking and the associated reduction of local and borough-wide traffic levels.

16. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighbouring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely pre-empted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed.

17. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group. The recommendations do not conflict with the council’s commitment to equalities or to the protection of human rights. In addition, part of the aim of the consultation is to promote social inclusion by:

- providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuge vehicles; and
- improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users on the public highway.

18. The consultation leaflets will meet communication guidance with a languages page providing advice as to how to access the council’s translation service. Furthermore, large format leaflets will be available for those with visual impairment.

Resource implications

19. The costs of each parking zone project, including staff fees, consultation and implementation (if supported) will cost approximately £50k which will be funded through capital provisions already established for this purpose.

20. A more accurate estimate of the costs from this scheme will be reported at the end of the consultation.

Legal implications

21. The community councils are being asked to comment upon the proposed consultation boundaries and methods for the proposed consultations in the Peckham Road south and Queen’s Road areas. Community councils are entitled to consider these issues pursuant to paragraph 3H of the council’s constitution.

22. The Equality Act 2010 introduced the public sector equality duty, which merged existing race, sex and disability equality duties and extended them to include other protected characteristics; namely age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief and sex and sexual orientation, including marriage and civil partnership. In summary those subject to the equality duty, which includes the Council, must in the exercise of their functions: (i) have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and (ii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. It is not envisaged that the consultation referred to in this report will conflict with the requirements of the Act.

23. The Human Rights Act 1998 imposed a duty on the council as a public authority to apply the European Convention on Human Rights; as a result the council must not act
in a way which is incompatible with these rights. It is not envisaged that the consultation referred to in this report will conflict with any of the protected rights.

Consultation

24. Consultation on the outline of the project has been carried out with the cabinet member for Environment and the Public Realm.

25. All aspects of future consultation are detailed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.
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Appendix 1  Peckham Road south CPZ study

Community council meeting
Camberwell – 11 July 2016
Peckham and Nunhead – 29 June 2016

Ward(s) affected
Brunswick Park and The Lane

Location
All roads in the area to the south of Peckham Road between the existing ‘B’, ‘L’ and ‘LG’ CPZs and to the north of the railway line, as shown on the plan included in Figure 2.

Background
It is proposed to consult properties in the study area to determine if there is a need or demand for a new parking zone in the Peckham Road south area.

Requests for a new CPZ have been raised via local members and directly from residents. Since 2012, we have received 55 individual requests for a CPZ, 27 of which have been received as of the first week of June 2016. There is a social media campaign, via twitter, calling for the introduction of a new CPZ and a petition has been submitted to the council.

The last parking zone consultation in this area took place in 2012. A new CPZ was rejected at this time. However, the project did result in the implementation of double yellow lines on all road junctions in the study area. This is likely to have resulted in increased parking pressure following the removal of space where vehicles were previously unsafely parked.

The proposed study area is in between three existing parking zones (B, LG and L); which is likely to result in a high demand for parking by commuters or other vehicles displaced from these zones.

Consultation area
The area recommended for consultation is shown on the plan contained at Figure 2 and includes all properties (2138 addresses) within the proposed boundary.

It should be noted the study area covers the following community council areas and wards:
- Camberwell community council – Brunswick Ward
- Peckham and Nunhead community council – The Lane

Consultation methods
The method of consultation and decision making is determined by the Council’s Constitution.

When consulting on the need for a new parking zone (referred to as a 1st and 2nd stage parking consultation) officers will survey the area and carry out an informal (non-statutory) consultation. The objective of the survey and consultation is to identify parking issues and to put forward possible solutions.

Before a final decision is taken, the community council will again be consulted. The procedure is summarised in Figure 1 and full details on the process are contained within Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Expected dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey &amp; consultation</td>
<td>Autumn 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                       | • Parking surveys
|                       | • Consultation pack and questionnaire to all residents, businesses and stakeholders
|                       | • Public exhibition
| Decision making       | Early 2017     |
|                       | • Draft report to community council
|                       | • Final report to Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm
| Delivery              | Spring 2017    |
|                       | • Statutory consultation
|                       | • Implementation

www.southwark.gov.uk/info/10058/about_southwark_council/375/councils_constitution
Scope of consultation

It should be noted that the scope of the review will cover the following key issues:

- determination of support for a new parking zone
- the streets to be included in the new zone,
- the times and days of operation of the zone;
- design considerations (type/position of proposed bays; retention/amendment of existing restrictions).

