

Item No. 11.	Classification: Open	Date: 2 April 2014	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:
 - Sturdy Road - remove existing single yellow lines and install 20 minute time restricted parking bay on the flank of No. 119 Consort Road.
 - Elm Grove - remove 7 metres of permit bay and install a double yellow line to provide access to a planned new dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No 54.

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 two 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

Sturdy Road

6. The parking design team was contacted by the directors of the Peckham Bazaar restaurant which is located at No. 119 Consort Road on the corner of Sturdy Road.
7. The location is on the boundary of Peckham B Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Consort Road is within the zone and Sturdy Road is outside the zone. This results in high levels of parking occupancy in Sturdy Road.
8. Currently the premises have a waiting restriction (yellow line) on both sides of the property. Waiting restrictions (as a national concession) allow for loading and unloading to take place but do not allow parking. Waiting restrictions have the advantage of keeping the kerbside free of parked cars, thus enabling vehicles to legitimately pull up and load /unload.
9. Officers and the cabinet member for transport, environment, and recycling met with the owners who explained that the operation of this business meant that they often needed to park after unloading their stock. This has resulted in a number of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) being issued when they leave their vehicle unattended for more than 5 minutes which is the observation period defined in the council's parking enforcement Protocol (which is used to identify if loading/unloading is occurring rather than parking /waiting).
10. A number of options have been considered:
 - a) No change to existing restrictions but ensuring the business understands the meaning of those restrictions and the council's enforcement protocol i.e. that vehicles must be moved as soon as unloading is complete.
 - b) Provision of a loading bay. This was perceived by the business as a good idea however the 5 minute observation period in the enforcement protocol is the same, so no real benefit to those who want to park.
 - c) Removal of the waiting restriction in Sturdy Road so that parking was permitted at all times and without any limit. However this would result in the space becoming filled-up and reducing space to unload.
 - d) Changing the waiting restriction to a parking bay.
11. On balance it is considered that a parking bay provides the best option for the business and may also benefit local residents and their visitors. Due to its location outside of a parking zone, pay and display parking is not recommended but a 20 minute time restricted parking bay should be installed. The business is supportive of this proposal.
12. It is noted that the existing single yellow line extends to the boundary wall of No. 11 Sturdy Road via a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No. 9. It is unclear if this crossover is still in use but it does provide a legal crossover and therefore it is not possible to install the parking bay across the dropped kerb. In accordance with the council's design standards for crossovers, it has been

recommended that the single yellow line be changed to a double yellow line. An alternative would be to remove the yellow line entirely (if it is not in use) however the council have received no request to remove the restriction.

13. Should an objection be received during statutory consultation, the proposal may be modified and lessened in its effect.
14. In view of the above it is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 1, the existing single yellow line is removed and a 12 metre 20 minute time restricted parking bay and double yellow lines are installed.

Elm Grove

15. The council's asset management team have received, considered and approved in principle (subject to this decision and statutory consultation) the construction of a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No. 54 Elm Grove.
16. The proposed crossover location currently has a permit holder only parking bay in front of it, this bay is part of Peckham (B) controlled parking zone (CPZ).
17. 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.
18. 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 one parking space.
19. Double yellow lines prohibit waiting (generally referred to as parking) 'at any time' however loading and unloading is permitted.
20. 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.
21. Please note that when this application was first made the resident who owns both Nos.52 and 54 requested a dropped kerb outside No.52 Elm Grove.
22. Officers presented this item to the Peckham and Nunhead community council at the meeting held 30 September 2013 when it was approved for statutory consultation.
23. The statutory process was completed and the traffic order made, officers notified the resident that the work was to start, it was then that the resident informed officers that she wanted the dropped kerb outside No.54 Elm Grove.
24. The resident has been informed that the application has to be re-submitted for approval and all costs will be incurred by them including abortive costs.
25. The traffic order for the double yellow lines outside No.52 will be revoked.
26. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 2 that the bay marking outside No. 54 is removed and 7 metres of double yellow line is installed.

Policy implications

27. 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

28. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
29. 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.
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 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 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	Sturdy Road – install a 20 minute time restricted bay and at any time waiting restriction (double yellow lines)
Appendix 2	Elm Grove – at any time waiting restriction (double yellow lines)

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 March 2014	
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	21 March 2014	