

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Item No. | Classification: Open | Date: 15 December 2014 | Decision Taker: Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport |
| Report title: | | Quietway Cycling Route Proposals | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | | South Bermondsey, Grange, Chaucer, Cathedrals | |
| From: | | Head of Public Realm | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport:
 - approves the implementation of the Quietway Cycling Route proposals for sites A to M – subject to statutory procedures - in accordance with the detailed recommendations highlighted in the below table:

| Site | Recommendation |
|----------|--|
| A | <p>Rossetti Road / Stevenson Crescent</p> <p>Implement with revisions to the scheme to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Removal of footway buildouts at either end of the cycle path and introduction of raised asphalt junction tables at both Stevenson Crescent and Rossetti Road, with tightened kerb corner radii. b) Change of junction priority at Stevenson Crescent and Rossetti Road so that the Quietway route takes precedence over adjacent side roads. c) Introduction of an additional Dutch style double hump on the cycle track and repositioning the humps on approach to the pedestrian footpaths crossing either end of the cycle track. |
| B | <p>Stevenson Crescent / Abercorn Way</p> <p>Implement without amendment</p> |
| C | <p>Abercorn Way / Oxley Close</p> <p>Implement without amendment</p> |
| D | <p>Oxley Close / Chaucer Drive</p> <p>Implement without amendment</p> |
| E | <p>Dunton Road / Lynton Road / Willow Walk Junction</p> <p>Implement without amendment</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| F | Pages Walk / Harold Estate Implement without amendment. Use of ANPR enforcement cameras to protect against possible misuse by motorcycles |
| G | Webb Street Implement without amendment as far as TLRN (red route) boundary |
| H | Rothsay Street Section A Not to be implemented at this time Section B Implement without amendment |
| I | Tabard Street Implement without amendment |
| J | i) Globe Street Implement without amendment ii) Trinity Street Implement as per consultation with following amendment: the amendments to the Trinity Street barrier will be undertaken for a trial period of 12 months, using ANPR cameras to gauge compliance by motorcycles and to enforce the closure of this road by issuing Penalty Charge Notices, and to assess the practicality for disabled cyclists and other users of non-standard bikes. |
| K | Great Suffolk Street and Borough High Street Junction Implement without amendment |
| L | Great Suffolk Street / Southwark Bridge Road Junction Implement without amendment |
| M | Webber Street and Blackfriars Road Junction Implement without amendment |

- Notes that parts of the works require a traffic management order and that if any objections to the related statutory consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision on whether to proceed with that part of the scheme will be subject to a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport.

- Notes that the works to the junction between Rothsay Street, Tower Bridge Road and Webb Street will not be implemented as per consultation as the present time. Works at this junction (which is within the remit of Transport for London) are subject to further review and will be implemented by Transport for London.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The Council's Constitution gives the portfolio holder for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport responsibility for (amongst other things) strategic traffic and highway schemes.
3. The proposals are for the implementation of 'Quietway 1' – which is the pilot Quietway route and forms the first of a series of proposed routes promoted by the Mayor of London in his Cycling Vision for London along with the boroughs. The entire route runs from Waterloo in LB Lambeth to Greenwich in LB Greenwich.
4. Further detailed information on the objectives, proposed scheme measures, consultation process, results and recommendations for each site can be referenced using the following table:

| | Report Reference | Report Title |
|---------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Site A | Appendix A | Site A Consultation Report |
| Site B | Appendix B | Site B Consultation Report |
| Site C | Appendix C | Site C Consultation Report |
| Site D | Appendix D | Site D Consultation Report |
| Site E | Appendix E | Site E Consultation Report |
| Site F | Appendix F | Site F Consultation Report |
| Site G | Appendix G | Site G Consultation Report |
| Site H | Appendix H | Site H Consultation Report |
| Site I | Appendix I | Site I Consultation Report |
| Site J | Appendix J | Site J Consultation Report |
| Site K | Appendix K | Site K Consultation Report |
| Site L | Appendix L | Site L Consultation Report |
| Site M | Appendix M | Site M Consultation Report |

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

5. Informal consultation for sites A to G took place with all residents and businesses within the consultation area from 25th July 2014 until 15th August 2014. (Online comments / responses were accepted until the 25th August 2014).
6. Informal public consultation for Sites H to M took place with all residents and businesses within the consultation area from the 5th August 2014, with a return deadline of the 5th September, allowing 4 weeks for the consultation period. However due to the summer holiday period, responses were accepted online until the 12th September 2014.
7. Full details of the consultation strategy, results, conclusions and recommendations can be found in Appendices A to M.