Figure 2 – Project area
Appendix 2  Queen’s Road CPZ study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community council meeting</th>
<th>Peckham and Nunhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>22 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>Livesey; Nunhead; Peckham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

In a network of streets around Queen’s Road, bounded by Meeting House Lane and Clifton Crescent to the north, Bayards Road to the south, Pomeroy Street and Lausanne Road to the east and the existing Zone ‘B’ CPZ to the west. The proposed study area is shown on the plan included in **Figure 2**.

**Background**

It is proposed to consult properties in the study area to determine if there is a need or demand for a new parking zone in the Queen’s Road area.

The last consultation which included the while of this area was a second stage CPZ consultation which took place in 2003. No new CPZ was implemented in this area following that review (79.6% No vs. 16.9% Yes).

Consultation for a smaller section of 18 streets in this area took place 2010. This resulted in the extension of the established Zone 'B CPZ into Gordon’s Road and Harders Road.

The area around Queen’s Road is regularly visited by the council to implement yellow line restrictions to prevent obstructive, inconsiderate and dangerous parking, particularly close to road junctions; this indicates a high level of parking demand. For example, additional parking restrictions have been introduced in recent years into Astbury Road, Kings Grove and Wood’s Road.

The streets inside the proposed study area are within easy walking distance to Queen’s Road station, which provides a 10 minute commute to London Bridge. Additionally, London Overground services commenced in 2012. This is likely to have led to an increase in the number of commuters using this station, which in turn would lead to increased parking pressures on the streets close to the station. Annual entry and exit figures (source: National Rail) demonstrate the year on year increase in users of the Queens Road station. Between 2008 and 2015, they have increased from 0.718 million to 1.791 million.

As from 2013 to June 2016 the council have received 27 requests from residents for a CPZ in the proposed study area.

**Consultation area**

The area recommended for consultation is shown on the plan contained at **Figure 2** and includes all properties (4149 addresses) within the proposed boundary.

**Consultation methods**

The method of consultation and decision making is determined by the [Council’s Constitution](https://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/10058/about_southwark_council/375/councils_constitution).

When consulting on the need for a new parking zone (referred to as a 1st and 2nd stage parking consultation) officers will survey the area and carry out an informal (non-statutory) consultation. The objective of the survey and consultation is to identify parking issues and to put forward possible solutions.

Before a final decision is taken, the community council will again be consulted. The procedure is summarised in Figure 1 and full details on the process are contained within **Appendix 3**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Expected dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey &amp; consultation</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation pack and questionnaire to all residents, businesses and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public exhibition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft report to community council</td>
<td>• Statutory consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final report to Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm</td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

**Scope of consultation**

It should be noted that the scope of the review will cover the following key issues:

- a) determination of support for a new parking zone
- b) the streets to be included in the new zone,
- c) the times and days of operation of the zone;
- d) design considerations (type/position of proposed bays; retention/amendment of existing restrictions).
Zone ‘B’ CPZ  
Mon – Sat  
8am – 6.30pm
Appendix 3 1st and 2nd stage combined (in principle and detailed design) consultation and study process

Item agreed on annual programme

Consultation method and boundary approved by community council

Parking occupancy/duration survey Consultation with all res/bus within consultation area

Consultation report Key decision report

Draft reports presented to community council Final representations appended

Decision by Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm

Decision taken to implement a CPZ as shown in detailed design

Traffic Order advertised and made CPZ implemented

3rd stage (experimental review) if applicable
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the following local traffic and parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:

   1.1 Cheltenham Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and access to bus stop for buses

   1.2 Barry Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and access to bus stop for buses

   1.3 Rye Hill Park – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles at Nos.34 to 120 Rye Hill Park.

   1.4 Tappesfield Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles.

   1.5 Scylla Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and to provide a turning area for vehicles to manoeuvre

2. It is recommended that the objections received against a non-strategic traffic management matter are considered and determined as follows:

   - The Lane Ward – consider and reject objections received, and instruct officers to install new double yellow lines on unrestricted junctions and upgrade junctions with existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines to improve inter-visibility and road safety for all road users.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Paragraph 15 of Part 3H of the Southwark constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:

   - the introduction of single traffic signs
   - the introduction of short lengths of waiting and loading restrictions
   - the introduction of road markings
   - the setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes
• the introduction of destination disabled parking bays
• statutory objections to origin disabled parking bays
• determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues

4. This report gives recommendations for local traffic and parking amendments and the determination of objections to a proposed traffic management order.

