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INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information

You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council’s web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact  Beverley Olamijulo  on 020 7525 7234 or email: beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk
Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

**Eleanor Kelly**  
Chief Executive  
Date: 7 November 2016
Peckham and Nunhead Community Council

Tuesday 15 November 2016
7.00 pm
St Mary’s Church and Community Centre, 17 St Mary’s Road, London, SE15 2EA

Order of Business

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

2. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

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

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

6. DEPUTATIONS (7.10PM)

Deputation request from some Lane ward residents.

Deputation request from some residents representing Bells Gardens Tenants and Residents Association (report to follow).
7. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS (7.25PM)

To receive any community announcements or presentations at this meeting. This can include community events or matters of local interest.

Post office, Peckham High Street

The developers are working with Travelodge and the owners of the Post Office site on proposals for a new hotel on the site. The proposals will include new facilities for the post office. As part of the application process the developers would like to carry out a consultation of the proposal with local interest groups and the community council.

Police updates

To receive an update from the police on community safety matters.

8. THEME FOR THE MEETING: TRAFFIC, TRANSPORT AND ROAD SAFETY (7.40PM)

TOPICS

- **Road safety**: Local traffic routes, pedestrians, pedestrian crossings, buses, cyclists and rat running
- **Safer routes in Southwark**: School travel plan
- **Air quality and traffic pollution**
- **Making streets safer** – physical measures, e.g. better lighting and tree cutting (including hedges) Parking control

Officers and representatives

Ernst Eramus, Southwark Parks and Open Spaces

Stephen Inch, (GLA) London Assembly (air quality and traffic pollution)

Bill Legassick, Southwark Environment Protection

Yvonne Bastien, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor, Environment and Leisure

Southwark officers from the Environment and Leisure department

Representative from Transport for London (TfL)

WARD BASED WORKSHOPS

1) Identify streets where lighting, hedges, overgrown trees, rubbish, that cause problems for pedestrians, push chairs, wheelchairs.

2) Identify rat running routes, or roads where speeding is a problem.
3) Identify schools where parking on zigzags etc. is compromising children’s safety.

4) Suggestions for improving safety/encourage cycling and walking/car sharing etc.

5) Concerns about air pollution in your ward.

6) Report potholes.

7) Driver education how to get the best from your vehicle driving in town.

8) How to get something done about road safety issues by Council/Police/TfL.

BREAK AT 8.20 PM

An opportunity for residents to speak to councillors and officers.

9. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY (8.30PM)

Community council question

Peckham and Nunhead Community Council agreed to submit the below question to Council Assembly on 30 November 2016.

“What further action could the council take to monitor as well as, boost the range and quality of apprenticeships on offer to young people in the borough?”

10. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (8.40PM)

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.

11. LOCAL PARKING AND TRAFFIC REPORT (8.50PM)

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

Members to consider the recommendations contained within the report.

12. SECURE CYCLE PARKING (CYCLE HANGAR) (9.00PM)
Note: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

Members to consider the recommendations contained within the report.

Date: 7 November 2016
Peckham and Nunhead Community Council

MINUTES of the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council held on Wednesday 21 September 2016 at 7.00 pm at Peckham Rye Church Hall, 45 Elm Grove, Peckham London SE15 5DD

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

OFFICER SUPPORT:
Mifta Choudhury, Peer Mentor, Children’s and Adults’ Services
Suley Muhidin, Community Participation Officer
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.

The chair thanked Peckham Rye Church for hosting the community council meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Councillors Michael Situ and Victoria Mills submitted their apologies for lateness.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS
There were none.

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

There were none.

5. **MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 29 June 2016 be agreed as an accurate record, and signed by the chair.

**MATTERS WHICH AROSE FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Item 7: The Friends of Camberwell Cemeteries**

Councillor Dolezal referred to page 3 of the minutes under item 7. He explained that following a complaint that was made about him as a councillor, the council’s monitoring officer looking into the matter and concluded that there were no findings with regards to him breaching the members’ code of conduct. Councillor Dolezal apologised for the use of any language that might have been deemed inappropriate.

