Item No. 17.	Classification: Open	Date: 23 March 2015	Meeting Name: Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
Report title:		Ivydale Road traffic calming review	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Nunhead	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Community Council:

1. Agree to implement revised Ivydale Road traffic calming review proposals as detailed in appendix A of this report, subject to the outcome of any statutory procedures.

2. Notes the proposed changes to the scheme outlined in paragraph 15

3. Notes the lack of support for some fundamental elements of the scheme, as shown in the consultation response summary at appendix C.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for the cleaner, greener, safer capital programme to community councils.

5. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on non-strategic matters traffic matters

6. Funding has been secured through the council's cleaner, greener, safer (CGS) programme to review existing traffic calming on Ivydale Road, between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road. This is due to complaints by residents living close to the speed tables. They are concerned about environmental nuisance caused by the humps when used by motorists, noise, vibration and perceived structural disturbance to their properties. This report gives recommendation to remove four existing road humps and replace with road narrowing measures.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. Although Ivydale Road is a local residential street, it can be busy with buses, local and through traffic accessing local amenities along the road eg Nunhead Train Station, schools, churches etc.,

7. The existing traffic calming scheme on Ivydale Road was introduced as part of Nunhead 20mph zone scheme in 2010. Traffic calming measures for the section of Ivydale Road, between Linden Grove and Athenlay Road, are a combination of speed cushions and road narrowings (footway buildouts) incorporating speed tables. The southern section of Ivydale Road, towards Cheltenham Road, currently employs road narrowings with give-way / priority system to calm the traffic but without raised features.

8. The CGS funding was provided to specifically review the road narrowings incorporating speed tables on the section between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road, but not the speed cushions or the section south of Lanbury Road. Over the last few years some residents of Ivydale road, particularly those living close to these speed tables have complained about the impact of the humps on the quality of their life, with noise, vibration, environmental nuisance and perceived structural damage to their property quoted, particularly when the speed tables are traversed by lorries and buses.

9. A site walkabout between council officers, residents and a ward councillor was held in September 2014. The aim was to inform project officers of residents' aspiration for the impending traffic calming review. This will then feed into the scheme development. It was clear from residents who attended that they would like to see the speed tables removed. Officers were asked to explore similar traffic calming measures to those operating at the southern end of Ivydale Road i.e. road narrowings with alternating priority but no raised feature.

10. Based on the feedback from the walkabout, officers proposed the following changes to address residents' concerns:

- Remove existing speed tables at locations shown on the plan in appendix B
- Narrow the road to 3.0m, at locations where the tables are removed - from the current 4.0m – to compensate for the traffic calming impact lost by removal of raised feature
- Introduce a give- way / priority system as a form of traffic calming and regulate the traffic. Priority will alternate along the road.
- Extend existing double yellow lines at some locations to allow adequate waiting gaps

11. The proposed changes are similar to existing traffic calming measures on the southern end of Ivydale Road, between Inverton Road and Cheltenham Road where there are no speed tables but the pinch points are narrower and there is a give-way / priority system to help slow and regulate the traffic.

12. The proposed changes will not address existing concerns about traffic congestion on this northern section of Ivydale Road, which is generally narrower, compared to the Cheltenham Road. Existing road layout and kerbside parking at the northern section of Ivydale Road reduces the available road width to 5.0-5.5 metres for two-way traffic. This is not wide enough for two buses to pass each other at any time, thus the need for waiting gaps.

13. For the give-way / priority system to work safely, adequate waiting areas are required. Therefore the proposals included extending double yellow lines on each side of the pinch points resulting in the loss of 1 parking space at each pinch point. In total around 8 parking spaces were proposed to be lost as part of the consulted plans.

14. Ivydale Road speed survey (mph) – between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road is shown below. These results suggest there is currently not a significant problem with speed of vehicles.

Location (House Nos)	Northbound (average / 85th percentile) mph	Southbound (average / 85th percentile) mph
142/117	21 /25.5	20.8 / 25.3
98/85	19.2 / 22.6	19.8 / 24.2
38	20.8 / 25.3	20.3 / 25.1

The 85th percentile speed is the speed that 85 percent of vehicles do not exceed, or 15 percent of vehicles go faster than this speed, and 85 percent go at or below this speed.