5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

• details of the background to the submission of the report
• any previous decisions taken in relation to the subject matter.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. A local parking amendment (LPA) is small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one.

7. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

8. Local parking amendments are batched together and carried through a quarterly programme. During the first quarter of 2016/17, the council is proposing the LPA’s as summarised in figure 1.

9. The rationale for each proposal is discussed in the associated appendix. A detailed design of the proposal is included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Road</td>
<td>To install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access to bus stop for buses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Road</td>
<td>To install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking access to bus stop for buses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Hill Park</td>
<td>install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles at Nos.34 to 120 Rye Hill Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappesfield Road</td>
<td>To install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scylla Road</td>
<td>install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and provide a turning area for vehicles to manoeuvre</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

10. Statutory consultation has recently been carried out on an item reflecting a recommendation made by Peckham and Nunhead community council on 6 February 2016. During the statutory consultation, objections to the proposals
were received.

11. The detail of the objections is summarised in figure 2. The associated appendix contains detail on the objections and a detailed design of the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lane Ward</td>
<td>To install new double yellow lines on unrestricted junctions and upgrade junctions with existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines to improve inter-visibility and road safety for all road users</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

**Policy implications**

12. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011,

- Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction
- Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy.
- Policy 8.1 – seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets

**Community impact statement**

13. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment

14. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.

15. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.

16. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighbouring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely preempted until the recommendation have been implemented and observed.

17. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.

18. The recommendations support the council’s equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:

- Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuse vehicles.
- Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.
Resource implications

19. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing public realm budgets

Legal implications

20. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.

21. Should the recommendations be approved the council will give notice of its intention to make a traffic order in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales Regulations 1996.

22. These regulations also require the council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order for a period of 21 days following publication of the draft order.

23. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and relevant statutory powers.

24. By virtue of section 122, the council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

25. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters

   a) The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises
   b) The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity
   c) The national air quality strategy
   d) Facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers
   e) Any other matters appearing to the council to be relevant.

Consultation

26. For the recommendations in paragraph 1, the implementation of changes to parking requires the making of a traffic order. The procedures for making a traffic order are defined by national Regulations which include statutory consultation and the consideration of any arising objections.

27. Should the recommendations be approved the Council must follow the procedures contained with Part II and III of the Regulation which are supplemented by the Council’s own processes. This process is summarised as:

   a) publication of a proposal notice in a local newspaper (Southwark News)
   b) publication of a proposal notice in the London Gazette
   c) display of notices in roads affected by the orders
   d) consultation with statutory authorities
   e) making available for public inspection any associated documents (e.g.
plans, draft orders, statement of reasons) via the council's website or by
appointment at 160 Tooley Street, SE1

f) a 21 day consultation period during which time any person may comment
upon or object to the proposed order

28. Following publication of the proposal notice, any person wanting to object must
make their objection in writing, state the grounds on which it is made and send to
the address specified on the notice.

29. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to resolve so that it is
withdrawn, it will be reported to the community council for determination. The
community council will then consider whether to modify the proposal, accede to
or reject the objection. The council will subsequently notify all objectors of the
final decision.

30. For the recommendations in paragraph 2, this report is for the community council
to determine an objection already received.

Programme Timeline

31. If these item are approved by the community council they will be progressed in
line with the below, approximate timeline:

- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – July to August 2016
- Implementation – September to October 2016
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## Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one.

These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

### Request

The council received a request from Transport for London Buses to investigate a number of problem locations on bus routes that operate through the borough.

This included the southbound bus stop located in Cheltenham Road where it meets Ivydale Road.

### Location

Cheltenham Road is mainly unrestricted, apart from small sections of double yellow lines and disabled parking bays.

The bus stop is located opposite a parade of shops that includes a takeaway, café and a convenience store, which may result in a demand for short term parking throughout the day.

### Investigation and conclusions

An officer visited the location on 4 May 2016 to ascertain the need to install new double yellow lines to provide access to the bus stop at any time.