**Item 11: Public question time**

Mr Barnard referred to page 7 of the minutes under item 11. He asked if his public question which was rejected at the previous meeting on the 29 June 2016 could be noted in the minutes.

The question made reference to the council's habitual complaints policy which officers advised would be ruled out of order under procedure rule 7.3.4 (f) because he raised issues to which there were other processes within the council for a resolution.

Prior to the community council meeting in June 2016, a written response addressing these issues was sent to Mr Barnard by his single point of contact in the council’s corporate complaint’s team.

Mr Barnard then requested through the chair whether an appropriate officer of the council could attend the community council meeting to outline what the council’s habitual complaints policy was. The chair agreed to look into the matter.

6. **DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS**

None were received.

7. **COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**Old Kent Road Area Action Plan (AAP)**
Tom Buttrick, from the planning policy team addressed the meeting about the ongoing consultation the council were conducting about a planning document known as the Old Kent Road area action plan which is a draft document which focuses on the Old Kent road and parts of north Peckham.

The consultation had been extended to 4 November 2016. Therefore comments could still be received from the community until the deadline date. Information leaflets and printed copies of the draft plan were available at the meeting. Tom explained that the information was also available on the council’s (planning policy) website.

He further explained that the draft plan sets out a 20 to 30 year future for the Old Kent Road area which would take into account the potential Bakerloo line extension, new houses and job opportunities, improvements to the Old Kent road corridor for buses, walking and cycling routes.

For more information contact Planning Policy on 0207 525 5471 or email planningpolicy@southwark.gov.uk

Website: https://consultations.southwark.gov.uk/planning-and-regeneration/old-kent-road-aap

**Leader's Question Time event**

The chair announced that there would be a leader’s question time event on Wednesday 19 October 2016 at Canada Water Library. The event would start at 7.00pm and the theme would be about public health and social care. Leaflets of the event were available at the meeting.

**Crown Post Office, the Rye Lane branch (and Peckham High Street)**

The chair announced that the representatives (architects) were unable to attend the meeting but had asked if they could be invited to a future meeting.

Councillor Dolezal thanked those that were involved in the campaign which concerned the proposed closure of the Rye Lane branch which included gathered signatures (petition) and those that attended the meetings and demonstration.

**NHS Health check**

The chair announced that the representative was unable to attend the community council but had agreed to be at the health theme meeting in January 2017.

**Police updates**

Inspector Lloyd safer neighbourhood inspector for the area addressed the meeting and outlined the following:

Referred to the crime statistics for the borough and outlined that the most impacted crime in Southwark was robbery. He said violent crime and theft person burglary were down by 18% in crime stats. However low level crime such as shop lifting and criminal damage were still significantly high. Inspector Lloyd referred to knife and gun crime which he understood had been a major concern in the community.
He acknowledged that the police’s use of stop and search did raise some concern particularly with regard to the number of stop and searches that took place which mostly related to drug and knife related offences. The police received a number of complaints about this issue. In light of this the police were looking into introducing “body warmer cameras” to help with stop and search. Councillor Hargrove stated that it was important for the police not to go back to the blanket approach on stop and search particularly when dealing with young people.

Cleaner Greener Safer Funding Programme 2017/2018

Andrea Allen, senior projects manager announced that the council were inviting people to apply for funding from the cleaner greener safer funding programme 2017/18. Andrea explained that £90k was allocated to each ward. The CGS scheme had been running for 14 years which successfully delivered a number of projects in the local area. They range from improvements to community gardens, adventure playgrounds and cycle hangars.

For more information contact Andrea Allen on 0207 525 0860 or email andrea.allen@southwark.gov.uk

Neighbourhoods Fund 2017/2018

The neighbourhoods fund 2017/18 launch date was on the 7 November 2016. It was announced at the meeting to give people advance notice about the funding programme. Information on the above would go out on a newsletter, facebook and the council’s website.

For more information contact Gill Kelly on 0207 525 3690 or email gill.kelly@southwark.gov.uk

7. THEME: TACKLING SAFETY ISSUES FOR YOUNG AND OLD

Chair introduced the Youth Co-chair, Francois who introduced the theme of tackling safety issues.

