

<b>Item No.</b> 17.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 10 November 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:
  - Friern Road – install double yellow lines adjacent to a planned vehicle crossover that will provide access to No. 37.
  - Therapia Road – install double yellow lines adjacent to a planned vehicle crossover that will provide access to No. 10.
  - Sternhall Lane – convert existing doctor bays to pay and display bays and install one destination blue badge disabled parking bay outside doctor's surgery.
  - Sandison Street – revoke existing doctor bay and convert one car space to shared - use (permits or paid) parking.
  - Gervase Street and Leo Street – install double yellow lines to provide access for larger vehicles.
  - Meeting House Lane – install two destination blue badge disabled parking bays outside St John Chrysostom Church.
  - Peckham Rye – install double yellow lines to improve inter-visibility from an off-street customer car park.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On 29 September 2014 Peckham and Nunhead Community Council deferred the seven local parking amendments listed above to seek further information from officers. At that meeting, members asked that an officer attend when the deferred parking schemes were next considered at the meeting.
3. Part 3H of the Southwark constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the community council.

4. 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.
5. This report gives recommendations for seven local traffic and parking amendments, involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions and road markings.
6. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Friern Road and Therapia Road**

7. The council's adopted streetscape design manual (SSDM) provides the policy framework for the appearance and design of streets where the council acts as Local Highway Authority.
8. The SSDM contains design standards that set out the detailed requirements for construction of highway features. Design standard DS.132 (Appendix 1) explains how any new vehicle crossover must be designed.
9. It is a requirement of that standard that any new crossover must provide no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) for at least 2 metres on either side of the crossover. This is to ensure a degree of visibility to motorists exiting from the driveway.
10. Double yellow lines prohibit waiting (generally referred to as parking) "at any time" however loading and unloading is permitted.
11. 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 in the following locations:
  - leading to No.37 Friern Road
  - leading to No.10 Therapia Road
12. It is recommended, as shown in Appendices 2 and 3, that double yellow lines are installed so that the above vehicle crossings may be approved for construction.

### **Sternhall Lane**

13. The Chairman of the Sternhall Lane Surgery Patient Participation Group (PPG) contacted the parking design team to request that a destination disabled parking be provided outside the surgery.

14. A site assessment was carried out that identified that the surgery has a small hard standing area that is currently used for parking. It could comfortably accommodate two cars, however, observations show that four are sometimes tightly packed in. The tight confines of the site and the access gate make this area unsuitable for visitor parking.
15. During the site assessment it was also noted that a blue badge (disabled) holder was parked on the single yellow line, blocking access to the entrance to the surgery car park. Blue badge holders are permitted to park on yellow lines but obstructing access is an offence and this behaviour is a clear indicator that the existing provision for disabled parking is insufficient.
16. During the course of discussions the PPG also advised that the surgery no longer made use of the two existing doctor parking bays that are situated near the surgery on the highway. Officers have confirmed that there are no doctor permits on issue for use of these bays.
17. Officers therefore consider that the doctor bays can be removed and replaced with visitor (paid) parking which will provide a parking facility for visitors to the surgery as well as being of benefit to other local businesses and residents. Blue badge holders can also park in these bays free of charge. The Chair of the PPG confirmed that they and the surgery are supportive of all these proposals.
18. In view of the above it is recommended, as shown in Appendix 4, that:
  - i) one 4 hour destination disabled bay is installed directly outside the Sternhall Lane Surgery, to meet the initial request of the PPG
  - ii) two doctor bays are replaced with pay and display bays to provide visitor parking for the surgery

### **Sandison Street**

19. The council was advised that the existing doctor's bay in Sandison Street could be removed as it was no longer in use.
20. The surgery at No. 1 Maxted Road is no longer open and as a result the doctor's bay on Sandison Street is not required. Officers have confirmed that there are no permits on issue for use of this bay.
21. It is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 5, the doctor's bay is removed and a shared use (permit holders or pay and display) bay is installed. This bay type is consistent with other parking bays in the same street.

### **Gervase Street and Leo Street**

22. On the weekend of 22 March 2014 London Fire Brigade (LFB) was called out to a vehicle fire on Leo Street where two vehicles had been set alight.
23. As a result of their observations of the event, a resident contacted the council raising concern that parking obstructs access for larger vehicles, particularly the fire brigade and refuse vehicles.
24. An officer carried out a site visit on 10 April 2014 and noted that Gervase Street and Leo Street have fluctuating carriageway widths between 4 and 5.8 metres and 4 and 8.3 metres, respectively.

25. In April 2014, LFB (New Cross) confirmed that they have substantial concerns regarding access in this area because vehicles regularly park on one side of the carriageway. LFB 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.
26. On 7 July 2014 a recommendation for double yellow lines was made to Peckham and Nunhead Community Council. A decision was deferred and officers were asked to carry out informal consultation with local residents before a decision was made.
27. On 15 August 2014 officers distributed a consultation letter and proposal plan to the 79 properties that front Gervase Street, Leo Street and all address in Burnhill Close. Recipients were invited to give comment by 10 September 2014.
28. 7 responses were received which are summarised as:
  - Four in favour of the proposed double yellow lines
  - Three were against the proposed double yellow lines for the following reasons:
    - loss of parking to residents and visitors
    - the proposals are disproportionate to the frequency of event
    - that double yellow lines are only required on one side of the road
29. Appendix 6 contains full detail of the responses.
30. Officers have reviewed the plans and consider that the original proposals are proportionate to ensure that the council meets its statutory duty to secure the convenient and safe movement of traffic whilst maintaining parking where it is safe to do so.
31. Yellow lines have only been proposed on both sides of the road where the effective carriageway width would be reduced (if parking was occurring) to below 3.1m. 3.1m is the minimum width required by London Fire Brigade to enable them to proceed through a gateway (including between parked cars). The council is clear that it puts the safe movement of traffic above the provision of parking.
32. In view of the above it is recommended that double yellow lines are installed on Gervase Street and Leo Street, as detailed in Appendix 7, to prevent obstructive parking and improve access for larger vehicles.

