

Item No 13.	Classification: Open	Date: 19 June 2013	Meeting Name: Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
Report title:		Local parking amendments	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within Peckham and Nunhead Community Council	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - 270 Consort Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay.
 - Stanbury Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Wingfield Street – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Kelvington Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Keston Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - 151 Consort Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay.
 - Borland Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay.
 - Chesterfield Way – install double yellow lines at southern end of street to protect vehicle entrance to No.37
 - Linden Grove – install double yellow lines on south side of street to improve traffic flow and protect width restrictions
 - Elm Grove – amend proposals such that a loading bay outside No. 4 Elm Grove operates at any time but with the “goods vehicle only” limit removed.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the Community Council.
3. 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:
 - the introduction of single traffic signs
 - the introduction of short lengths of waiting and loading restrictions
 - the introduction of road markings
 - the introduction of disabled parking bays

- the setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes.
4. This report gives recommendations for four local parking amendments, involving traffic signs and road markings.
 5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Origin disabled bays – 270 Consort Road, Stanbury Road, Wingfield Street, Kelvington Road, Keston Road, 151 Consort Road and Borland Road.

6. Seven applications have been received for the installation of seven disabled persons' (blue badge) parking bays. In each case, the applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons' parking bay.
7. An officer has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the road network and carried out consultation with each applicant to ascertain the appropriate location for each disabled bay.
8. It is therefore recommended that disabled bays be installed at the following locations, see appendices for detailed design:

Reference	Bay location (approx)	Drawing appendix number
1314Q1009	Outside 270 Consort Road	Appendix 1
1314Q1011	Outside 58 Stanbury Road	Appendix 2
1314Q1019	Outside 16 Wingfield Street	Appendix 3
1314Q1020	Outside 13 Kelvington Road	Appendix 4
1314Q1021	Outside 1a Keston Road	Appendix 5
1314Q1028	151 Consort Road located in Ellery Road side of 143 Consort Road	Appendix 6
1314Q1029	Outside 24 Borland Road	Appendix 7

Chesterfield Way – 1314Q1018

9. The council was contacted by Affinity Sutton Homes Limited who are the owners of No.37 Chesterfield Way. Their property has an off-street carpark area that provides parking space for their two wheel chair residents.
10. The access to their carpark is via a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover from the public highway.
11. Affinity Sutton Homes Limited explained that vehicles regularly park adjacent to the crossover and therefore block access to the off-street disabled parking area. They ask that parking restrictions are installed on the highway to deter this.
12. Chesterfield Way is public highway and mostly has unrestricted parking. There are some existing restrictions and parking bays near to the junction with Old Kent Road which are associated with the red route (TLRN) which is managed and enforced by Transport for London.
13. An officer visited this location on 2 May 2013 and noted that vehicles were parked

very close to the off-street car park entrance but were not obstructing access.

14. The remaining kerb space in Chesterfield Way was heavily parked including double parking occurring in the purpose-built turning head (see photographs in appendix 8). This turning head was constructed for the very purpose of enabling vehicles to turn around in a cul-de-sac street. Vehicles parking in the turning head make such a manoeuvre impossible and force vehicles to reverse out of the street, raising substantial safety concerns and against the basic principles of highway design.
15. In view of the request from Affinity Sutton Homes Limited and the clear need to provide access to the off-street disabled parking car park it is recommended that yellow lines are installed adjacent to the dropped kerb.
16. Additionally, and in view of the parking taking place in the turning head it is also recommended that the double yellow lines extend, as detailed in Appendix 9, throughout the southern extent of Chesterfield Way.

Linden Grove - 1314Q1026

17. The council was contacted by a councillor on behalf of a constituent with concerns about traffic flow and obstruction between No.145 and No.189 Linden Grove.
18. Linden Grove is a residential street with housing on the northwest side and Nunhead cemetery on the southeast side. Parking is mainly uncontrolled with some yellow line restrictions at the junction with Oakdale Road and Ivydale Road and adjacent to the two traffic calming two pinch (outside No. 147 and No. 177).
19. The section of highway between the two pinch points is narrow at 6.5m and is not able to support parking on both sides without causing an obstruction to traffic flow.
20. It is therefore recommended that, as detailed in Appendix 10, double yellow lines are introduced on the south eastern side between No.153 and No.189 to improve traffic flow for all road users.

Elm Grove - amendment of proposals previously approved - 1213Q3032

21. On 2 March 2013 Peckham and Nunhead Community Council approved changing the loading bays in Elm Grove and Holly Grove to operate at any time, subject to statutory consultation.
22. One objection was received during the statutory consultation period. The objector highlighted the need for residents of the eight flats in 4 Elm Grove to be able to load. As the loading bay is already designated as "goods vehicles only" (during the working day) the proposal to extend the restriction to 24/7 would have prevented cars owned by residents using the bay at all times.
23. In view of the objection we have amended our proposals such that the bay will operate 24/7 but without the "goods vehicles only" limit. In this way the bay will be available for residents to use whilst improving the opportunity for loading to take place throughout the week.
24. We have been in contact with the objector and understand him to be happy with this revision.

25. In view of the above, it is recommended that the proposed order be made in a modified form (lessened in its effect) so that the bay outside No. 4 Elm Grove operates at any time but with the “goods vehicle only” limit removed. These proposals are detailed in appendix 11.

Policy implications

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

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

27. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
28. 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.
29. The introduction of blue badge parking gives direct benefit to disabled motorists, particularly to the individual who has applied for that bay.
30. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
31. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighboring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely preempted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed.
32. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate affect on any other community or group.
33. The recommendations support the council’s equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:
- Providing improved parking facilities for blue badge (disabled) holders in proximity to their homes.
 - Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuge vehicles.
 - Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

Resource implications

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

Legal implications

35. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
36. 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.
37. 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.
38. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.
39. 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 the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.
40. 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

41. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out.
42. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
43. Should the community council approve the items, statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. The process for statutory consultation is defined by national regulations.
44. The council will place a proposal notice in proximity to the site location and also publish the notice in the Southwark News and the London Gazette.
45. The notice and any associated documents and plans will also be made available for inspection on the council's website or by appointment at its Tooley Street office.
46. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which to do so.
47. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to informally resolve, this objection will be reported to the community council for determination, in accordance with the Southwark Constitution.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Public Realm projects Parking design 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	Tim Walker (020 7525 2021)

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	270 Consort Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 2	Stanbury Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 3	Wingfield Street – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 4	Kelvington Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 5	Keston Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 6	151 Consort Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 7	Borland Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 8	Chesterfield Way – photo of street environment
Appendix 9	Chesterfield Way - proposed at any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 10	Linden Grove – proposed at any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 11	Elm Grove/Holly Grove proposed consolidation of Loading only bay hours of operation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	7 June 2013	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Community Council Team	7 June 2013	