The panel members (below) also introduced themselves to the meeting and gave a brief summary on what they do in the community.

Florence Eshalomi
A member of the London Assembly and representative of the Lambeth and Southwark constituency. In her previous role as a Lambeth councillor, she became involved in dealing with issues that concerned young people and was a special representative for tackling youth violence.

Gifty Peters
A community advocate for young people and active housing representative.

Nat Hawley
Young ambassador for the Princes’ Trust who shared his story to the audience of the personal struggles he faced when he was younger and how he became involved in the Princes’ Trust which related to a major family incident. The charity helped him a lot to attend school and achieve his GCSEs. Nat said he felt empowered and now he teaches
and supports young people with dyslexia.

**Suley Muhidin, Southwark Council**  
Suley spoke about the opportunities for young people and outlined how they could develop their skills and be more involved in their community.

**Cllr Evelyn Akoto, deputy cabinet member for young people and careers**  
Cllr Akoto spoke about her role and how she would like to see more jobs, training and educational opportunities for young people in the borough.

**Inspector Lloyd – Inspector for the Peckham and Nunhead wards**  
Addressed the meeting during the police updates and responded to questions from the audience.

**Mifta Choudhury, David Idowu Foundation**  
Mifta has worked in the borough for five years. His view was that a number of young people were disengaged from a lot of services and do not necessarily understand basic skills. Some young people were not able to match up to those that did have the skills.

There was an overall consensus that the issue of unemployment amongst young people needed to be addressed and they should have access to training and job opportunities. It was noted that a number of organisations were already working with community groups to try and achieve this.

Overall the panel members agreed that more support should be available to help mentor young people.

8. **COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY**

Members of the community council submitted a question about apprenticeships based on discussion and the theme at the meeting. This would be submitted at the council assembly meeting on Wednesday 30 November 2016.

**Community council question:**

What further action could the council take to monitor as well as boost the range and quality of apprenticeships on offer to young people in the borough?

9. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**PQ1:**

A question was raised about the council’s new automated voice recognition switchboard. The person outlined that it had not worked in a way that would reduce time and money due to the multiple questions that were asked so that one could be directed to the right department. She asked if this was part of the cost cutting exercise that the council had put in place?

**A1:**

Councillor Colley confirmed that it was part of the cost cutting exercise that was put in
This matter had previously been referred to when information about the council’s budget was announced. Councillor Colley mentioned that most of the time the automated voice recognition worked fine when she used it but advised people to either say “switchboard” or stay “silent” then the caller would be transferred to the operator. She said council staff were the principal users of the switchboard which was not resourceful when the switchboard directs staff to other members of staff within the council. It was noted that the situation would be monitored.

PQ2:

I am a partner in the Peckham Townscape Heritage Initiative. At a meeting of the partnership on 14 September 2016 it emerged that despite the designation of Rye Lane as a Conservation Area in 2011, the council had not developed any supplementary planning guidance (SPG) to give teeth to this designation. It was submitted that given the current tsunami of planning applications for the town centre there was an urgent need for an SPG. This is to ask whether this need had been conveyed to the relevant councillors, and what actions would be taken to ensure that effective planning guidance is developed?

A2:

Councillor Nick Dolezal said he was aware of this issue and the council were dealing with the matter.

Q3:

Do you know or are the councillors aware of Councillor Wingfield’s promise to have information on the website about people buried at Camberwell Old Cemetery that were buried above the remains of other dead people. We are also concerned about the destruction of 12 acres of trees/woods in Camberwell Old Cemetery. The council should not be selling graves to religious people knowing that the people were already buried in the graves?

A3:

The chair said the matter would be referred to Councillor Ian Wingfield.

Q4:

The council’s digital campaign – what is the council doing about supporting disadvantaged groups on this particularly those who were considered vulnerable. Secondly, it appears that some people have difficulty navigating around My Southwark web pages in that there were issues when people were registering their details?

A4:

The chair said this would be looked into by the relevant officers.

