

<b>Item No.</b> 14.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 7 July 2014	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Local traffic and parking amendments	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All wards within Peckham and Nunhead Community Council	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Public Realm	

## RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the following local traffic and parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
  - Highshore Road – extend no waiting (double yellow lines) and no loading at any time restrictions to ensure access to an off-street delivery yard to the rear of No. 32 to 36 Rye Lane.
  - Coll's Road / Drayton Road – install double yellow lines at the junction to improve sight lines.
  - Gervase Street and Leo Street – install double yellow lines to provide access for larger vehicles.
  - Peckham Rye – install double yellow lines to improve inter-visibility from an off-street customer, car park.
  - Gowlett Road – reposition the existing loading bay near its junction with East Dulwich Road.
  - Lynbrook Grove – install double yellow lines opposite No.32 to provide access.

## 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 six local traffic and parking amendment, 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**

### **Highshore Road**

6. The council was contacted by the Health and Safety Adviser of Bonmarché who occupy the premises at No. 32 to 36 Rye Lane. The Adviser set out that vehicles parking on single yellow lines in Highshore Road prevented their delivery vehicles from accessing their off-street delivery yard that is situated to the rear of their premises.
7. Bonmarché were asked to complete a council loading assessment form which is aimed at better understanding a businesses delivery and servicing plan. The completed form identified that Bonmarché receive deliveries from a range of vehicle sizes (from Transit type van to large 3-axle 33 tonne lorries) on Thursdays mornings and Sunday evenings.
8. The supplier (not Bonmarché) determines when the deliveries take place and by what sized vehicle, although Bonmarché do advise the supplier of the location of their loading yard so an appropriate maximum size vehicle can be used. Bonmarché only accept deliveries on Highshore Road if the access to their delivery yard is obstructed..
9. Following receipt of the loading assessment, an officer carried out a site visit on 8 April 2014 to assess the concerns raised and to evaluate if there was a need to change waiting or loading restrictions.
10. During the site visit, vehicles were observed parking on the existing single yellow lines and were also double parking in the middle of the road.
11. Observations were made that supported the loading assessment that Bonmarché delivery vehicles approach the yard by driving forward down Highshore Road towards Rye Lane then reverse back into the yard. If vehicles are parked on the single yellow line this maneuver cannot take place.
12. It is recommended that an at any time waiting/loading restrictions are installed at the outside and opposite the delivery yard as detailed on Appendix 1 to prevent obstructive parking and improve access.

### **Coll's Road / Drayton Road**

13. The council was contacted by the Vice-Chair of the Astbury Road Area Residents Association who raised concerns with the parking in their area, in particular at the junctions.
14. An officer met with the Vice-Chair on 23 March 2014 and carried out a walk about to discuss the parking at the junctions of Astbury Road/Loader Street and

Coll's Road junction with Drayton Grove.

15. At the time of the visit the Vice-Chair commented that the parking was lighter than usual and there were a large number of free spaces available.
16. During the meeting the junction of Astbury Road and Loader Street was clear of parked vehicles and there was no obstruction of sight lines.
17. It was noted at the time of the visit that vehicles were parked close to the junction of Coll's Road and Drayton Grove reducing the sight line which was causing vehicles to advance onto the junction.
18. It is recommended that an at any time waiting restrictions is installed at the junction of Coll's Road and Drayton Close as detailed on Appendix 2 to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.

### **Gervase Street / Leo Street**

19. On the weekend of 22 and 23 March 2014 the London Fire Brigade (LFB) was called out to a vehicle fire on Leo Street where two vehicles had been set alight. As a result a resident contacted the council with concerns regarding access for the LFB and for refuse vehicles.
20. An officer carried out a site visit on 10 April 2014 and note that Gervase Street and Leo Street are narrow with widths varying on Gervase Street between 4 metres and 5.8 metres and on Leo Street between 4 metres and 8.3 metres.
21. We received feedback in April 2014 from the LFB White Watch based at New Cross, that they have substantial concerns regarding access as vehicles historically park on one side of the carriageway. The fire crew from White Watch noted that if a fire appliance was to pass it would have to mount the footway and this would not be possible if the vehicle was parked opposite a tree.
22. It is recommended that as detailed on Appendix 3 that double yellow lines are installed on Gervase Street and Leo Road to prevent obstructive parking and improve access for larger Vehicles.

