

<b>Item No.</b> 15.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 29 January 2014	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Dulwich Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Local parking amendments	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All wards within Dulwich Community Council	
<b>From:</b>		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:
  - College Road - install double yellow lines at the entrance/exits to College Gardens to improve sight lines.
  - Melford Road – covert existing loading only bay to 20 minutes time restricted free bay at junction with Lordship Lane.
  - Sydenham Hill - remove an existing time restricted free bay in bus lane near the junction with London Road

## 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 setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes
  - the introduction of destination disabled parking bays
  - statutory objections to origin disabled parking bays.
4. This report gives recommendations for three local parking amendments, involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions 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

### College Road

6. In response to concerns raised by residents of College Gardens an officer from the council's road safety and community projects group met with the residents and carried out a site inspection.
7. The officer noted that the intervisibility, between pedestrians and motor vehicles, at the following locations was poor:
  - two junctions of College Gardens and College Road
  - pedestrian island refuge, outside No.31 College Road
8. In practice, this means that pedestrians and motorists have difficulty seeing sufficiently far up College Road to identify whether there is an oncoming vehicle before stepping or entering into the main carriageway.
9. An officer from the parking design team also visited this location and noted that there were no vehicles parked in close proximity to the entrances to College Gardens or the pedestrian island refuge.
10. The pedestrian refuge is protected by an existing but short length of at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines). The short length leaves a length of unrestricted kerb space (sufficient for two cars to park) between the refuge and the southern entrance to College Gardens. This is likely to have the effect of encouraging vehicles to park in the gap and reduce visibility between all road users. See photos in Appendix 1.
11. There is also a significant concern that pedestrians crossing at the traffic island have a poor line of sight of approaching vehicles. It would appear that the existing yellow lines are too short and were originally designed only to achieve the objective of preventing parking so that vehicles could smoothly pass by the traffic island.
12. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 2, that new double yellow lines are installed in College Road at its junctions with College Gardens (where not currently existing) and that double yellow lines are extended on the approach sides of the pedestrian island.

### **Melford Road**

13. Councillor Robinson contacted the parking design team after meeting with the traders on Lordship Lane where he received a request to change the existing loading only bay in Melford Road at its junction with Lordship Lane to a 20 minute time restricted free bay.
14. Traders say that the loading only bay is of little use and that a 20 minute time restricted parking bay would be of greater benefit to all businesses as an additional parking facility for customers.
15. An officer carried out a site visit on 18 December 2013 and noted that a BOC Gas Lorry was unloading in the loading bay on Melford Road. The driver was delivering heavy gas bottles to the Barcelona Tapas Bar adjacent to the bay.
16. There are three loading only bays outside the parade of shops on the red route (TLRN) on Lordship Lane that operate Monday to Sunday 10am to 4pm, these are located between Melford Road and the bus stop outside Nos.497/499.

17. Outside Gloucester Court opposite the parade of shops is a 20 minute time restricted free bay on the red route (TLRN) on Lordship Lane which operates Monday to Sunday 10am to 4pm.
18. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 3 that the existing loading only bay on Melford Road, outside the Barcelona Tapas Bar is converted to a 20 minute time restricted free bay to improve parking facilities for customers using the parade of shops on Lordship Lane.

### **Sydenham Hill**

19. The council received an enquiry from Councillor Simmons, stating that he had received a request for the parking bay on Sydenham Hill (near the junction with London Road) to be removed as it blocks the bus lane during peak hours.
20. From the existing road markings and other signs it appears that the bay was meant to operate inter-peak. That is to say, that parking would only be allowed outside of peak bus lane hours (7-10am and 4pm-7pm).
21. The sign for the parking bay, however, does not reflect that and instead suggests the very opposite, that parking is allowed (for a maximum of 10mins) during bus lane hours.
22. We can find no background or reasons for this parking bay and agree that it is a very poor location for a parking bay in a bus lane and so close to the traffic signals, and there is unlikely to be significant demand either in peak hours or the inter peak..
23. It is therefore recommended that this bay, as detailed in Appendix 4, is revoked, and the single yellow line is maintained.
24. It is noted that Lewisham are the highway authority for the entire road but Southwark remains the traffic authority for the side of the road where the bay is situated and therefore is in a position to implement this recommendation

### **Policy implications**

25. 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**

26. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
27. 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.

28. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. 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**

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

### **Legal implications**

33. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
34. 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.
35. 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.
36. 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.
37. 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.
38. 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**

- 39. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out.
- 40. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
- 41. 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.
- 42. 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.
- 43. 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.
- 44. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which do so.
- 45. 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: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011">http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011</a>	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	College Road –pedestrian refuge photos
Appendix 2	College Road - at any time waiting restriction (double yellow lines)
Appendix 3	Melford Road – maintain existing loading only bay or convert to 20 minute time restricted free bay
Appendix 4	Sydenham Hill – revoke existing time restricted free bay

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Des Water, Head of Public Realm	
<b>Report Author</b>	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	17 January 2014	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments Included</b>
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
List other officers here		
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	17 January 2014	