Community Council Consultation

8. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 19 and 21 of the Southwark Constitution, Community Councils are to be consulted on the detail of strategic parking/traffic/safety schemes.
9. On the 17th September 2014, officers consulted Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council covering the background to the study and the highlights of the results with a draft of the proposed recommendation to the Cabinet member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport for sites A to G, as per this report. The Community Council resolved on the following comments:-
 - In Grange Ward, where the route meets Webb Street and goes through the Harold Estate, there was a proposal to remove the chicane. Residents had said that prior to the introduction of the chicane, motorised scooters and fast cyclists had used the route, so there were safety concerns about its removal. A possible solution to that would be a Dutch style reverse hump fixture.
 - Some residents had complained that they were not consulted on the proposals and it would have been better if more of those affected by the proposals had been included.
 - Chris added that CCTV could be used to see how parts of the route were working in practice as a safety measure. The cycling commissioner had said that they were prepared to fund an enforcement regime.
 - Councillor Anood Al-Samerai asked for the introduction of segregated cycle lanes, as those were best for cyclists' safety.
10. On the 29th September 2014, officers consulted Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council covering the background to the study and the highlights of the results with a draft of the proposed recommendation to the Cabinet member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport for sites H to M, as per this report. The Community Council resolved on the following comments
 - Site G/H: There had been a considerable number of comments from residents about this site, and concerns had been expressed about the proposed changes. In particular, it was feared that these would push traffic into Alice Street from Tower Bridge Road. Residents of the Jam Factory had expressed concerns about possible rat-running and restricted access for emergency vehicles, as the road was very narrow already. Decima and Meakin estates residents had raised concerns about creating a bottleneck in Alice Street, which would impact on wheelchair and pushchair users especially. This would need looking at closely.
 - Site I: there was general agreement with the plans set out for site I.
 - Site J: over the last month, there had been concerns raised by residents of Trinity Square about the changes to the gates at Trinity Street. These were supported by ward councillors. Changes to / widening of the gates would increase motorcycle traffic through the square, and no evidence to the contrary had been presented in the report. Furthermore, the recommendation in the report was not consistent with the proposal that

had been consulted on. There was a possible alternative via Swan Street, which the cycle path could take. Ward councillors had given residents their full support in opposing any measures which would undermine the purpose of the gates.

- Site K: councillors were satisfied with the measures, and had not received any negative representations regarding the plans for this site.
- Site L: ward councillors said that they had not been approached about this item with negative comments. In addition to the proposals, residents should be consulted about moving the zebra crossing on the corner of Great Suffolk Street and Toulmin Street. Another issue which needed to be addressed in the area was people cutting across pavements.
- Site M: councillors were supportive of the plans set out for site M.

11. Detailed consultation results are provided in the attached appendices.

Response to Significant Issues Raised

12. In relation to Site F, officers recommend the proposals are implemented. Officers will consider the introduction of ANPR cameras for enforcement purposes to prevent possible misuse by motorcycles.
13. In relation to Site H, this area will now be excluded from this decision and the section of route where it crosses Tower Bridge Road will be subject to further discussion with Transport for London (Highway and traffic authority for that road). The results of this consultation will be passed to Transport for London to consider. A final decision on how this section of route is implemented will be for Transport for London and will be subject to its approvals processes.
14. In relation to Site J, following the community council meeting, the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport agreed to meet with officers, ward councillors and representatives from the Trinity Newington Tenants' and Residents' Association to discuss the recommendations that were made in the consultation report for Site J. The meeting was held on the 20th October 2014.
15. Following discussions at the meeting, the Cabinet Member instructed officers to provide a report investigating the feasibility of the alternative route suggested by the Trinity Newington Tenants' and Residents' Association and compare it to the proposed route via Globe Street and Trinity Street.
16. A detailed report was produced (see Appendix N), which fully investigates the feasibility of diverting the Quietway Route via Cole Street and Swan Street. The findings clearly indicate that there are numerous issues relating to cost, inconvenience, loss of parking and safety, which are prohibitive to making this alternative routing viable. Transport for London and the Cycling Commissioner have commented that they would not support this alternative route. In addition, Transport for London has also confirmed that they would not be willing to fund the additional costs associated with the alternative route via Cole Street and Globe Street.
17. The alternative proposed route must therefore be discounted as not a feasible alternative.

