

<b>Item No.</b> 17.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 7 February 2015	<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>		Nunhead, Peckham, Peckham Rye and The Lane	
<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:
  - Adys Road – install double yellow lines at the junction with Oglander Road to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.
  - Clifton Way – install double yellow lines at the junctions with Pomeroy Street and Loder Street to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.
  - Forest Hill Road – install double yellow lines adjacent to a planned vehicle crossover that will provide access to No.76.
  - Marmora Road – install double yellow lines adjacent to a planned vehicle crossover that will provide access to No. 60.
  - St George’s Way – install double yellow lines at the junction with Trafalgar Avenue to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines.

## 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 five local traffic and parking amendments, involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions and road markings.

5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed with the key issues section of this report.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Adys Road**

1. The council was contacted by a local resident who is concerned about vehicles that are parked on the junction of Adys Road and Oglander Road reducing the inter-visibility between road users.
2. Adys Road and Oglander Road have unrestricted parking with short lengths of waiting restrictions and disabled parking bays.
3. The resident reported that they had a traffic collision at this junction and it was a result of the significantly reduced visibility as cars can park all the way round the shallow corner.
4. As the resident reported that they had been involved in a traffic collision we contacted the road safety team and they responded that they had reviewed the junction and there have been no collisions reported to the police (Stats19) within the last 3 years (up to the end of July 2014).
5. However, the road safety team also commented that they considered that installing double yellow lines at this location would improve sight lines for all road users which would, in turn, improve road safety.
6. An officer carried out a site visit on 9 September 2014 and there were vehicles parked within 5 metres of this junction.
7. It is noted that the eastern side of the junction is in Peckham and Nunhead and the western side is in Camberwell. Therefore a report is being submitted to both community council areas.
8. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 1, that double yellow lines are installed to improve visibility at a priority road junction.

### **Clifton Way**

6. A local resident contacted the parking design team to request that double yellow lines are installed on the junctions of Clifton Way and Loder Road and Pomeroy Street to prevent obstructive parking and to improve sight lines.
7. Clifton Way is mostly unrestricted parking but has some short lengths of double yellow lines and disabled bays.
8. An officer met with the resident and carried out a site visit on 22 August 2014 and it noted that vehicles were parked with 5 metres of both junctions.
9. The junction of Clifton Way and Loder Street has existing footway build-outs that are designed to prevent parking in Clifton Way immediately adjacent to the junction and these appear to be effective. However, in Loder Street, there are two pedestrian dropped kerbs (no tactile paving) that were both obstructed by

parked cars. This prevents those with reduced mobility from crossing at this location.

10. The junction of Clifton Way and Pomeroy Street has no parking restrictions and one build out in Clifton Way. It was noted that large high sided vehicles were parked close to the junction and this was further reducing visibility of oncoming traffic.
11. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 2, that double yellow lines are installed at those junctions with Pomeroy Street and Loder Road to prevent obstructive parking and improve sight lines for all road users.

### **Forest Hill Road and Marmora Road**

12. 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.
13. The SSDM contains design standards that set out the detailed requirements for construction of highway features. Design standard DS.132 (Appendix 3) explains how any new vehicle crossover must be designed.
14. 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.
15. Double yellow lines prohibit waiting (generally referred to as parking) "at any time" however loading and unloading is permitted.
16. 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.76 Forest Hill Road (1415Q3013)
  - leading to No.60 Marmora Road (1415Q3024)
17. It is recommended, as shown in Appendices 4 and 5, that double yellow lines are installed so that the vehicle crossing outside the above locations may be approved for construction

### **St George's Way – 1415Q3020**

18. Cllr Hargrove contacted the parking design team on behalf of one of his constituents regarding the junction of St George's Way and Trafalgar Avenue
19. The resident commented that parking *"continues to be an issue and is clearly driven by commuters who use Chandler Way and more so St George's Way to catch buses. In particular St George's Way is effectively reduced to a one way street. Cars are entitled to park so close to the intersection with Trafalgar Avenue that this is becoming a queuing and traffic hazard."*
20. The council does not have plans to consult upon a parking zone in this street which would be effective in removing commuter and long-stay visitor parking however, this programme of local parking amendments provides opportunity to

improve traffic flow.

21. St George's Way runs parallel with the south side of Burgess Park between Trafalgar Avenue and Wells Way. Parking is mostly unrestricted with short sections of double yellow lines, including at the junction of St George's Way and Trafalgar Way.
22. An officer carried out a site visit on 13 November 2014 and confirmed that parking was occurring on both sides of the carriageway, beyond the limit of the existing double yellow lines. This has the effect of reducing the effective carriageway so that vehicles must give way to oncoming traffic. It was observed that, in general, westbound vehicles had to wait for on-coming eastbound vehicles and that those vehicles were queuing through junction.
23. It is therefore recommended, as shown in appendix 6 that the existing double yellow lines on the south side are extended to improve the flow of traffic at this location.

### **Policy implications**

24. 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**

25. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
26. 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.
27. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. The recommendations support the council's equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:
31. Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuge vehicles.

32. Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

### **Resource implications**

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

### **Legal implications**

34. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
35. 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.
36. 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.
37. 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.
38. 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.
39. 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**

40. Where public or stakeholder consultation has already been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
41. 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.

42. 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
43. 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.
44. 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**

45. If these items are approved by the community council they will progressed in line with the below, approximate timeframe:
- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – March to April 2015
  - Implementation – May to June 2015

#### **Background Documents**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
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	Adys Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 2	Clifton way – install double yellow lines
Appendix 3	Vehicle Crossings design standard DS.132
Appendix 4	Forest Hill Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 5	Marmora Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 6	St George's Way – install double yellow lines

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Head of Public Realm - Des Waters	
<b>Report Author</b>	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	27 January 2015	
<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>		28 January 2015