Summary of consultation responses

15. A public consultation was undertaken in Ivydale Road - the consultation period was from 1-19 December. Responses received afterwards were acknowledged. The consultation document is shown in appendix B.

16. Out of total of 365 consultation leaflets delivered in December 2014, a total of 44 responses were received during the consultation period equating to 12% response rate.

17. Summary of consultation responses

- 79.5% of respondents are in favour of removing the tables.
- 56.8% support narrowing of the pinch points.
- 50% are not in favour of priority system with double yellow lines..

18. Summary of respondents' comments as to why they don't support some features of the proposal and officer response to these comments is shown in appendix C. The lack of support for the priority system with double yellow lines is mainly due to concerns about loss of parking.

19. In the questionnaire it was made clear that the give-way / priority system can't operate without the double yellow lines. The proposed road narrowing will allow only one car to pass at a time thus the need for a priority system.

20. A meeting was also held between Cllr Fiona Colley, officers, and the Chair of Governors of Ivydale School to discuss the detail of the scheme and some of the possible issues.

21. If the community council approves the progression of the scheme, a statutory consultation will be carried out prior to implementation. If any objections are received to this process, a further report will be required for the community council to consider and determine those objections.

22. Consideration was also given to not removing the raised feature opposite the church however it is considered preferable to maintain consistency and treat all the pinch-points on the road similarly given the concerns raised by residents were not solely regarding one particular pinch point.

23. To address issues raised during consultation, the following modifications have been made to the proposals:

- Double yellow lines proposed at junctions of Ivydale Road with Limesford Road and Harlescott Road to improve road safety and inter-visibility for all road users – approximately 7.5m on each side as per Southwark's design standard

- Additional 20mph roundel markings to encourage speed reduction
- Replace speed cushions within the section under consideration with sinusoidal humps which give a better ride for cyclists
- Extended double yellow lines to be applied to only one side of each narrowing rather than both sides as proposed. This will result in loss of 4 parking spaces instead of 8.

Officers will keep the last issue under review, it is hoped that only extending the double yellow line on one side will be sufficient to maintain flow of traffic given the clear sight lines between vehicles on each side approaching the pinch points, however officers have some concerns about whether this will be sufficient. If this proves not to be successful, it may become necessary to consider extending the provision on the second side of the pinch points in the future.

Policy implications

24. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the polices of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

    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

Community impact statement

25. The proposal is intended to maintain the existing level of traffic calming whilst ensuring local residents do not suffer the perceived side-effects of the present scheme.

26. The scheme will not have a significant impact on walking and cycling levels in the borough. It should improve bus services by increasing levels of comfort and reliability.

Resource implications

27. Funding allocation from 2014/15 CGS programme for this scheme is £41,750. S106 funding of £7000 is also earmarked. There is currently a budget shortfall of £20,000 which the Community Council will need to meet before works can commence, or alternatively a phased approach to the works will need to be agreed.

28. Works will be implemented by the council's highways term contractor, Conway Aecom, and are expected to be carried out in 2015 /16 financial year.

Consultation

29. Ward members were consulted prior to commencement of the public consultation. A public consultation was carried out in December 2014 as outlined above.

30. If approved for implementation the proposal will be subject to statutory consultation, required in the making of any permanent Traffic Management Orders. If objections are received a further report to the Community Council will be required to consider and determine those objections.

Reason for Urgency

31. It is unreasonable to not feed back the consultation results to the local community in a timely fashion as the report has already been postponed once, and there is a significant gap until the next planned meeting.

Reason for Lateness

32. Additional analysis and options were required following the public consultation.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Clement Agyei –Frempong Tel: 0207 525 2305

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	Ivydale Road – revised proposal
Appendix B	Ivydale Road –traffic calming review – consultation document
Appendix C	Summary of consultation responses and comments
Appendix D	Consultation area

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager
Report Author	Clement Agyei-Frempong, Senior Projects Engineer
Version	Final
Dated	19 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
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		19 March 2015