

Item No. 15.	Classification: Open	Date: 30 September 2013	Meeting Name: Camberwell Community Council
Report title:		Local parking amendments	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within Camberwell Community Council	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the following local parking amendment, detailed in the appendices to this report, is approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - Windsor Walk - convert existing pay and display parking and permit (L) parking bays to shared use (permits or pay and display) parking bays
2. It is recommended that the six objections made against the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit parking and to install 9.5 metres at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on Grove Lane be considered and rejected, and officers be instructed to proceed and make the traffic order, and implement the scheme, as detailed in paragraphs 16 to 47.
3. It is recommended that the two objections made against the proposal to install at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on junction of Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road be considered and rejected, and officers be instructed to proceed and make the traffic order, and implement the scheme, as detailed in paragraphs 48 to 74.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the Community Council.
5. 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.
6. This report gives recommendations for three local parking amendments, involving traffic signs and road markings.
7. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Windsor Walk - 1314Q2022

8. The council was contacted by a representative of Ronald McDonald House Charity who provide accommodation to families who have patients in hospitals and hospices. They have premises at No. 6 to 9 Windsor Walk which are associated with nearby King's College Hospital.
9. The charity asked if provision could be made for disabled parking near to its premises on Windsor Walk to assist those who stay at their Camberwell House and who have disabled family members and who find public transport more difficult to navigate.
10. Camberwell House is a free respite home for the families of seriously ill children that are being treated at King's College Hospital. There are 24 bedrooms and currently have no on-street parking available in particular for those with disabilities.
11. Windsor Walk is within Camberwell L parking zone which operates 8.30am – 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Currently, the parking on Windsor Walk is mostly permit (L) holder only with a small number of pay and display bays adjacent to Denmark Hill rail station.
12. An officer carried out a site visit, 9 August 2013, to see if any of the existing parking bays can be converted to a type of bay that would assist the charity.
13. It is proposed that all the existing parking bays in Windsor Walk are converted to shared use (permits or paid) bays. This would assist the Charity as the Council has a general allowance that blue badge (disabled) holders may park free of charge and without time limit in any paid parking bay. Providing shared use parking also has the advantage that existing L zone permit holders would not be unduly affected, although occupancy levels are noted to be low.
14. Officers have discussed this with Ronald McDonald House who are very supportive of this proposal.
15. It is therefore recommended that, as detailed in appendix 1, the existing parking bays on Windsor Walk be converted to shared use (permit or paid parking) bays to allow permit holders to continue to park as well as allowing blue badge holders to park free of charge and allowing any other visitors to pay for parking for a period of up to 4 hours (consistent with all other paid parking within this zone).

Grove Lane – Determination of statutory objections – 1213Q4019

16. This item was presented to Camberwell Community Council at the meeting of 19 June 2013. At that meeting members approved the decision to progress to statutory consultation.

Background

17. The council's asset management team have received, considered and approved in

principle (subject to the June decision and statutory consultation) the construction of a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No. 165 Grove Lane.

18. The proposed crossover location currently has a permit holder's only parking bay in front of it, this bay is part of South Camberwell (L) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
19. It is not possible to maintain a parking bay and dropped kerb at the same location as the presence of both would provide a conflicting message to motorists.
20. Officers are proposing to progress a local parking amendment such that the parking bay is removed and a waiting restriction (double yellow line) is installed; this will result in the loss of approximately two parking spaces.
21. Two parking spaces are being lost because the proposed dropped kerb is due to be located at the northwest boundary line of the property. One space could have been retained if the crossover was located at the southeastern boundary line however this would have required the relocation of a lamp column which is prohibitively costly.
22. Double yellow lines prohibit waiting (generally referred to as parking) 'at any time' however loading and unloading is permitted.
23. It is noted that double yellow lines are now the council's standard restriction for crossovers located within a parking zone. This is part of a wider objective to reduce sign clutter and to improve comprehension of restrictions at the point of parking.

Details of objections

24. Public Realm Projects advertised the council's intention to remove 9.5 metres of permit parking and to install 9.5 metres at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on Grove Lane.
25. The proposed TMO was advertised on 6 June 2013 by way of street and press notices in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
26. During the statutory, three week consultation period six written objections were received and officers wrote to objectors explaining the council's reasons for the double yellow lines and if they accepted this explanation to withdraw their objection.
27. Six objectors asked to maintain their objections, the details of those objections are provided in Appendix 3 and summarised in the following paragraphs.

Objection 1

28. Shortage of parking, removal of 9.5 metres equates to about 3 vehicles.

Objection 2

29. Concerned about the safety implications of the proposed amendment.
30. Reduce the size of the parking bay from 45m to 35.5m.
31. Reduction in space will force residents to park elsewhere.

Objection 3

32. Losing more car spaces by allowing No. 165 a crossover when 161 and 163 have been refused this privilege on two separate occasions.
33. Stopped residents parking their cars behind their houses by introducing another zone 'E-HF' without consultation (Stories Mews).

Objection 4

34. Further use of the limited garden space of residences spoils the residential quality.
35. 165 Grove Lane has always had a Two Car Garage on the Mews.
36. It would become unnecessarily restrictive and awkward for visitors.

Objection 5

37. Will remove 9.5m - at least two spaces' worth - of parking in favour of one or two spaces.

Objection 6

38. Reduction in the residents' parking space available is not acceptable.
39. Nor is it desirable to replace a front garden with hard standing.

