

Item No. 14.1	Classification: Open	Date: 23 March 2015	Meeting Name: Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
Report title:		Canada Water and Southwark Park parking consultation	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Rotherhithe Ward	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the community council comment upon the consultation areas detailed in paragraphs 12 to 24 along with the consultation methods detailed in paragraphs 25 to 26.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Part 3D of the Southwark constitution sets out that decisions relating strategic transport issues, including parking zones, are a matter for decision by the relevant cabinet member.
3. Part 3H of the Southwark constitution identifies that the community council should be consulted on strategic transport decisions, such as the method of consultation and whether to create a new parking zone.
4. This report is presented to the community council for the purposes of consultation on the boundary and method of a strategic parking project.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Project scope

5. The council plan to carry out three highway parking projects as follows:
 - A. Combined 1st and 2nd stage parking zone consultation on the principle and detail of a possible new zone in:
 - i) Five streets off Lower Road (Appendix 1)
 - ii) Two streets off existing H CPZ (Appendix 2)
 - B. Southwark Park – consult upon the proposal to introduce a time limit on parking in the carpark and road through the park.
 - C. Review parking layouts in Canada Street and Quebec Way.

Primary aims of parking zones

6. Improve availability of parking spaces: Give priority to certain groups i.e. residents and their visitors, loading and business short-stay parking over and above commuter parking (see parking hierarchy, Appendix 3).
7. Reduce overall traffic levels: Parking, by definition, is preceded by a trip and the

council has a clear policy to reduce traffic levels with the aim of reducing congestion, improving air quality and amenity and to encourage sustainable transport modes (walking/cycling) by deterring non-essential journeys.

8. Improve road safety and smooth traffic flow: Zones reduce the level of parking occupancy and provide natural passing spaces enabling pedestrians to cross the street more safely and for vehicles to pass one another more easily.
9. Reduce parking demand such that streets can be used for purposes other than just parking such as tree planting or on-street cycle parking: Studies have also shown that streets with lower levels of traffic have a positive effect on social interaction.
10. Assist control on future development (enabling planning department to make new developments parking permit exempt).

History of parking zones in the area

11. The recommended consultation area has been consulted previously and is adjacent to other, existing parking zones that have been amended on a number of occasions, as outlined in Figure 2.

Date	Project	Streets / area	
1998	Rotherhithe (H) CPZ introduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albion Street • Clack Street • Lower Road • Moodkee Street • Neptune Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renforth Street • Risdon Street • Surrey Quays Road • Swan Road • Temeraire Street
1998	Bermondsey (G) CPZ introduced	Streets to the west of Southwark Park	
2000	South Rotherhithe (N) CPZ introduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abbeyfield Road • Aspinden Road • Chilton Road • Cope Street • Croft Road • Corbetts Lane • Debnams Road • Hawkstone Road • Lower Road • Luxford Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oldfield Road • Plough Way • Raymouth Road • Rotherhithe New Rd • Rotherhithe Old Rd • Silwood Street • St Helena Road • Warndon Street • Yeoman Street
2002	Parking study in the Rotherhithe area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All other uncontrolled streets on the Rotherhithe peninsular • CPZ not supported 	

Figure 2

Consultation areas

Parking zone consultation areas (street off Lower Road and Zone H)

12. The two areas recommended for consultation are identified in maps contained in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. The surrounding CPZs (and non-CPZ areas) are also shown on the maps.
13. The areas recommended reflect:
 - A. correspondence (see paragraphs 15 to 18)
 - B. a logical grouping of streets that adjoin the existing, neighbouring parking zones
 - C. parking policy
 - D. the origin and purpose of the highway project funding - a section 106 (s106/137053) commitment to undertake a parking study in the area, associated with planning permission granted for Canada Water Site A (09-Ap-1870).
14. Note that the project relates only to the public highway and not to any Housing estate car parks or roads.
15. Requests from the public to introduce a parking zone, or to consult upon the introduction thereof, are one indicator that assists in the development of proposals.
16. Where requests are geographically concentrated it is likely to indicate:
 - A. some degree of broad public support to prioritise parking
 - B. 'parking stress' (where demand for parking is approaching or exceeding the available supply)
17. It is important that requests should only be used as an indicator and these are no substitute for a proper consultation. Research has shown that "customers very rarely complain to the service/ product provider. Instead they will tell their friends, who will in turn tell their friends, creating a pyramid of dissatisfaction." Equally, those members of the public who do not consider there to be a problem are fairly unlikely to write to the council to ask to keep the status quo.
18. The council collates requests for parking zone consultations in a map system to assist in the identification of patterns that may be more localised than street level, especially where they originate from a long road which may have different parking characteristics at different ends. In the interests of data protection this information is presented in Appendix 4 in a table format.