The following was noted at the time of the site visit:

- Vehicles parked on the approach to the Bus stop, including illegally on existing double yellow lines. This has an impact on traffic flow.
- Buses having to pull up in front of bus stop as parked vehicles are obstructing the bus’ approach to the bus stop

### Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending that double yellow lines are introduced on the northeast side approach to the bus stop.

This proposal will prevent all day parking but will also guarantee a loading provision for up to 40mins if loading/unloading is observed. We do not expect a net loss of approximately 4 parking spaces to have a significant negative impact on parking in the area.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

### Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in August 2016.
Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.
Proposal: Install double yellow lines (20m)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>16/17_Q1_007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Barry Road/Peckham Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To install double yellow lines to prevent inconsiderate parking and access to bus stop for buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council meeting</td>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local parking amendment**

A local parking amendment (LPA) is small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one.

These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

**Request**

The council received a request from Transport for London Buses to investigate a number of problem locations on bus routes that operate through the southern part of the borough, this included the southbound bus stop located in Barry Road where it meets Peckham Rye. TfL raised the following issue:

“Buses turning right from Peckham Rye southbound into Barry Rd southbound might encroach near to vehicles parked in the northernmost one / two parking bays located along the eastern kerb on Barry Road”

**Location**

Barry Road / Peckham Rye is a Classified Road with sections of double yellow lines and disabled parking bays. This section of the road has an estate agent and The Clock House public house. An existing time limited 30 minute free parking bay provides space for those that want to park short term.

**Investigation and conclusions**

An officer visited this location on 4 May 2016 to ascertain the need to install new double yellow lines, to provide access to the bus stop at any time.

The following was noted at the time of the site visit:

- An officer spoke to two bus drivers who said they have no problems approaching the bus stop southwards from Peckham Rye on the southeast side.
- Our observation and feedback with two bus drivers is not representative of problems buses may experience as our site visit only provided us with a snapshot of the current arrangement and it is noted that traffic flow and parking will differ.
- It was observed that two vehicles parked opposite the bus stop of the northwest side restricted traffic flow approaching the junction with Peckham Rye when buses were stopped on the bus stop
- Buses do cross centre line, however, and traffic delays were observed

**Recommendation**

Based on our investigation and conclusions, the council are recommending that double yellow lines are extended on the northwest side approach the junction with Peckham Rye.

Although the double yellow lines may seem excessive, it should be noted that the proposed extents protect two dropped kerbs, one of which serves the off-street parking for a multiple occupancy apartment block. Therefore, we do not expect a net loss of approximately 2 parking spaces to have a significant negative impact on parking in the area.
This proposal will prevent all day parking but will also guarantee a loading provision for up to 40mins if loading/unloading is observed.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

**Next steps**

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in August 2016.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.
### Local parking amendment

**Reference**  
16/17_Q1_013

**Location**  
Rye Hill Park

**Proposal**  
To install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles at Nos.34 to 120 Rye Hill Park

**Community council meeting**  
Peckham and Nunhead

**Community council date**  
29 June 2016

**Ward(s) affected**  
Peckham Rye

---

#### Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one.

These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

#### Request

The council received a request from Waste Management to investigate a number of problematic locations where large refuse lorries are access issues due to inconsiderate and obstructive parking.

One of the locations included the access to Nos. 34 to 120 Rye Hill Park.

#### Location

The parking in Rye Hill Park is mostly unrestricted apart from small sections of double yellow lines and disabled parking bays.

#### Investigation and conclusions

Waste management require double yellow lines to prevent vehicles parking and to allow constant access to this part of the public highway and the estate road.

By proposing double yellow lines, this will improve inter-visibility, safety and access for all road users, particularly larger vehicles.

The council do intend to propose double yellow lines on all road junctions within the borough on a ward by ward basis. However, as access problems with this particular public highway/estate road junction has been brought to our attention, we are recommending it is accelerated through the LPA process, to maintain the refuse collection from tower block nos.34 to 120.

#### Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending that double yellow lines are installed on both entrances to the estate block on Rye Hill Park.

We do not expect the proposal to have a significant negative impact on parking in Rye Hill Park, as the proposal is removing unsafe parking space rather than safe.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

#### Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will
commence in August 2016.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.
Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is a small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

Request

The council received a request from Waste Management to investigate a number of problematic locations where large refuse lorries are experiencing access issues due to inconsiderate and obstructive parking.