18. The principal objection of the Tenants' and Residents' Association is to the proposal to enlarge the 'chicane' gap in the decorative gates that prevent motor vehicles from accessing Trinity Church Square from Trinity Street. It believes that any 'easing' in this restriction will make it easier for motorcycles and mopeds to use this gap. Currently the barriers are below the minimum design standard for a cycle chicane. Inevitably there is a small risk that making the gap larger will make it more attractive for mopeds to use, It should be noted that the gates provide a physical barrier, however there is a clear need to make the gap easier for pedal cycles to access. The existing chicane is difficult to transverse for many cyclists and unusable for more specialist cycles such as tricycles and trailers. Cyclists with disabilities or mobility problems are particularly disadvantaged by the current layout. Wheels for Wellbeing and Southwark Cyclists both made detailed objections to the current layout and indicated in their consultation responses that the consultation proposals did not go far enough to open up this restriction for cyclists. There is also a Traffic Management Order preventing use of this by motor vehicles. This can be enforced by camera.

North Area Housing Scheme Engagement

19. A section of the scheme passes through housing land on the Harold Estate (within the scheme extents of Site F). Accordingly, the North Area Housing Management Team was consulted on the 14th August 2014. The Housing Office noted the content of the consultation but did not detail any objections or make specific comments regarding the proposed measures.
20. It is noted that the proposed measures for Site F will not affect access into the estate and will improve pedestrian safety and accessibility. All proposed materials are a standard low cost specification, including precast concrete units for parking bays and footways and asphalt for carriageway construction. Therefore there is no additional future maintenance liability is envisaged over and above existing requirements.
21. In addition, the size of the green space between the Harold Estate access road and Webb Street is being reduced and replaced with hard standing associated with the footway and cycle track proposal. Therefore the maintenance cost at this location should be reduced as the hard standing area will require less maintenance than the existing green space.
22. It is not anticipated that this section of the Harold Estate is adopted as public highway as part of these proposals and therefore the maintenance of this section of the Quietway route will remain the responsibility of the North Area Housing Management Team.

Basis for Recommendations

23. On the basis of the overall support officers recommend that the proposals for each site proceed to implementation subject to statutory procedures. Suitable amendments to the proposals have been made at sites F and J. Sites G and H will have certain elements omitted at the present time subject to further negotiation with Transport for London.
24. If any objections to the statutory consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision on whether to proceed with the related parts of the scheme will be the subject of a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport.

Policy implications

25. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011 (TP/11) and principles of the emerging Cycle Strategy (SCS), in particular:-

TP/11

- Policy 1.1 - pursue overall traffic reduction
Policy 2.3 - promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough
Policy 4.2 - create places that people can enjoy
Policy 5.1 - improve safety on our roads and to help make all modes of transport safer.

SCS

- Principle 1 (Stress free cycling) – Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3
Principle 2 (Cycling as a priority) – Objectives 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7
Principle 3 (Cycling for everyone) - Objectives 3.6 and 3.7
Principle 4 (Cycling for health and wellbeing) – Objective 4.3
Principle 5 (Cycling as an investment) – Objective 5.2

Community impact statement

26. The implementation of any transport project creates a range of community impacts. This transport scheme aims to improve the safety and security of vulnerable groups and support economic development by improving the overall transport system and access to it. This project is particularly geared to improving conditions for pedestrians and cyclists by reducing traffic speeds, improving safety and accessibility for vulnerable road users and improving the streetscape. The proposals are just not for current cyclists, but are for people who have always been put off cycling by the thought of sharing the road with high volumes of cars, vans, buses and lorries. The scheme objective is to significantly increase the number of residents using cycling as their preferred mode of transport, particularly for local journeys, which as both health and environmental benefits.

Equalities

27. The measures proposed as part of the Quietway scheme promote inclusive cycling, so that people of all abilities can safely cycle the route to reach their destination of choice. A key element of the scheme is to remove existing barriers to cycling such as chicanes and gates that are currently preventative to mobility cycles.

Resource implications

28. The total cost of proposed scheme is estimated to be around £4million for sites A to M. The total cost of the project is being funded by Transport for London through two different revenue streams. Sites A to G are being funded through the Quietway budget and Sites H to M are being funded through the Central London Grid allocation.
29. The project is funded by Transport for London via the Central Grid and Quietway programmes. On the 8th August, the TfL Borough Cycling Programme Manager wrote to the council confirming £2,656,000 implementation funding for the

Central Grid section of the Quietway Route, with an additional £344,000 for design costs (see Appendix O). This is sufficient to fund the proposed scheme and any associated fees.

