

<b>Item No.</b> 16.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 23 July 2014	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Mint Street and Quilp Street Amendments to Parking Arrangements	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Cathedrals	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Public Realm	

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Community Council agrees the extension of double yellow lines from Mint Street Park to the junction of Caleb Street and the extension of the single yellow line along Southwark Bridge Road across the junction with Quilp Street.
2. That the Community Council notes the removal of one existing permit parking bay from Weller Street.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. In October 2010, Borough Bankside and Walworth Community Council approved the use of Section 106 funds to deliver improvements to Mint Street Park boundary that would involve the closure of Quilp Street and Mint Street where the two roads extend into the park. The intention was to integrate the redundant roads into the park to create more welcoming entrances.
4. Following extensive consultation with local stakeholders planning approval has been given for a proposal for the closure and re-design of these roads. The design involves closing Mint Street at the hammerhead in the park and retaining the rest of the road as public highway. Quilp Street and Leigh Hunt Street are to be closed and integrated into the park.
5. Revised traffic restrictions are now required to reflect this new design. Double yellow lines are proposed from Mint Street Park to Caleb Street, whilst at the top of Weller Street one existing permit bay will be lost to facilitate vehicle turning. With the closure of Quilp Street there will be a need to extend the existing single yellow line across the junction with Southwark Bridge Road.
6. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters such as changes to single and double yellow lines to the community council. Once this report is agreed a traffic management order will be issued to enforce the local traffic amendments set out in paragraphs 5 above.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

7. Informal consultation with residents and business premises on these roads about the proposed parking amendments were completed on 30 June 2014. See appendices A, B and C.
8. Nine adjoining properties were consulted at 135, 137 Southwark Bridge Road and 85-91 Mint Street. One of residents responded that he supported the proposal and no. of residents objected to the proposals. The resident who agreed also commented that the location of the bus stop and bus shelter may need to be reviewed.
9. A parking survey was undertaken on 2 and 3 July 2014 during peak parking times. The full report is included as appendices D, E, F and G and but the main results are that the overnight parking demand in streets surrounding Weller Street is at 72% capacity in resident permit holder bays (RPH) whilst parking demand on Weller Street is at 97%. The loss of one bay would increase the stress on Weller Street itself but officers consider that there is sufficient parking capacity in surrounding streets. It is therefore not expected that the loss of the parking space on Weller Street will have a significant impact on parking within the area.
10. A safety audit was undertaken for the re-design of these roads. The full report is attached as appendix H. The report highlighted that the removal of the Mint Street hammerhead reduces available turning space for larger vehicles and recommended that a sweep path exercise be undertaken on Mint Street to demonstrate the suitability of the turning facility at the junction with Weller Street. Such an exercise has been done with large cars and taxis, all of which have sufficient turning along the highway proposals. Emergency vehicles and larger vehicles will have access to the hammerhead in the park via removable bollards.
11. In view of the above it is recommended that the community council agree to proceed with the traffic management order for the proposals.

## **Policy implications**

12. 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**

13. These recommendations are in compliance with the transport plan and have therefore been subject to an equality impact assessment.
14. 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.

15. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
16. 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.
17. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate negative impact on any other community or group.
18. The recommendations provide access for key services such as emergency vehicles by way of proposed drop bollards at the entrance of the park on Mint Street, yet the proposals do not allow for turning of refuge vehicles, as these are already reversing up Weller Street and would continue to do so once the proposals are in place.

### **Resource implications**

19. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing Public Realm Division budgets.

### **Legal Implications**

20. Traffic management orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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**

26. Consultation to date has been carried out as described in paragraph 8.
27. Should the community council approve, statutory consultation, as defined by national regulations, is required before the implementation of the traffic management order. 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. 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.
28. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which do so. 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.

### **REASON FOR URGENCY**

29. A decision is required at the July 2014 meeting, because the works are scheduled to start in September 2014 and the Mint Street refurbishment has to be completed this calendar year, in order to remain within current tender prices. This would provide sufficient time for officers to make the necessary arrangements for the works to commence in line with the current timetable. A further three month delay would have an adverse impact on this timetable and potentially lead to additional costs to the council.

### **REASON FOR LATENESS**

30. The initial report has been amended due to new information received following consultation with officers.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Informal consultation, parking Stress Survey and Road Safety Audit 1&2	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Parks Design Team 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Charlotte Glazier 020 7525 0859

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	(Informal consultation) Consultation letter
Appendix B	(Informal Consultation) Consultation plan
Appendix C	(Informal Consultation) Feedback form
Appendix D	(Parking Stress Survey) Survey results
Appendix E	(Parking Stress Survey) Survey area
Appendix F	(Parking Stress Survey) Site inventory
Appendix G	(Parking Stress Survey) Stress data
Appendix H	(Road Safety Audit 1&2) Mint Street Park final letter

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
<b>Report Author</b>	Charlotte Glazier, Project Manager/Landscape Architect	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	11 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 Constitutional Team</b>	11 July 2014	