### **Meeting House Lane**

33. The council was contacted by Father Peter from St John Chrysostom Parish Church, Meeting House Lane who requested two blue badge (disabled) bays to assist disabled visitors who want to come to the church. In particular it was noted that space was needed to allow 'Dial-a-ride' or Taxi-card users to be conveniently picked up and set down as well as space for blue badge holders that arrive by car.
34. Meeting House Lane is mainly unrestricted parking with some lengths of double yellow lines at junctions. There are also a number of original disabled bays outside residents' homes.

35. An officer carried out a site visit on Monday 18 August 2014 and observed that parking occupancy was low to medium and that space was available for any visitors who may have wanted to stop and park.
36. The priest later confirmed that demand for parking space was highest when church services were taking place but also between Tuesday and Sunday when cultural events and meetings were scheduled.
37. The council's policy is to provide destination disabled parking places in locations that people want to visit.
38. It is recommended that two destination disabled bays (8am to 8pm, max stay 4 hours) are installed in front of the entrance to the church as detailed on Appendix 8 to assist blue badge holders visiting the church. The operational hours will ensure turnover of space and allow overnight residential parking.

### **Peckham Rye**

39. The council was contacted by a resident who was acting on behalf of the Neighbourhood 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 on inter-visibility with oncoming traffic.
40. 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.
41. 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 parked very close to the dropped kerb reducing sight lines.
42. Officers prepared an initial design for new double yellow lines and sought comment from the resident who had raised the issue. The resident confirmed that she had spoken to the Vet and they were happy with the proposal. Officers have attempted to seek a direct response from the veterinary centre but, to date, have not received any response. In view of the resident's comments, officers expect that the proposed design will meet the aims and expectations of the veterinary centre.
43. On 7 July 2014 a recommendation for double yellow lines was made to Peckham and Nunhead Community Council. A decision was deferred so that members could consult further with officers. Officers were also asked to ascertain whether those who use the vets were responsible for the obstruction.
44. On the 7 August officers wrote to the Peckham Rye members and asked if they would like to meet on site or if they had any comments. No replies were received. Members were also advised that it was not possible to ascertain who parks on the public highway and whether or not they are associated with the Vets. Casual observations have observed different vehicles at different times and we do not have a method, with the budget available, to trace owner or identify the final destination of those vehicles owners.

45. It is recommended that double yellow lines are installed in front of the car park of the Neighbourhood Veterinary Centre as detailed on Appendix 9 to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.

### **Policy implications**

46. 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**

47. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
48. 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.
49. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
50. 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.
51. 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.
52. 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**

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

### **Legal Implications**

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

55. 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.  
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.
56. 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.
57. 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.
58. 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**

59. Where public or stakeholder consultation has already been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
60. The implementation of changes to parking requires the making of a traffic order. The procedures for making a traffic order are defined by national Regulations which include statutory consultation and the consideration of any arising objections.
61. Should the recommendations be approved the council must follow the procedures contained within Part II and III of the Regulations which are supplemented by the council's own processes. This process is summarised as:
  - a) publication of a proposal notice in a local newspaper (Southwark News)
  - b) publication of a proposal notice in the London Gazette
  - c) display of notices in roads affected by the orders
  - d) consultation with statutory authorities
  - e) making available for public inspection any associated documents (eg. plans, draft orders, statement of reasons) via the council's website or by appointment at 160 Tooley Street, SE1
  - f) a 21 day consultation period during which time any person may comment upon or object to the proposed order
62. Following publication of the proposal notice, any person wanting to object must make their objection in writing, state the grounds on which it is made and send it

to the address specified on the notice.

63. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to resolve so that it is withdrawn, it will be reported to the community council for determination. The community council will then consider whether to modify the proposals, accede to or reject the objection. The council will subsequently notify all objectors of the final decision.

### Programme timeline

64. If these items are approved by the community council they will progressed in line with the below, approximate timeframe:

- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – November to December 2014
- Implementation – January to February 2015

### 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	Vehicle Crossings design standard DS.132
Appendix 2	Friern Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 3	Therapia Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 4	Sternhall Lane – convert existing doctor bays to pay and display and install new destination disabled bay
Appendix 5	Sandison Street – convert existing doctors bay to shared bay
Appendix 6	Gervase Street/Leo Street – consultation comments
Appendix 7	Gervase Street/Leo Street – install double yellow lines
Appendix 8	Meeting House Lane – install destination disabled bays
Appendix 9	Peckham Rye – install double yellow lines

## AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm		
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer		
Version	Final		
Dated	29 October 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			29 October 2014