30. The council expects to receive an additional letter of confirmation shortly from TfL outlining the funding awarded to the borough for the Quietway section of the route that will include money for implementation and design fees. It must be noted that works will not commence on site until funding has been confirmed.
31. The proposed capital works are expected to be completed by 31st March 2016, which is within the time limit set by TfL for the grant.
32. As the roads along the cycle route are an existing asset, any future maintenance cost of the completed scheme will be funded from the current revenue budget of the Asset Management business unit.

Consultation

33. The public and informal consultation undertaken is detailed above and in the relevant appendices.
34. Part of the schemes require traffic management orders. The process for implementing a traffic management order involves a statutory consultation procedure. If any objections are received that cannot be informally resolved, determination of them will be the subject of a further report.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Legal Services

35. The Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport is being asked to approve the implementation of the Quietway Cycling Route proposals.
36. Part of the scheme requires a traffic management order. The process for implementing a traffic management order involves a statutory consultation procedure. If any objections to the consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision on whether to proceed with that part of the scheme will be subject to a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport.
37. The Equality Act 2010 introduced the public sector equality duty, which merged existing race, sex and disability equality duties and extended them to include other protected characteristics; namely age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief and sex and sexual orientation, including marriage and civil partnership. In summary those subject to the equality duty, which includes the Council, must in the exercise of their functions: (i) have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and (ii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
38. The Human Rights Act 1998 imposed a duty on the Council as a public authority to apply the European Convention on Human Rights; as a result the Council must not act in a way which is incompatible with these rights. The most important rights for planning purposes are Article 8 (respect for homes); Article 6

(natural justice) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (peaceful enjoyment of property).

39. The Council's constitution gives the portfolio holder for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport responsibility for (amongst other things) traffic management, promoting sustainable transport and road safety. Part 3D of the constitution provides that the responsibility for agreeing statutory and other strategies in relation to their area falls to the individual Cabinet Member. Approving the implementation of the Quietway Cycling Route Proposals would therefore clearly fall within this paragraph.

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services (CAP13/052)

40. The report is requesting approval from the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning, and Transport to implement the Quietway Cycling Route proposals.
41. It is noted that the cost of the proposed scheme is estimated to be £4,447,000 (£2,663,000 for the Central Grid section site H to M and £1,784,000 for the Quietway Section Sites A to G) and will be directly funded by Transport for London through the Borough Cycling Capital Programme. The scheme will be completed within the time limit set by TfL for the grant funding.
42. It is also noted that any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing departmental revenue budgets.
43. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation are being directly funded by TfL.

APPENDICES

| No. | Title |
|-------------------|--|
| Appendix A | Site A Consultation Report (Stevenson Crescent / Rossetti Road) |
| Appendix B | Site B Consultation Report (Stevenson Crescent / Abercorn Way) |
| Appendix C | Site C Consultation Report (Abercorn Way / Oxley Close) |
| Appendix D | Site D Consultation Report (Oxley Close / Chaucer Drive) |
| Appendix E | Site E Consultation Report (Dunton Road / Lynton Road / Chaucer Drive) |
| Appendix F | Site F Consultation Report (Pages Walk and Harold Estate) |
| Appendix G | Site G Consultation Report (Webb Street / Swan Mead) |
| Appendix H | Site H Consultation Report (Rothsay Street) |
| Appendix I | Site I Consultation Report (Tabard Street) |
| Appendix J | Site J Consultation Report (Globe Street and Trinity Street) |
| Appendix K | Site K Consultation Report (Borough High Street junction and Great Suffolk Street) |
| Appendix L | Site L Consultation Report (Southwark Bridge Road junction) |
| Appendix M | Site A Consultation Report (Webber Street and Blackfriars Road junction) |
| Appendix N | Officer response to Cole Street / Swan Street diversion |
| Appendix O | Cycle Grid Funding Confirmation Letter |

BACKGROUND PAPERS

| Background Papers | Held At | Contact |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Transport Plan 2011 | Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH | project officer name and number |
| Minutes of the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council meeting held on 17 th September 2014. | As above | As above |
| Minutes of the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council meeting held on the 29 th September 2014. | As above | As above |

AUDIT TRAIL

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Lead Officer | Des Waters, Head of Public Realm | | |
| Report Author | Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager | | |
| Version | Final | | |
| Dated | 1 December 2014 | | |
| Key Decision? | Yes | If yes, date appeared on forward plan | n |
| CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER | | | |
| Officer Title | Comments Sought | Comments Included | |
| Director of Legal Services | Yes | Yes | |
| Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services | Yes | Yes | |
| Date final report sent to Constitutional Team | | 10 December 2014 | |