### **Peckham Rye**

23. The council was contacted by a resident who was acting on behalf of the Neighborhood Veterinary Centre at No. 1 Barry Parade, Peckham Rye. They explained that, when leaving the Vet's car park, they had concerns about the poor level of inter-visibility with coming traffic.
24. The Veterinary Centre has an off-street car park in front of the surgery with a capacity of approximately four vehicles. The car park is accessed from the highway via a vehicle crossover situated immediately south of a pedestrian crossing.
25. The vehicle crossover has no restrictions in front or immediately adjacent to it and, on 12 May 2014, when an officer carried out a site visit it was noted that vehicles were parking very close to the dropped kerb reducing sight lines,

26. Officers have sought comment from the Veterinary Centre upon the initial design but, to date, have not received any feedback. The resident who is acting on behalf of the Veterinary Centre said that she had spoken to the Vet and they were happy with the proposal. We therefore consider that the proposed design will meet the aims and expectation of the Veterinary Centre.
27. It is recommended that double yellow lines are installed in front of the car park of the Neighborhood Veterinary Centre as detailed on Appendix 4 to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.

### **Gowlett Road**

28. A blue badge disabled bay application from a resident of East Dulwich Road has resulted in the need to realign the existing loading only bay on Gowlett Road.
29. An officer visited the applicant on 11 March 2014, to discuss the best location for their disabled bay. It is not possible to install a disabled bay outside their property however it was agreed that the nearest, closest alternative location was in Gowlett Road near its junction with East Dulwich Road.
30. An officer carried out an informal consultation, on 19 March 2014 with the shop owners on East Dulwich Road to ascertain the need for the loading only bay and the feedback was that it is used everyday and the shop owners wanted it maintained. They had no opposition to the loading only bay being moved north to accommodate the new blue badge disabled bay.
31. It is recommended that the existing loading only bay is repositioned northward by approximately 3 metres as detailed on Appendix 5 to accommodate a new blue badge disabled bay.
32. Please note that the disabled bay has been approved by powers delegated to officers.

### **Lynbrook Grove**

33. The parking design team was contacted by a local resident who has been unable to access their off street parking due to vehicles parking opposite their dropped kerb.
34. Lynbrook Grove is not within a parking zone but has at any time waiting restrictions at its junction with Chandler Way. This junction is closed to vehicular traffic by way of lockable bollards that provide filtered permeability for cycles and emergency service vehicles.
35. An officer carried out a site visit, 12 May 2014, at this location and found no vehicles were parked opposite the dropped kerb that would prevent access to the off-street parking. However, it was acknowledged that this was just a snapshot on and so officers asked the resident to provide evidence of obstruction occurring which they have done via a collection of photographs.
36. It is recommended that double yellow lines are installed in front and opposite of the dropped kerb of No.32 detailed on Appendix 6 to prevent obstructive parking and improve access.

## **Policy implications**

37. 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**

38. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
39. 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.
40. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
41. 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.
42. 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.
43. 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**

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

## **Legal implications**

45. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
46. 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.
47. 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.

48. 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.
49. 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.
50. 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**

51. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out.
52. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
53. 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.
54. 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.
55. 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.
56. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which do so.
57. 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.

### **Programme timeframe**

58. If these items are approved by the community council they will progressed in line with the below, approximate timeframe:
  - Traffic orders (statutory consultation) - August to September 2014

- Implementation – September to October 2014

## 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	Highshore Road - install at any time waiting/loading restriction
Appendix 2	Coll's Road/Drayton Grove - install at any time waiting restriction
Appendix 3	Gervase Street/Leo Street - install at any time waiting restriction
Appendix 4	Peckham Rye - install at any time waiting restriction
Appendix 5	Gowlett Road - relocate existing loading only bay
Appendix 6	Lynbrook Grove - install at any time waiting restriction

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
<b>Report Author</b>	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	26 June 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
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	26 June 2014	