One of the locations included a section of Tappesfield Road where there is a sharp 90 degree bend.

Location

The parking in Tappesfield Road is unrestricted apart from a disabled parking bay.

Investigation and conclusions

Waste management require double yellow lines to prevent vehicles parking and to allow constant access along this part of Tappesfield Road.

The highway has a sharp bend at this location and when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road, this makes it difficult for refuse vehicles to manoeuvre.

By proposing double yellow lines, this will improve visibility, safety and access for all road users, particularly larger vehicles.

Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending that double yellow lines are installed on the inside of the sharp 90 degree bend opposite No.132.

We do not expect the proposal to have a significant negative impact on parking in Tappesfield Road, as the proposal is removing unsafe parking space rather than safe. It should also be noted that yellow lines are not proposed directly adjacent to residential properties.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in August 2016.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).
Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.
Proposal: Install double yellow lines
Local parking amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>16/17_Q1_015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Scylla Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and to provide a turning area for vehicles to manoeuvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council meeting</td>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>The Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one.

These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

Request

The council received a request from a resident for the installation of double yellow lines at the end of Scylla Road adjacent to the new Medical Centre.

Location

The section of Scylla Road that runs east from Consort Road is a dead end and all parking is unrestricted.

Investigation and conclusions

An officer carried out a site visit on 20 May 2016 where it was noted that a number of vehicles were parked at the end of the road. This parking activity could force motorists to reverse their vehicle along Scylla Road, to exit onto Consort Road.

There was a turning head built into the carriageway, approximately 20m from the end, but this has been fenced off and has been stopped up (order made on 14 October 2014; report ref: DRD-0027) and is no longer public highway.

Scylla Road is unrestricted and the only way the highway can prevent parking is to install double yellow line restrictions.

Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending that double yellow lines are install at the end of the highway to allow enough room for vehicle turn around and not be forced to reverse out on to Consort Road.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in August 2016.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council council meeting for determination.
**Local parking amendment**  
**Determination of statutory objection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>The Lane Ward - junction protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposal | To install double yellow lines on all unrestricted junctions and to convert existing single yellow line to double yellow lines on existing restricted junctions to improve inter-visibility and road safety for all road users. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community council meeting</th>
<th>Peckham and Nunhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>The Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

At the meeting held 6 February 2016, the Peckham and Nunhead community council approved this proposal for statutory consultation.

The council is proposing double yellow lines on all junctions in the borough to improve junction visibility and facilitate access for all road users.

This document provides detail on proposals to introduce double yellow lines on all junctions in The Lane Ward.

We estimate there are 3000 road junctions in Southwark, approximately 2000 of which are currently protected with yellow lines. The majority of these protected junctions are located with our existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). This leaves in the region of 1000 junctions without yellow line restrictions where inconsiderate or unsafe parking cannot be enforced against by civil enforcement officers.

The Lane ward is largely covered by the Peckham (B) controlled parking zone (CPZ) which was introduced in 1974. The majority of road junctions in the ward already have double yellow lines, with approximately 80% of the road junctions protected.

The double yellow lines are being proposed at 29 junctions as detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adys Road and Amott Road</td>
<td>Gordon Road and estate road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amott Road and Hinckley Road</td>
<td>Avondale Rise and Bellenden Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley Road and Gowlett Road</td>
<td>Avondale Rise and Copleston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenwick Road and Fenwick Grove</td>
<td>Copleston Road and Danby Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scylla Road and Galatea Square</td>
<td>Copleston Road and Choumert Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consort Road and Scylla Road</td>
<td>Copleston Road end of road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead Green and Gordon Road</td>
<td>Chadwick Road entrance to industrial estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood Road and Nunhead Green</td>
<td>Highshore Road and Oliver Mews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood Road and Barton Close</td>
<td>Keston Road and Hinckley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsale Road and estate entrance road</td>
<td>Waghorn Street and Howden Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsale Road and estate entrance road</td>
<td>Choumert Grove and Quantock Mews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrook Street and Troy Town</td>
<td>Consort Road and Linacre Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrook Street and Waghorn Street</td>
<td>Pilkington Road and Sandlings Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutbrook Street and Maxted Road</td>
<td>Gordon Road and Ellery Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howden Street and Maxted Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram**

[Map showing the location of the junctions mentioned in the text]
Statutory consultation was carried out between 14 April 2016 and 05 May 2016. Notices were placed in the Southwark News and copies erected on lamp columns. During this period, the council received eight objections and five emails of support.