10. HIGHWAYS CAPITAL INVESTMENT FOR 2015/16 AND 2016/17

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

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.
RESOLVED:

1. That the following proposed funding schemes from the Highways Capital Investment for 2015/16 and 2016/17 be agreed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nunhead ward</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astbury Road/ Colls Road Footway</td>
<td>£19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewys Road Footway</td>
<td>£29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulworth Road Footway</td>
<td>£23,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total allocation** £71,800

2. That the Highways Capital Investment allocations for local wards: The Lane, Peckham Rye, Peckham and part Livesey will be considered at a future community council meeting.

11. LOCAL PARKING AND TRAFFIC REPORT

This item was withdrawn at the officer’s request.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:
RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council consider a deputation request from residents of the Lane ward.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. A deputation request has been submitted by some residents living in the Lane ward.

3. The deputation states:

   "We would like to make a deputation on behalf of some residents of the Lane Ward who oppose the council’s proposal to remove the ability for residents to formally consider traffic management schemes at community council meetings.

   Our deputation would offer a unique perspective to the Peckham and Nunhead councillors and wider Peckham residents by being made up of residents who have been heavily involved in recent local traffic schemes.

   We feel the removal of the ability for residents to formally consider traffic management schemes will reduce communication, cooperation and transparency on matters which directly affect our residents' way of life.

   We would ask the Councillors to reject the current proposal."

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. Any relevant resource or community impact issues will be contained in the comments of the strategic director.
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

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

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

9. 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.

10. 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

Proper Constitutional Officer

11. The council has the responsibility for taking decisions on traffic management orders (TMOs), which regulate road movement and parking by updating or changing road markings, such as yellow lines and parking bays within the borough.

12. Currently, TMO decisions are taken by community councils. There are five meetings a year in each of the five community council areas. At each meeting, there is a section for public announcements and engagement, and a section later on for executive decision-making. This means that anyone who is interested in the TMOs must wait for the rest of the meeting to be dealt with before the issue they wish to hear about is brought up. As well, some TMOs are delayed because the community council that can agree them is some months away.

13. Southwark Council plans to change the decision-maker for TMOs to be the relevant cabinet member, which means that decisions can be made whenever they are needed. It also means that members of the public who are interested in a decision can:

- contact officers or the decision-maker directly with any issues they wish to raise
- engage with the statutory consultation sent out by the council
- raise queries and concerns with their ward members.

14. As well as this, councillors from wards affected by TMOs will be contacted directly before the statutory consultation, and if at least two ward members ask for part or all of a TMO decision to come to community council for consultation, it will be put on hold and brought to the next community council meeting for their discussion. The community council's comments will then be taken into account by the cabinet member when taking the decision, as well as any comments from members of the public and individual ward members.
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Held At</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received correspondence from the representatives.</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>Report Author</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Dated</th>
<th>Key Decision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chidi Agada, Acting Constitutional Manager</td>
<td>Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>31 October 2016</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>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date final report sent to the Constitutional Team
**RECOMMENDATION**

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:

   - Woods Road – to install new double yellow lines at the junctions with Burchell Road and Colmore Mews to maintain access for refuse and emergency vehicles

   - Tower Mill Road – to install double yellow lines on junctions and adjacent to footway build outs to maintain access and to prevent obstructive and dangerous parking and to improve inter visibility at junctions for all road users.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2. Paragraph 20 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

3. This report gives recommendations for local traffic and parking amendments, involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions and road markings.

4. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

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

6. 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.

7. Local parking amendments are batched together and carried through a quarterly programme. During the second quarter of 2016/17, the council is proposing two LPAs as summarised in figure 1.

8. 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>Woods Road</td>
<td>to install new double yellow lines at the junctions with Burchell Road and Colmore Mew to maintain access for refuse and emergency vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Mill Road</td>
<td>to install double yellow on junctions and adjacent to footway build outs to maintain access and prevent obstructive and dangerous parking and to improve inter visibility at junctions for all road users</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Policy implications

9. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the polices 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

10. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an equality impact assessment

11. 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.

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

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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

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

Legal implications

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

18. 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.

19. 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.

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

21. 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.

22. 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

23. 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.

24. 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 (eg. 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

25. 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.

26. 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.