Reasons for report recommendations

40. It is not possible to maintain a parking bay and dropped kerb at the same location as the presence of both would provide a conflicting message to motorists.
41. The crossover has been proposed at the northern boundary of the property as this removes the necessity of relocating a lamp column (~£5k). However, it is for this reason that the proposal results in two parking spaces being lost instead of one.
42. The council does not have a specific policy that priorities public on-street parking over private off-street parking, or visa-versa, and therefore each location must be considered on its own merits.
43. It is noted that the council has not installed a new parking zone (E_HF). The sign referred to is a new-style sign that is associated with a long-standing housing estate parking zone.
44. Members are asked to consider the effect upon parking and traffic in the Council's role as traffic authority. It is not this report's purpose to consider the policy of the conversion of gardens to hard standings which is a planning authority matter.
45. Members are advised that their decision taken previously (19 June) approving the removal of the parking bay is not binding and all objections must duly be considered.
46. However, the majority of the objections received are made on the grounds that it will

reduce the number of on-street parking spaces and force other permit holders to park elsewhere and this issue would have been apparent at the time of the earlier decision.

Recommendation

47. In view of the above explanation, it is recommended that the Community Council:
- a. consider the six objections
 - b. reject the six objections
 - c. instruct officers to make the traffic order, as proposed,
 - d. instruct officers to write to the objectors to inform them of the decision
 - e. instruct officers to remove 9.5 metres of permit parking and to implement 9.5 metres at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on Grove Lane as shown in appendix 4

Everthorpe Road – Determination of statutory objections – 1213Q4028

48. This item was presented to Camberwell Community Council at the meeting of 19 June 2013. At that meeting members approved the decision to progress to statutory consultation.

Background

49. The council was contacted by the street leader asking that double yellow lines are installed at the junctions of Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road.
50. The street leader stated at present the number of vehicles parking in Everthorpe Road has increased and he is concerned that they are parking close to the junction.
51. At present Everthorpe Road is uncontrolled and vehicles are parking too close to the junction mentioned above. On 26 March 2013, an officer carried out a site visit to this location and found vehicles were parked closer than 10 metres to the junction reducing the sight lines.
52. The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated 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).

Details of objections

53. Public Realm Projects advertised the council's intention to install at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction of Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road.
54. The proposed TMO was advertised on 6 June 2013 by way of street and press notices in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
55. During the statutory, three week consultation period two written objections were received and officers wrote to objectors explaining the council's reasons for the double yellow lines and if they accepted this explanation to withdraw their objection.

56. Both objectors asked to maintain their objections, the details of those objections is provided in Appendix 5 and summarised in the following paragraphs.

Objection 1

57. Objector will be affected directly by the proposal.
58. Lose more parking spaces.
59. Why is proposal made only at one end of Everthorpe Road.

Objection 2

60. Proposal will encourage traffic to take the corner faster.
61. Suggest that this would help Lorries who get stuck and clearly lorries shouldn't be there.

Reasons for report recommendations

62. This item was raised by the street leader who stated that vehicles were edging out on Oglander Road as the sight line was compromised by parked vehicles and this leads to conflict with oncoming vehicles.
63. The highway code, rule 243, advises do not park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space.
64. At the time of the site visit only the junction Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road had vehicles parked closer than 10 metres to the junction.
65. Parking close to a junction or a dropped kerb reduces the inter-visibility between all road users. In particular, vehicles parked close to a junction are likely to reduce the sight lines between a vehicle proceeding along the street and a vehicle entering into that street. This can lead to an increasing risk (or severity) of collision. Vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians are at greatest risk of injury in such circumstances.
66. Vehicles parked at or close to a junction have two primary effects upon the road network: a reduction in visibility between road users and a reduction in the effective space of the carriageway for vehicles to turn. Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important to 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 break and come to a stop.
67. Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of substantially reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD) which 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, eg pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
68. It is noted that almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2012 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with T junctions being the most commonly involved.

69. Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eyelevel is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately 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.
70. At this junction dropped kerbs have been installed to assist pedestrians wanting to cross the road. Before stepping off the kerb it is important that pedestrians have a clear line of sight of any oncoming vehicles.
71. Reduced carriageway space caused by vehicles parked at junctions has greatest impact upon large vehicles which have larger turning circles and may need the full kerb-to-kerb width to make a turn in one movement. This is of particular importance to the London Fire Brigade who require a sweep circle of 16.7m.
72. The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated 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).
73. The proposal to install yellow lines at this junction is proposed in accordance with the council's adopted [Southwark Streetscape Design Manual \(SSDM\)](#) standards.

Recommendation

74. In view of the above explanation, it is recommended that the Community Council:
 - a. consider the two objections
 - b. reject the two objections
 - c. instruct officers to make the traffic order, as proposed,
 - d. instruct officers to write to the objectors to inform them of the decision
 - e. instruct officers to implement the double yellow lines at the junction of Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road as shown in appendix 6

Policy Implications

75. 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

76. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
77. 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.
78. The introduction of blue badge parking gives direct benefit to disabled motorists, particularly to the individual who has applied for that bay.

79. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
80. 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.
81. 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.
82. 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

83. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing local parking amendment budget.

Legal implications

84. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
85. 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.
86. 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.
87. 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.
88. 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.
89. 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

- 90. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
- 91. 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.
- 92. 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.
- 93. 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.
- 94. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which to do so.
- 95. 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	Windsor Walk - convert existing bays to shared use bays
Appendix 2	Grove Lane – objections
Appendix 3	Grove Lane – at any time waiting restriction (double yellow lines) outside No.165
Appendix 4	Everthorpe Road - objections
Appendix 5	Everthorpe Road – at any time waiting restriction (double yellow lines) junctions of Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Project Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 September 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 Constitutional Team	18 September 2013	