Paragraph 16 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:

- determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues

**Summary of objection(s)**

The eight objections received are attached to this report and can be summarised as:

- Losing 30 metres parking on Hinckley Road
- Parking on Hinckley Road is a nightmare
- This proposal will further reduce parking on Adys Road
- I appreciate the reasons for this proposal, however, and would be willing to restrict my objection to the double yellow lines at the corner of the two roads that leads into the cul-de-sac (which cul de sac?)
- I support the use of double yellow lines at junctions which need them. But I object to the proposed order for double yellow lines at all the junctions in Nutbrook St and surrounding streets without a considered discussion with residents in these streets
- We have very dense parking in Nutbrook Street, and we do not want Residents Parking which I fear this is a secretive move towards, despite resident’s recent objections.
- There is no need to further reduce parking in Avondale Rise by adding no parking zones near junctions
- I’m a local resident and object to the blanket imposition of double yellow lines on all road junctions in my area.

The five emails of support are also attached and can be broadly summarised as:

- Support the proposals as visibility at junctions is poor
- Would like consultation on a residents parking zone.

Officers wrote to the objectors acknowledging receipt of their representations. They were also advised that their objection would be sent to the Peckham and Nunhead community council for determination.

**Recommendation and next steps**

Officer recommendations remain unchanged and we still propose double yellow lines on all unrestricted junctions in The Lane Ward.

Why are double yellow lines being proposed?

- The current proposals aim to remove obstructive and dangerous parking from all junctions in the area. The Highway Code makes it clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated parking bay. However the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).

- By introducing double yellow lines at junctions we ensure that we meet the needs of all road users whilst ensuring that motorists clearly understand where and when it is safe to park. In our experience motorists have a clearer understanding of the meaning of a double yellow line compared to their understanding of the Highway Code and therefore will abide by them without the need for enforcement.

- Where there are single yellow lines on a junction this can send out mixed messages that it is acceptable to park in these locations at certain times which is why we are proposing upgrading these to double yellow lines as part of this project.

- Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important for safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance in which they
will be able to brake and come to a stop.

- Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of substantially reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD). This is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, e.g. pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle. Double yellow lines ensure this inter-visibility is provided at junctions and prevents people parking over dropped kerbs.

- It is noted that almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction.

- Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eye level is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionally affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction. The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these areas are potentially more dangerous to vulnerable road users.

It is recommended that the objections made against the proposal to install double yellow line on all unrestricted junction and to upgrade single yellow lines to double yellow lines on junctions be considered and rejected, as the proposal will improve inter-visibility and road safety for all road users.

It is also recommended that officers write to the objectors to explain the decision, and proceed with making the traffic order and implementing the road markings.
Objection 1

I object to 30 linear metres of double yellow line being painted on Hinckley Road SE15. This short, dead-end road currently has approximately 180 linear metres of parking space which is fully occupied most evenings. Losing 30 metres (approximately 20% of the current parking space) will cause parking difficulties for residents. I request that we lose less parking space (perhaps 5m at each junction rather than 7.5m). I also request that no double yellow lines are painted on the junction of Keston Road and the most westerly section of Hinckley Road which is immediately adjacent to the dead-end. There is not need for trucks to be negotiating this corner.
Objection 2

From:
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 10:08 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

[Title]

[Firstname]

[Lastname]

[Telephone_number]

[Email_address]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Borough-wide junction protection: The Lane Ward The London Borough of Southwark (Waiting and loading restrictions) (Amendment No. *) Order 201* Hinckley Road

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

Parking on Hinckley Road is a nightmare! There are several vans parked here from an address on East Dulwich which are for days at a time taking precious parking spaces. I object to the proposal to place double yellow lines in Hinckley Road and Keston Road, at the junctions to both roads, as there is already limited parking space in this road for the residents' cars. I appreciate the reasons for this proposal, however, and would be willing to restrict my objection to the double yellow lines at the corner of the two roads that leads into the cul-de-sac, as these seem totally unnecessary because large vehicles do not go down the cul-de-sac.
Objection 3

From:
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 7:03 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

[Title]

[Firstname]

[Lastname]

[Telephone_number]

[Email_address]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
H/ND/TMO1516-041

[overallresponse]
4. I object to part

[response]
I object to proposal section 2[i] (ADYS ROAD on the north-east side at its junction with Nutbrook Street). This section of Adys Road often has inadequate parking for existing residents and visitors and the proposed restriction would further reduce available parking.

