

|                                    |                                |  |   |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Item No.</b><br>15              | <b>Classification:</b><br>Open | <b>Date:</b><br>21 July 2014               | <b>Meeting Name:</b><br>Dulwich Community Council |
| <b>Report title:</b>               |                                | Local Traffic and 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 traffic and parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
  - Dulwich Wood Avenue – extend double yellow lines at the junctions with Hunter’s Meadow and Bell Meadow.
  - Gallery Road – install double yellow lines in three locations: south of the junction with Burbage Road, south of Lovers’ Walk and north of Belair Park car park.
  - Turney Road – install double yellow lines at the junction with Boxall Road and Aysgarth Road and adjacent to the pedestrian refuges.

## 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 traffic and 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**

### **Hunters Meadow / Bell Meadow**

6. Councillor Hayes contacted officers on behalf of a constituent who reported on-going problems with vehicles parking too close to the junctions of Dulwich Wood Avenue with Hunter's Meadow and Bell Meadow, thus reducing sight lines of oncoming traffic when exiting from the two side roads onto Dulwich Wood Avenue.
7. Hunter's Meadow and Bell Meadow are not public highway and therefore any parking occurring on those roads is outside of the council's control, however there are existing waiting restrictions in place on Dulwich Wood Avenue on either side of these two roads.
8. Dulwich Wood Avenue currently has a 30mph speed limit but the council intends to introduce a 20mph speed limit on all Southwark roads this year. Once the new speed limit has been introduced we would expect to see lower speeds along Dulwich Wood Avenue.
9. Lower traffic speeds reduce the distance needed for vehicles to come to a stop and we have therefore designed the extension to the double yellow lines to reflect this new standard.
10. It is recommended that the existing double yellow lines are extended on the northwest side of both junctions of Bell Meadow and Hunter's Meadow with Dulwich Wood Avenue, as detailed on Appendix 1, to improve the right hand sight line and junction safety.

### **Gallery Road**

11. This item was previously presented to Dulwich community council on 19 March 2014. Members deferred the item so that this scheme could be considered in conjunction with the raised pedestrian crossing proposal on Gallery Road.
12. The raised pedestrian crossing proposal is only at outline design stage and will be subject to consultation later this year. The approximate location of the crossing is shown in Appendix 2. As can be seen, there is a small overlap between the yellow lines and the potential crossing, however we do not consider that this is of any real significance and therefore we recommend continuing with this item.
13. The following paragraphs provide the background and recommendations to the yellow line proposals as reported to the 19 March 2014 meeting.
14. Prior to the previous Dulwich community council meeting, Councillor Hayes contacted officers on behalf of a constituent who reported on-going problems with vehicles parking on Gallery Road that reduced the effective carriageway width to a single lane of traffic, causing delay to traffic flow.
15. Gallery Road fluctuates in width, has recessed parking bays in some locations and also has a number of narrower sections which, with moderate levels of parking, can cause vehicles to wait to allow oncoming traffic to pass.

16. Casual observations suggest that the demand for parking on Gallery Road has increased, for a number of reasons, and vehicles are now parking in locations that can cause obstruction to the flow of traffic. The resident listed three areas of particular concern:
- Between the mini-roundabout at the village and the crossing by Dulwich Picture Gallery.
  - Between the South Circular and the crossing by Dulwich Pre-Prep.
  - The area between Dulwich Pre-Prep and where the temporary double yellow lines start where the road narrows.
17. In 2010 five recessed bays were installed to provide parking outside and opposite the Dulwich Picture Gallery, outside the Old College Tennis and Croquet Club and outside the Dulwich College Pre-Prep School. There have also been incremental increases in yellow line in this road over a number of years.
18. An officer visited this location on 14 and 27 January 2014 to assess the concerns and also use the temporary double yellow lines (installed whilst rail bridge repairs were being undertaken) as a working example of what might be appropriate on a permanent basis.
19. A vehicle tracking assessment has been carried out using a worst-case scenario of parking occurring wherever legal to do so (i.e. in all locations that do not have an existing parking restriction) and with two standard London Fire Brigade vehicles proceeding in both directions.
20. In this scenario, it is clear that there are a number of locations along Gallery Road where traffic is reduced to a single lane and where conflict would occur with two oncoming vehicles (i.e. one vehicle would need to give way to another).
21. Officers are not, however, recommending that all conflict locations have waiting restrictions installed (eg. in front of the Picture Gallery). Instead, it is recommended that three particular stretches are addressed, as detailed in Appendix 2. This is felt to provide the appropriate balance between traffic flow and providing sufficient parking opportunities given the nature and location of the road.