Southwark Park consultation area

19. The project originates from a request by Parks and Open Spaces officers to review parking within Southwark Park. This includes the road that runs between Gomm Gate and Southwark Park Road Gate, as well as the carpark off Hawkstone Road.
20. The general scope of the project is to consider the introduction of a time limit for parking in these areas. This is being considered to ensure turn-over of space and to prevent all-day parking by non-park using motorists. This will give genuine visitors to the park greater opportunity to find a parking space.

21. There will not be a specific letter drop to a defined area for this project as it is a public park with visitors from a wide area. There will, however, be notices installed within the park and direct consultation will take place with the Friends of Southwark Park.

Review of existing parking arrangements in Canada Street and Quebec Way

22. Parking in these streets is mostly controlled by waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to ensure the safe movement of traffic. There are, however, some unrestricted lengths of kerb where free parking can take place.
23. At this stage permit parking bays do not seem viable and therefore this area has not been included within the scope of the above parking zone project outlined in paragraphs 12 to 18.
24. The project will review these unrestricted lengths in the context of future development due to take place adjacent to the highway. It is anticipated that this may lead to a further consultation on the introduction of further parking changes.

Consultation methods for the parking zones and Southwark Park projects

25. The method of consultation and decision making is fundamentally determined by the council constitution and the strategic transport decision making process (Appendix 5).
26. Parking zone consultations follow a standard process that was established in the Parking and Enforcement Plan and is summarised in Figure 1 as published on the council’s website.

Stage		Expected dates
Design and consultation	Parking stress (occupancy / duration) surveys	Completed Jan '15
	Inception report to community council	March
	3 week consultation - pack and questionnaire to all residents, businesses and stakeholders - public exhibitions	June
	Data analysis including objective parking stress data	July
	Draft reports presented to community council for final comment	September
Decision making	Final reports and decision to be taken by Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning and Transport	October
	Statutory consultation (traffic orders)	December
	Implementation and go-live	January '16

Figure 1

Policy implications

27. 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

28. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report and have been subject to an equality impact assessment.
29. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the area where the proposals are made.
30. The implementation and operation of a parking zone contributes to an improved environment through the elimination of on-street commuter parking and the associated reduction of local and borough-wide traffic volumes.
31. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety. This is being recommended separately on today's agenda for this area as part of the council's local parking amendment programme.
32. 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 consultation is completed and any resulting recommendations implemented and observed.
33. The consultation leaflets will meet communication guidance with a languages page with advice of how to access the council's translation services. Large format leaflets will be available for those with visual impairment.
34. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.
35. 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.
 - Prioritising parking to those who most need it, in accordance with the council's parking hierarchy.

Resource implications

36. The cost of the project and implementation (if supported) of the parking zone will be met from a contribution established for this purpose in a section 106 agreement (s106/137053) associated with planning permission granted for Canada Water Site A.
37. The costs of the Southwark Park consultation and implementation (if supported) will be met by the parks and opens spaces business unit.
38. A better estimate of the costs and potential parking income from this scheme will be reported at the end of the consultation.
39. Details of future consultation are contained within the body of this report.

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: http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Map of recommended consultation boundary for streets off Lower Road
Appendix 2	Map of recommended consultation boundary for streets off H CPZ
Appendix 3	Adopted parking hierarchy
Appendix 4	Table of requests from the public to consult
Appendix 5	Strategic transport decision making process

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Project Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	10 March 2015	
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	10 March 2015	