Programme Timeline

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

   - Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – January 2017
   - Implementation – February to March 2017
**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Held At</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Plan 2011</td>
<td>Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Network development Highways 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH</td>
<td>Leah Coburn 020 7525 4744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Woods Road – install double yellow line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>Tower Mill Road – install double yellow lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUDIT TRAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Matthew Hill, Head of Highways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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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

In July 2016 the council received a request to install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive and dangerous parking on Woods Road. The following was stated in correspondence:

“It is quite tight for cars to pass each other in the straight section of Woods Rd. However, at the bends at both Burchell Rd and around the school building, it is almost impossible to pass another car and the density of cars parked either side make the road hazardous, especially at the start and end of the school day when parents and carers are dropping children off at school.”

“On a daily basis, we have very large lorries attempting to travel down the road, past the school. They then have to reverse up the road, past the school again, as they are unable to turn the corner with Burchell Rd.”

Location

Woods Road is mainly unrestricted with short sections of parking restrictions including double yellow lines and school keep clear markings that prevent parking. There are also 8 existing disabled bays in the street.

Parking demand is likely to be high in the street, with residents, Peckham Methodist Church, John Donne Primary School all competing for limited kerbside space.

The road is also is within short walking distance to Queens Road rail station and bus routes in to town making the street an attractive parking location for non-residents.

It should be noted that a parking study is planned for the area in early 2017.

Investigation and conclusions

Officer have visited this street on a number of occasions and parking demand is high which results in vehicles parking close to the junctions with Culmore Mews and Burchell Road.

With vehicles parking inconsiderately and dangerously, this means access is severely restricted for larger vehicles such as a fire engineer, refuse or delivery vehicle. This can potentially result in complete obstruction for vehicles.

Recommendation
Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending the introduction of double yellow lines on the junctions with Burchell Road and Colmore Mews to maintain access for refuse and emergency vehicles. These proposals will compliment any future controlled parking zone design which may come forward after consultation in early 2017.

The proposal is ensure that vehicle access and road safety is maintained at all times by removing what is considered unsafe parking.

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 November 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 have received a number of requests from residents for double yellow lines to prevent obstructive and dangerous parking, which is taking place on Tower Mill Road at all times.

### Location

Tower Mill Road is mainly unrestricted except for small sections on double yellow lines and disabled parking bays.

The street has a high residential density, this along with being close to the boundary of an existing parking zone, as well as Burgess Park means that there is likely to be high demand for on-street parking.

### Investigation and conclusions

Officers have carried out a number of site visits and on each occasion it was noted that vehicles were parked close to the road junctions.

A major concern that was observed is the obstructive parking adjacent to the junction with Pearse Street. During the visit the officer noted that large delivery vans were having difficulty manoeuvring past the parked vehicles. The way vehicles were parked would effectively block the road for emergency and refuse sized vehicles.

During 2016 the council has received four requests from residents for a parking zone; this indicates that parking stress is increasing in the area. There are currently no plans to carry out a consultation on the possible introduction of a parking zone. However there is clearly a safety concern with dangerous and inconsiderate parking that requires safety measures.

As the entire highway is unrestricted and vehicles are parking wherever possible including, this reduces the highway width and makes access difficult for large vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>16/17_Q2_014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tower Mill Road/Donato Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To install double yellow on junctions and adjacent to footway build outs to maintain access and to prevent obstructive and dangerous parking and to improve inter visibility at junctions for all road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council meeting</td>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>15 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>Peckham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This recommendation is also being reported to Camberwell community council as the proposal also partially falls within Brunswick Park ward.
### Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions the council are recommending the introduction of double yellow lines on all road junctions on Tower Mill Road and in sections of the street where parking is deemed unsafe, this to maintain access and prevent obstructive parking at any time.

The council recognise that this proposal removes parking, however in the instance road safety and vehicular access needs to take priority over the loss of unsafe parking.

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 November 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.
RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council approve the implementation of a cycle hangar in Kincaid Road, subject to necessary statutory procedures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 20 of the Southwark constitution, community councils are responsible for determining non-strategic traffic matters.

