

Item No 12.1	Classification: Open	Date: 4 December 2013	Meeting Name: Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
Report title:		Non-strategic traffic management matters	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that one objection received to a non-strategic traffic management matter is considered and determined as follows:

Albion Street

- a. Consider one objection made against the proposal to install at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Albion Street.
- b. Reject the objection and instruct officers to install the proposed length of waiting restrictions as shown in Appendix 1 for the reasons given in paragraphs 0 to 18.
- c. Instruct officers to complete the statutory traffic order procedures associated with the above recommendations, including advising the objectors of the council's decision.

2. It is further recommended that the following non-strategic traffic management matters are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:

- Rolls Road and Catlin Street – implement traffic signs for the extension of a 7.5t weight limit.
- Lynton Road - formalise the existing 2.2m width restriction near No. 195 Lynton Road.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the Community Council.
4. 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.

5. Paragraph 17 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the Community Council will determine any objection to a traffic management order that does not relate to a strategic or borough wide issue.
6. This report makes recommendations to the Community Council to two non-strategic traffic management matters involving traffic signs and road markings and also makes recommendations to determine an objection relating to a non-strategic traffic management order.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

ALBION STREET - DETERMINATION OF STATUTORY OBJECTIONS - 1213Q4022

7. This item was presented to Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council at the meeting of 26 June 2013. At that meeting members approved the decision to progress to statutory consultation.

Background to report recommendation

8. The council's waste management team reported problems gaining access for their refuse vehicles along the residential section of Albion Street, between Canon Beck Road and Swan Road.
9. The carriageway in this section is relatively narrow, it fluctuates in width and has a slight bend. It is unable to safely support parking on both sides of the street. However motorists do, on occasion and in parts, park on both sides which obstructs access to almost all vehicles, including refuse or emergency vehicles.

Details of statutory consultation

10. Public Realm Projects advertised the council's intention to install double yellow lines to prevent vehicles obstructing the highway on Albion Road.
11. The proposed traffic order was advertised on 29 August 2013 by way of street and press notices in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
12. During the statutory, three week consultation period one written objection was received. Officers wrote to the objector explaining the council's reasons for the double yellow lines and asked if they would accept this explanation and withdraw their objection.
13. The objector asked to maintain their objection, full details of which is contained in Appendix 2 and summarised in the following paragraphs.

Summary of objection

14. The objection is summarised as follows:
 - a. Despite a number of complaints, the council has not consulted/introduced a parking zone into this street.

- b. The proposals will make finding a parking space even more difficult.

Reasons for report recommendations

- 15. The geometry of the street is such that parking cannot be accommodated on both sides of the road without causing obstruction. The road varies in width between 6m and 5.6m. Parking on both sides would reduce the effective width to approx 2m yet London Fire Brigade need, at minimum, 3.1m.
- 16. The council has a legal duty to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's roads but does not have a duty to consult upon parking zones.
- 17. It was explained to the resident that currently there is no funding for the Rotherhithe (H) controlled parking zone to be reviewed or extended, however the request would be considered when preparing the next strategic parking project programme.

Recommendations

- 18. In view of the above explanation, it is recommended that the Community Council:
 - a. consider the objection
 - b. reject the objection
 - c. instruct officers to make the traffic order, as proposed
 - d. instruct officers to write to the objector to inform them of the decision
 - e. instruct officers to implement the double yellow lines in the Albion Street as shown in Appendix 1.

Rolls Road and Catlin Street weight restriction

- 19. Following the removal of a width restriction on Rolls Road, as part of works relating to the redevelopment of Eveline Lowe primary school, the Council undertook a review of HGV rat running in the South Bermondsey ward. Traffic counts were undertaken as part of the review
- 20. The traffic survey showed that after the removal of the Rolls Road width restriction, HGV traffic on Rolls Road is not a significant problem, less than 1.51% of traffic (since the width restriction was removed), whereas HGVs makes up over 4.86% of traffic on Catlin Street - hence the proposal to extend a weight restriction to both roads – to replace the lost width restriction on Rolls Road and to recognise the scale of the problem on Catlin Street. The review identified the introduction of a weight restriction as the most practical and effective option to reduce HGV traffic in the area. Other options were considered but ruled out as less likely to be effective in achieving the principal objective. This approach was agreed with ward Members.
- 21. In view of this a detailed design was prepared (see Appendix 3) to extend the existing 7.5 tonne weight limit in the Bermondsey Area to include Rolls Road and Catlin Street.

22. The council carried out statutory consultation and no objections were received and the traffic order was subsequently made in July 2012 although not yet implemented.
23. It is recommended that the traffic signs associated with this weight limit are now implemented.

Lynton Road

24. Lynton Road has an existing physical measure that prohibits and prevents all vehicles over 2.2 metres in width from proceeding in either direction in a stretch of the street approximately between 191/193 and 197/199 Lynton Road (see Appendix 4).
25. This prohibition was implemented in 2004 under experimental traffic order procedures but was not made permanent or removed, yet the physical feature remains in situ. This matter was reported to the community council in 2011 and 2012 but was deferred pending decisions relating to a wider traffic scheme.
26. Following the completion of the wider traffic scheme that is discussed in paragraphs 19 to 23 it has now become necessary for the council to re-advertise the council's intention to make a new, permanent order for this width restriction.
27. It is recommended that notice is given of the council's intent to make a new permanent traffic order for this width restriction.

Policy implications

28. 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

29. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
30. 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.
31. The introduction of blue badge parking gives direct benefit to disabled motorists, particularly to the individual who has applied for that bay.
32. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
33. 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.

34. 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.
35. 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 refuge vehicles
 - Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

Resource implications

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

Legal implications

37. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. 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

43. Where statutory consultation has been carried out this is detailed within the main body of this report.

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	Albion Street – Plan of any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 2	Albion Street – Objection
Appendix 3	Rolls Road and Catlin Street – Plan of proposed extension to 7.5t weight limit
Appendix 4	Lynton Road – Plan of existing width restriction

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Head of Public Realm - Des Waters	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	22 November 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	22 November 2013	