The council should instead be focussing on reducing the high volumes of traffic on this residential road, rather than improving sightlines for those using this road as a high-speed shortcut to avoid the Peckham Rye junction.
Objection 4

From: [Title]
Sent: Saturday, April 02, 2016 6:30 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

Are you a resident

Which consultation

Borough-wide junction protection: The Lane Ward The London Borough of Southwark (Waiting and loading restrictions) (Amendment No. *) Order 201* Hinckley Road

Overall response

4. I object to part

Response

I object to the proposal to place double yellow lines in Hinckley Road and Keston Road, at the junctions to both roads, as there is already limited parking space in this road for the residents' cars. I appreciate the reasons for this proposal, however, and would be willing to restrict my objection to the double yellow lines at the corner of the two roads that leads into the cul-de-sac, as these seem totally unnecessary because large vehicles do not go down the cul-de-sac.
Objection 5

From:]
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 10:12 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: H/ND/TMO1516-041.

Dear Council traffic orders department

I support the use of double yellow lines at junctions which need them. But I object to the proposed order for double yellow lines at all the junctions in Nutbrook St and surrounding streets without a considered discussion with residents in these streets who are very familiar with the junctions. Not all junctions need this draconian blanket treatment. They need to be assessed individually.

It wouldn’t matter if there was not a severe car parking problem in the area. This will be made much worse by the extent of the proposed yellow lines, so the yellow lines restrictions must not be more than are necessary.

Objection 6

From:
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 5:48 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: H/ND/TMO1516-041.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I live in Nutbrook Street and am alarmed at the proposal to put double yellow lines on the junction corners of our road, as part of a general scheme to do so across he board in the area.

We have very dense parking in Nutbrook Street, and we do not want Residents Parking which I fear this is a secretive move towards, despite residents recent objections.

Motorists tend to be very sensible about junctions, with the Highway Codes guidelines followed.

At the Adys Road junction with Nutbrook Street there is a wider pavement preventing parking anyway and this creates a kind of parking bay which is self-evident to users. At the Maxted junction with Nutbrook street there are iron posts.

The Highway Code directs the illegality of parking on a corner – the length of yellow lines proposed is going to have a negative impact on local residents without alleviating the true danger in our roads- large delivery lorries seeking a short cut to the main roads.

The danger at these junctions is not caused by parked cars but by huge lorries, directed by their sat navs, through inappropriately sized residential streets and this is what should be addressed. These lorries threaten to hit any parked cars, however far from the junction. I do wish the council would address this issue instead of putting law abiding motorists under even more pressure. It cannot be too much of a burden on the Councils budget to implement signs that discourage large vehicles from coming down our residential streets without specific purpose.

Yours
Objection 7
From: [Title] [Firstname] [Lastname] [Telephone_number] [Email_address] A resident
From: [Title] [Firstname] [Lastname] [Telephone_number] [Email_address] 
Sent: Friday, April 08, 2016 1:19 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

[Whichconsultation] H/ND/TM01516-041

[overallresponse] 4. I object to part

[response]
There is no need to further reduce parking in Avondale Rise by adding no parking zones near junctions. Parking in this street has already been reduced (again) by the unnecessary expansion of bus stops to double the size. Is it the plan to keep reducing parking until it becomes so impossible that a CPZ is introduced? I do not run a car myself but this affects my friends and neighbours. If Southwark is strapped for cash this money should go into education or home care, not into making residents' lives more difficult for no good reason.

Objection 8
From: [Title] [Firstname] [Lastname] [Telephone_number] [Email_address] 
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 11:21 AM
To: traffic orders
Cc: 
Subject: Consultation on H/ND/TM01516-041

I’m a local resident and object to the blanket imposition of double yellow lines on all road junctions in my area. Specifically, I object to this statement from the public notice:

“It is not good practice... to implement junction protection as and when they arise.” This is clearly nonsense. The fact that individual, as-needed implementation is not value for money compared with blanket implementation serves only the Council’s internal budgeting not the real concerns of residents.
Support 1
Sent:  
To: traffic orders  
Subject: Ref: H/ND/TMO1516-041  

Dear Sir/Madam,  

I would like to express my support for the introduction of double yellow lines at local junctions. As a resident of Maxted Road for the past 10 years, I frequently experience complete lack of visibility when leaving a junction.