3. Full details of the results associated with the study can be found in Appendix 1, the 'consultation summary'.

4. The ward members awarded Cleaner Greener Safer (CGS) funding for the scheme at the community council meeting on Saturday 6 February 2016.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

5. An informal public consultation took place with all residents within the consultation area from the 28 June 2016 until the 12 July 2016, giving two options for the hangar location.

6. One resident commented on the proposal and objected to one of the locations adjacent to his flat.

7. The proposal was amended and one location was proposed for further consultation.

8. A second consultation was carried out within the consultation area from 12 to 25 July 2016.

9. Of the 80 letters posted in the consultation area, there were 3 responses.

10. All 3 responses were in favour of the hangar.

11. No objections were received.

12. 2 out of the 3 responses requested cycle parking spaces.

13. The hangar will have 4 vacant spaces on installation; however these are expected to be filled rapidly as there are many houses which have been split into flats in the area.
14. The uptake of spaces in the cycle hangar will be monitored. Should it be proven that there is not sufficient use of the hangar, it will be considered for relocation within Peckham ward.

15. Residents who are not aware of the proposal in the identified location have a further opportunity to object during the statutory consultation stage of the experimental traffic order. Any such objections will need to be formally considered by the cabinet member prior to implementation.

16. A 2 meter double yellow line to the north of the hangar will be installed to give access to pedal cyclists.

Policy implications

17. 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 1.7  Reduce the need to travel by public transport by encouraging more people to walk and cycle
   Policy 1.12 Ensure that cycle parking is provided in areas of high demand and in areas where convenient
   Policy 2.3  Promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough
   Policy 4.1  Promote active lifestyles
   Policy 5.8  Improve perceptions of safety in the public realm
   Policy 6.3  Support independent travel for the whole community.

Community impact statement

18. The implementation of any transport project creates a range of community impacts. All transport schemes aim to improve the safety and security of vulnerable groups and support economic development by improving the overall transport system and access to it. Cycling infrastructure proposals also have the added advantage of improving the environment through reduction in carbon emissions and social health and fitness benefits. No group has been identified as being disproportionately adversely affected as a result of these proposals. Cyclists will benefit.

Resource implications

19. This project is funded via the 2016/17 CGS capital programme.

20. The funding for the 2016/17 CGS capital programme was approved by the cabinet and is part of the council’s overall capital programme as detailed in the launch of cleaner greener safer capital programme 2015/16 report dated August 2014.

21. All professional fees related to the project are also treated as the capital costs of the project.

22. The total expenditure and sources of funding for the scheme will be monitored and reported on as part of the overall capital programme.
Consultation

23. Two informal public consultations were carried out between June and July 2016, as detailed above.

24. If approved for implementation this will be subject to statutory consultation required in the making of an experimental traffic management order. The statutory consultation period will run for the experimental period and the order made permanent on the basis of the trial results.
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</table>
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Consultation Report

Installation of a secure cycle hangar on Kincaid Road

Date: 26 October 2016
Details of the consultation and summary of responses

Peckham and Nunhead Community Council awarded funding via the Cleaner Greener Safer Programme, to install a secure cycle hangar on Kincaid Road on 6 February 2016.

The initial idea had been suggested by a resident in the area near the proposed location.

In order to ensure that there was demand for the cycle hangar, an informal postal consultation was carried out between 28 June to 12 July 2016 and a second consultation from 12 to 25 July 2016.

Residents of properties 1a-42b Kincaid Road and 88a/b 90a/b 92a/b 94a/b Meeting House Lane were initially invited to comment on two location for the one hangar. A resident from Meeting House Lane contacted the Project Manager by telephone to object to one of the locations. This was taken into consideration and the proposed location was amended.

Residents of properties 1a-42b Kincaid Road and 88a/b 90a/b 92a/b 94a/b Meeting House Lane were invited to comment on the final proposed location for the hangar and to fill in a small survey. This asked whether they supported or did not support the installation of the hangar, whether they would like a cycle parking space, and for any other comments.

A total of 3 responses were received.

There were no objections.

A total of 2 residents requested spaces leaving 4 spaces vacant at consultation stage.

Details of these responses are shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Road</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brilliant idea hopefully get more keen on cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting House Lane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Another one should be installed in Meeting House Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting House Lane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No comment on document)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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