#### **Turney Road junctions with Boxall Road and Aysgarth Road - 1314Q4004**

22. This item was previously presented to Dulwich Community Council on 19 March 2014. Members asked that officers consult informally with stakeholders on the scheme before returning the item to Dulwich Community Council for a decision.

#### **Background**

23. The parking design team was contacted by a resident of Boxall Road who raised concern about vehicles parking at the junction with Turney Road.
24. An Officer visited this location, 27 January 2014, and it was noted that vehicles were parked within 5 metres of the priority junction of Boxall Road and Turney Road.

25. Subsequently, the council received a report from a police community support officer (PCSO) of the Village Safer Neighborhood Team that they had needed to attend Dulwich Hamlet School due to parking congestion in Turney Road.
26. The PCSO reported that vehicles were parking too close to the pedestrian refuge island making it unsafe to use the crossing.
27. It is noted that there is an existing "school keep clear" that was being observed by motorists however it does not extend through or on either side of the crossing point.
28. The PCSO spoke with the head teacher who will be taking steps, internally, to raise the issue with parents. The PCSO and (the then) Cllr Crookshank-Hilton asked whether yellow lines could be installed at the location. Public realm officers agree that this should be a straight-forward approach to address poor levels of visibility caused by parked cars.
29. There is also a very similar arrangement of highway features (school keep clear, pedestrian refuge island and priority junction) approximately 60 metres west, at the junction with Aysgarth Road. Whilst little correspondence has been received at this location, it is recommended that yellow lines are also installed at this location to avoid incremental growth that is neither efficient nor helpful.
30. 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.
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.

#### **Informal consultation**

34. On 12 May 2014 an officer met with stakeholders representing the school, residents, Dulwich Society and Safe Routes to School.
35. At the meeting, the group initially discussed the objectives before carrying out a site visit to discuss the initial design and potential amendments.
36. On 15 May, an officer circulated to all stakeholders a statement of the design principles, a swept path analysis, a revised design (Revision C) and a timeframe

for the next steps. Comments on the key documents were sought by 13 June. The design principles and swept path analysis are provided in Appendix 3.

37. In order to gain feedback beyond those stakeholders present, the resident for Turney Road Residents Association agreed to distribute the revised design to all Turney residents in the affected section of the road. Another resident of Turney Road also agreed to speak to neighbours in Boxall and Aysgarth.
38. Turney Road Residents Association provided a response (summaries and quotes) on 24 June (Appendix 4). A further two emails were received after this date both of which included photographs of poor parking (parking too close to the islands and parking on the footway).
39. On 24 June 2014 officers provided feedback from the informal consultation to Village ward members. No comments have been received.

### **Recommendations**

40. In view of the issues raised and observed, the amendments made to the design and the feedback received during the informal consultation it is recommended that double yellow lines are installed as detailed in Appendix 5 (Revision C) to improve sight lines and safety at the pedestrian refuges and at the junctions with Aysgarth Road and Boxall Road for all road users.

### **Policy implications**

41. 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**

42. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
43. 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.
44. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
45. 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.
46. 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.

47. 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**

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

### **Legal implications**

49. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
50. 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.
51. 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.
52. 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.
53. 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.
54. 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**

55. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out other than as detailed above.
56. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.

57. 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.
58. 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.
59. 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.
60. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which do so.
61. 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 timeline

62. 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<br>Environment and Leisure<br>Public Realm projects<br>Parking design<br>160 Tooley Street<br>London<br>SE1 2QH<br><br>Online:<br><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<br>020 7525 2021 |

### APPENDICES

| No.        | Title   |
|------------|---|
| Appendix 1 | Dulwich Wood Avenue – proposed extension of double yellow lines |
| Appendix 2 | Gallery Road - proposed double yellow lines                     |
| Appendix 3 | Turney Road – design principles and swept path analysis         |
| Appendix 4 | Turney Road – Turney Road resident feedback                     |
| Appendix 5 | Turney Road – proposed double yellow lines                      |

## AUDIT TRAIL

|   |                                     |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Lead Officer</b>   | Des Waters, Head of Public Realm    |                          |
| <b>Report Author</b>  | Tim Walker, Senior Project Engineer |                          |
| <b>Version</b>  | Final                               |                          |
| <b>Dated</b>  | 9 July 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 Community Council Team</b>                 | 9 July 2014                         |                          |