However, Maxted road is already a very busy parking road for people going to Peckham Rye station or dropping their children at The Belham primary school and leaving their car on Maxted whilst they go to work. I regularly see this happen and know parents at the school who confirm this is their practice.

As we are reducing parking spaces through the introduction of double yellow lines, pls can we consider some kind of residents permit parking system on Maxted Road? Even just one that is valid 9.30am-10.30am to avoid commuters leaving their car all day but not to impact local business on bellenden road.

It's extremely frustrating not being able to park near your house, especially with young children, because commuters are parking in your road.

Thanks

Support 2
From:  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 9:14 AM  
To: traffic orders  
Cc:  
Subject: Ref H/ND/TMO1516-041 - Double yellow lines. Lane Ward. Nutbrook Street parking.

Hi,

We live on Nutbrook street and I would like to register our concerns over the already congested parking in the area which would be exacerbated by the loss of around 4 spaces on each of the junctions you are proposing to add lines to.

I actually agree that parking needs to be better enforced in the area because people regularly park on, or over, junctions making it dangerous for all road users. So I actually am happy with the plans in that respect.

However, with new homes and schools being built in the area plus all of the commuters that come to the area to use Peckham Rye station it seems to me that the residents, who already find it difficult to park may start to find it impossible. Are there any plans to make any of the roads in our area (Howden/Nutbrook etc) resident permit holders only and, given that the parking difficulties are not of our own making are there and plans to make any such permits available at an affordable rate to residents?

Thanks,
Support 3
From: traffic orders
To: H/ND/TMO1516-041

H/ND/TMO1516-041

Yellow Lines at end of roads

Dear Sir or Madam,

I do not object to the lines on the corners as agree that it will be safer.

However I am increasingly aware of the fact parking in the area is near impossible already and the yellow lines will reduce spaces even more. If the yellow lines do go ahead surely permit parking must be considered.

If I take the car out I can never park on my road again when I return so often end up walking from 3 or 4 roads away, with two small children carrying everything I have with me. This has become a real problem over the last year. I have to go out at night to bring the car back to our house so it is convenient when I have the kids in the morning. In the morning when I pull out of the space there are cars circling and vying for my space. I also constantly see people parking up and heading off in the direction of the station to work. We are just a road away from restrictions and since the Station has expanded and therefore the demand increased, people are coming from further to park and walk to the station.

I have spoken to many people in the area and they agree the problem is stopping us doing things as feel if we move out cars it will be such a hassle to park again (with two sleeping kids for instance) that we don't go.

I understand our area is not under review for permit parking but please can you tell me how we can get it considered? Should we start a petition to show interest?
Who do we contact?

Just an hour of permit parking would discourage people parking up all day to get to station.

Look forward to hearing from you,

Best wishes,

Support 4
From: Sunday, April 10, 2016 12:14 PM
To: traffic orders
Subject: H/ND/TMO1516-041.

I fully support the introduction of double yellow lines at junctions.

Car and vans regularly park on corners on my street (Howden St SE15 4LB), blocking sight lines and endangering lives.
Good afternoon,
I am a resident on nutbrook street and I am writing to support the addition of double lines at junctions. It is dangerous when cars park too close to junctions as this makes visibility for oncoming cars very poor. It is however extremely difficult to park on nutbrook street as it is so I think this needs to be combined with residents parking.
Many thanks,
Best wishes,
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<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Barrie Hargrove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Richard Livingstone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Victoria Mills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jamille Mohammed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Cleo Soanes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Johnson Situ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No of copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of the community council receiving electronic copies only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Michael Situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Fiona Colley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No of copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Olamijulo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Officer Hub 2 2nd Floor, 160 Tooley Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Councils Development Officer Hub 3 5th Floor 160 Tooley Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others**
Elizabeth Olive, Audit Commission
160 Tooley Street 1

**Total:** 27

**Dated:** 21 June 2016